

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

@5:00pm in CBJ Room 224 & Zoom meeting

- A. **Call to Order:** Mr. Ridgway called the meeting to order at 5:00pm in CBJ Room 224 and via Zoom.
- B. **Roll Call :** The following members were in CBJ Room 224 or via zoom - James Becker, Don Etheridge, Paul Grant, Debbie Hart, Shem Sooter, Matthew Leither, Albert Wall (arrived at 5:08pm), Annette Smith, and Mark Ridgway.

Also in attendance: Carl Uchtyl – Port Director, Matthew Sill – Port Engineer, Matthew Creswell – Harbormaster, Emily Wright – CBJ Law, Rorie Watt – City Manager, and Teena Larson – Administrative Officer.

- C. **Port Director requests for Agenda changes**

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

- D. **Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items** - None

- E. **Approval of Minutes**

1. Hearing no objection the June 21st, 2023 minutes were approved as presented.

- F. **Unfinished Business**

2. Downtown Safety Rail - Correspondence

Mr. Uchtyl said on page 12 in the packet is a letter to the Assembly that he was directed to draft for the Board indicating the Boards desire to install safety railing along the Seawalk. This went before the Board last month. He added the picture of an individual laying on the bull rail. The picture was taken on July 3rd and the individual was non-responsive. JPD and CCFR was called and eventually CARES assisted the individual. He said Docks & Harbors has asked for funding through marine passenger fees for this safety rail since the completion of the 16B project in 2017. The request has not been funded through the City Manager's process. This letter informs the Assembly there is undue risk with not having safety rails along the seawalk. The City Manager added a section in this memo also.

Committee Questions -

Mr. Grant said he was walking on the Docks a few days ago and he saw some guys diving off the dock. Will this handrail keep someone from this activity?

Mr. Uchtyl said no, this is a safety rail and anyone could jump over it.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Mr. Ridgway said the safety rail will be approximately 36" high off the bull rail. The reason for the need is that people have tripped and fell off the seawalk to their death and he wanted that added in the letter.

Mr. Uchytel said he does not recommend adding that verbiage and does not see the value. Stating that in the letter could potentially expose Docks and Harbors and the City to liability.

Mr. Ridgway asked if there was consideration to add a picture of the existing safety rail that we would like to extend.

Mr. Uchytel said he did not add that because he assumed with the close proximity to City Hall that those curious on what it would look like could walk over and see it. He said he can add it if the Board wants it added.

Mr. Grant asked if we are conceding any liability if someone falls over the side by sending this letter and stating over and over that we have inadequate safety railings on the docks?

Ms. Wright said the information is already out there. If you want Mr. Uchytel to put facts in the letter stating the amount of people that have fallen to their death, that is okay to do and it does not increase our liability. It could be brought up in litigation but it does not add to our liability.

Mr. Sooter said he worked on the 16B project when it was being constructed. The company installing the dock asked for a complimentary OSHA inspection and OSHA required a temporary hand railing be installed on any dock that was no longer a working face.

Ms. Smith said we are eliminating access to the water for people that want to get to the water and that bothers her. She has friends that like to dive off the Seawalk.

Mr. Wall joined the meeting.

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion/Action –

Mr. Ridgway said he agrees that he does not want to restrict access to the water, but he does not see the safety rail restricting access but keeping someone from falling off the Seawalk to their death. The letter is basically pointing out the safety concerns and asking why we have been turned down for funding. He asked Mr. Sill to send out a picture of the rail that would be installed.

Mr. Leither asked if we are allowing people to jump off the seawalk?

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Mr. Uchytel said we have signs that say no diving but it still happens. We could fine them for a violation of posted notice.

Mr. Leither commented that this safety rail is not restricting anything because the diving is already not allowed.

Ms. Smith said she sees people fishing from this area and swimming and they are all non paying users and she wonders if that is the issue. The Seawalk has not been a safety issue since the 60's.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the Marine Park Lightering float was removed under the pretence of safety. He recommended all the members of the Committee go look at the safety rail before the next Board meeting.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: MOVE THE SAFETY RAIL LETTER TO THE NEXT FULL BOARD MEETING AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

G. New Business

3. Proposed Launch Ramp Survey - Derby Weekend

Mr. Creswell said on page 14 and 15 in the packet is the potential survey. Last month, we had a Board member of the Territorial Sportsman comment that he would like more done at Amalga Harbor. In 2021 we conducted a survey during the Salmon Derby for our launch ramp users geared toward North Douglas focusing on the future expansion that was being discussed at the time. Lots of people took the survey. Staff is looking at doing that same survey again. The proposed questions are in the packet and he would prefer less than what is there. As an incentive to do the survey, he is recommending to give away two 2024 launch ramp permits that would be given away randomly.

Committee Questions-

Mr. Grant asked why we need to know what the preferred launch ramp is?

Mr. Creswell said this gives us an idea what launch ramp the users are using the most. We also ask this question when someone purchases a launch ramp online.

Mr. Grant said he would remove that question because we get the information elsewhere.

Ms. Smith asked if there was going to be staff handing out the survey at each launch ramp? Is there a reason there is not an area people can write comments?

Mr. Creswell said in 2021 we used Survey Monkey which is an electronic survey. We laminated posters with the QR code and posted at all our launch ramps. Entering the comments in one spot works best on these surveys.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Ms. Hart said for question one, instead of asking the preferred, we could ask them to rank them.

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Ridgway recommended staff continue efforts to obtain information on launch ramp user input.

Mr. Creswell commented that he also posts the survey link on facebook and the majority of the responses to the survey came from there.

Mr. Ridgway commented that if something was going to be given away to start out with that information.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: MOVE TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE LAUNCH RAMP SURVEY DURING THE SALMON DERBY WEEKEND AND MOVE THIS TO THE FULL BOARD FOR FINAL REVIEW AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

4. Boat Shelter Sale – Board Right-of-First Refusal to Purchase

Mr. Etheridge recused himself from this discussion. His nephew is selling this boat shelter for nephew's mother.

Mr. Uchytel said in accordance with our regulation, any patron wishing to sell their boat shelter is required to give the Board the right-of-first refusal. The patron does have a buyer but the Board has the right to purchase this if they want. In the past, the Board has always elected to waive that right.

Board Question

Ms. Smith asked if that was something we could rent out at a higher rate?

Mr. Uchytel said we would have to establish regulations for that fee, but that is possible.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the Board has expressed desire to remove this requirement over the years and was wondering where that was left off?

Mr. Grant said he remembers past discussions on purchasing a boat shelter included, maintenance on poorly maintained boat shelters, and we would be taking them out of the property tax base.

Public Comment-None

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Board Discussion/Action

MOTION By MS. SMITH: TO WAIVE THE DOCKS & HARBORS BOARDS RIGHT-OF-FIRST REFUSAL TO PURCHASE BOAT SHELTER AE-21 AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

H. Items for Information/Discussion

5. Code Revision – Tourism and Docks & Harbors Duties

Mr. Watt said the goal for this is to have a healthy structure for CBJ. He wants Docks & Harbors to have a code that makes sense, supports Docks & Harbors operations, and supports the Docks & Harbors mission. This is not an attempt to reduce, or take away authority. We currently have code that dates back to the 90's and 2000's, that does not represent the will of the Assembly and the desire for a more tightly controlled cruise ship industry. This does not say Docks & Harbors would not have a role in it, but coming out of the Visitor Industry Task Force was the recommendation to centralize our tourism activities or tourism management. That creates the need to codify those duties and also creates a need to make complimentary changes on the Docks & Harbors side. He said currently, titles can be very confusing for the public. CBJ has a Port Director and also Drew Green with Cruise Line Agencies has a title of Port Director. CBJ has a Tourism Manager and then also a City Manager. It can be confusing on who is in charge. CBJ has a duty to make that clear to the public. There is also some quirky land issues. Mr. Watt explained that Docks & Harbors, Parks & Rec, and Public Works all do not have very clear defined areas to manage. He wants to get the process started to make it so the new City Manager, the Tourism Manager, and Port Director are clear on what their duties and expectations are. In looking at the code, over time the Assembly has allocated tidelands and uplands to the Board to manage for the benefit of the Harbors. He said that should not change and CBJ should work towards enhancing that revenue stream. This change is not a criticism to the Port Director because he does an excellent job. The current situation could be different if Mr. Uchytel were to leave. He sees this as a clean up activity that needs to be initiated. He has expressed to the Assembly they should be eternally grateful to the Board for dealing with the Harbor issues. This is really to focus on the Cruise Ship dock side and the maritime environment. He wants to know what is important to the Board and then he and the Port Director will work this out together.

Committee Discussion

Mr. Grant commented that during his time on the Board, the Board has spent a lot of time on fee increases. Does the Assembly have the time, or the focus on the detail why certain things are done in rate discussions. If they do not, this is an important policy decision being turned over from Docks & Harbor Board to Staff to deal with.

Mr. Watt asked for clarification, is the rate setting for the waterfront or for just Harbors?

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Mr. Grant commented that we just went through a process that we addressed all the fees for both Docks & Harbors.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the City sees something wrong with Docks & Harbors raising all of our rates under our Enterprises?

Mr. Grant commented that a representative from the cruise industry was very active in our fee increase process. That representative pointed out that because of the cruise industry contributions to the infrastructure, their portion of the on going costs should be less than the proposed 9%. The Board is moving forward with raising all Docks & Harbors fees 9%, and with little controversy. He is asking if there is someone in the City wondering if they can do a better fee increase process than the Board?

Mr. Watt commented that the Assembly really does not have the time, but they have the authority. He said the Assembly deals with fee increases all the time. Rate studies have been done and the Assembly has opted for fee increases from zero to inflation. This is a common problem. With the Docks, there are enough other competing factors and ideas that make it complicated for the Docks fee structure.

Ms. Smith asked when reading the memo, she was thinking, “why don’t you want advice from the Docks & Harbors Board”. It is clear to her that there is a very clear division. The Assembly makes the decision whether the City wants to set a limit on the amount of cruise ship passengers. She asked if it needs to be put in code specifying what the Assembly and Docks & Harbors can do? She asked Mr. Watt, “what is broken right now”? She does not see anything broken.

Mr. Watt said he sees there is unclear direction. There is a section in the code about marketing the Docks, and he does not see anyone really wanting him to market the docks. There is a section about updating the downtown waterfront plan, but he does not see the Assembly wanting him to do that. There is the land management from Docks, Parks & Rec, and Public Works that is confusing to the public. Those are the things that need worked on. With the creation of the Tourism Manager and the focus on visitation in ship scheduling, the Tourism Manager has no codified authority to do what she is doing. However, we all know that is what the Assembly wants and the Industry mostly understands the Authority is coming from the Assembly. We need to give the Board a department script of what is expected.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the City entered into a MOA with Cruise Line Agencies limiting the ships to five and the Board was not asked to be part of that. The Board provided significant amount of comments for the Visitor Industry Task Force that they were never spoke of. He said he understands that there are really two conversations going on and there really should be only one. His initial reaction to this is, “what’s broken”. We do take into consideration what the Assembly would think, but our engagement with the Assembly has been somewhat limited. He asked if that is the whole issue, communication with Industry and clarifying roles?

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Mr. Watt said he believes it is both of those. Communicating with industry is complicated because who is Industry? Cruise Line Agencies generally has a lot of other agencies speaking on their behalf on many levels. He does not believe Cruise Line Agencies does a lot of communicating for the Industry but for themselves.

Mr. Ridgway said the Board deals a lot with arguments about boat yards which is really about services and whale watching boats. He agrees with, “who represents the Industry”, but that really depends on the issue. This Board deals with a lot and he does not think the Assembly wants to get into that granularity. He does not believe the solution would be to take away the Docks responsibility from the Board.

Ms. Smith commented that she has been on the Board about five years and the appointed Assembly liaison attends our meeting less than 10% of the time. She is not criticizing, but that is one Assembly member volunteering their time and worked long hours. They do not have the time to take another huge burden on.

Mr. Grant commented that he believes with both Docks & Harbors, the Board has done a good job of keeping the enterprises economically healthy. He also asked, “what’s broken”. If there are portions in the code not useful, take them out but he does not hear big structural changes.

Ms. Smith asked how would you fix the confusion with the land management in Douglas with Parks & Rec management across the street from the Harbor and patrons think that is Docks & Harbors.

Mr. Watt said he does not think we can fix all public confusion. However, we can certainly make it a little more logical for the downtown waterfront and a clear clean up that needs to happen.

Mr. Ridgway said when he read this memo, it was pretty clear to him that it states that the code needs to be updated and Docks be taken away from the Board management. Is that the future for the Board moving forward.

Mr. Watt said not to take the Docks operations away from the Board. The Tourism Manager is a policy position. The goal is not to make the Tourism Manager the Operations Czar.

Mr. Grant remembered that recently the Board wanted to hire a consultant for the harmonization for the new Huna Totem Dock/Coast Guard Dock/NOAA Dock and the small cruise ship dock and the Assembly turned that down. He finds that ironic because that was a policy decision.

Mr. Watt said the Port Director and himself were both on the same page for that study.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Ms. Hart said she is new on the Board, and she has seen times when the Assembly does not want the Board input. That has been challenging to navigating. She asked if this change is just to make it more clear the Docks & Harbors Board duties and also the Tourism Manager duties. She heard Mr. Watt say that the Assembly wants this to align with the current Assembly direction but she is unsure what those expectations are and what the Assembly is really looking for? Are these changes potentially short term and they may change again under a new Assembly? She asked Mr. Watt what the marching orders are from the Assembly?

Mr. Watt said the current Assembly said yes to this, but it could change in the future. This goes back to the Visitor Industry Task Force recommendations. The Task Force recommendations best speak for the Assembly then and now. There were comments from the Board to the Visitors Task Force that were not included in the Task Force recommendations because they were out of synch with how that Task Force was thinking. He commented that with the airport, everything is fenced in and everything within that area is the airport's. With the cruise ships economy, it does not just live in the water. The cruise ship economy affects the whole community and thence the drive for the centralized tourism function that we have never had. That is a policy function rather than operational. Although the vast majority of criticism we get about cruise ship tourism is about tour operation in the community, flight seeing, whale watching, too many people at the Mendenhall Glacier, small tours inpinging on peoples recreation patterns, Docks & Harbors really only touches that in ways that it facilitates advantages of the whale watching fleets. As he sees the criticism, whale watching has an outside impact and level of criticism on the community.

Mr. Ridgway commented this memo was originally intended for the Committee of the Whole on Monday but it was cancelled for lack of quorum. They could have decided to move forward with this memo and we could be having a different discussion right now. He asked Mr. Watt to provide an example, if this moves forward in the way intended in the memo, the Port Director and the Board will still have some of the decisions/issues that we are managing currently, and the Tourism Director will manage the other issues. He asked what we are currently working on that in the future we would not be working on? How can we help this decision making process?

Mr. Watt said in the future the Board would not be working on the economics to the cruise ships. There needs to be a realignment of all of our fees, but in the context of all of the fees. We are dramatically under charging at the CBJ cruise ship docks compared to their value and compared to what cruise ships pay at the private docks. We can only negotiate with industry and come up with a rational modernization of those fees. He believes this is bigger than the Board can contribute. He said the Board can help by doing what we are doing tonight. It is good for him to hear what the Board thinks and what is important.

Mr. Ridgway commented that Docks & Harbors Enterprises is far ahead of Marine Passenger Fees in terms of appropriately right-sizing the fee. The Board went through a

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

two year effort to raise the dockage fees. He asked Mr. Watt what other Dockage fees are there that has not been addressed?

Mr. Watt said what has happened with fees over time is we started our modern fee structure which came out in a response to citizen initiative over 20 years ago, which was followed with 15 years arguing on the legality & size of those fees, the expenditure of those fees, and then a three year litigation, which eventually ended well for Juneau. He said if we want to continue to manage a healthy visitor industry, we are not doing enough. Negotiating more and broader uses of fees, rates, partnership agreements, etc., is all necessary for the community and things like further developing the infrastructure at Eaglecrest. If we are going to accommodate people visiting Juneau, and our citizens are going to accept it, they need to have places to go. From 2019 to 2023 we are growing three or four hundred thousand visitors but we have not grown that many tour operators. That is very complicated to bring that to execution.

Mr. Leither said his understanding of what has been occurring is that we went through this process to raise the dockage fees for the large cruise ships and we are working on a 9% increase. That 9% increase is the cost to maintain our Port infrastructure, staff the Harbor, and be responsible as an enterprise. As a Board member, he feels that is his responsibility. His understanding of the City's responsibility is that if you want to fund the Gondola, there is the head tax and that is what he thinks the division is.

Mr. Watt said that is correct, but he believes there is a third element that is not captured. The land that the docks are on has no captured revenue, yet we lease tidelands to the private docks and they pay us for the value of the land. We need to capture the value of the tidelands that the cruise ship docks are on in the same way it happens at the private docks. We have several different fees, and overtime, we have blurred the line on what we use the fees for which was the result of the litigation. The broader discussion is that we need to provide public infrastructure necessary for the industry, and capture cost of doing business all at the same time.

Ms. Smith said speaking to the comment Mr. Watt said about the cruise ships not paying enough, it bothers her that if that decision is taken out of the Boards hands, and put in the hands of the people not involved with the expenditures, there could be an issue. If this is a problem, the Assembly should come to the Board because we are the ones that know how much it costs to run those docks. Speaking to the comment that there may not be enough shore excursions, to her that is not the Board's issue. It would be the Board's issue to know if there was enough room for these additional vehicles.

Mr. Sooter asked Mr. Watt to provide what the Tourism Manager does now, and why was that position created in the first place. He said regarding the rate schedule, in CBJ 85.02.15 part b – it reads, the base rate for registered net ton shall be established by the City Manager by resolution pursuant to code 01.60 utilizing the services of an independent appraiser, the rate shall be the market rate for facilities with like amenities and services. The Manager shall determine the market rate every five years or from time

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

to time as he or she shall determine. The market rate shall be adjusted annually by the Manager based on the Anchorage cost of living index.

Mr. Watt said he does not know that section of code. He said the Tourism Manager spends a tremendous amount of time communicating with cruise line companies, CLIAA, and cruise line agencies in other ports. Some of the communication is collaboration and coordination and some of that is trying to understand where the industry is heading and what is happening. If the Assembly would approve a dock at the Sub-port, she would work to try to understand what might happen as a result of that. There is regional collaboration among the different ports that she participates in and there is many discussions about scheduling of and prioritization of ships. He said we are trying to optimize tourism for Juneau. He said for years we have been passive in the scheduling of our municipal docks unlike any other City property.

Mr. Wall said he sees every day how Docks and Harbors impact each other. Putting the fence along the dock will take away resources for what we could do in the Harbor. His concern is, Docks & Harbors becomes so separate that they are blind to the impact that they have on each other. The potential impact that Docks & Harbor could have on each other is huge. The congestion in the Harbor is disturbing at times. The conversation has to be somehow unified.

Mr. Etheridge said there is no connection in Docks funds and Harbor funds. They are two separate Enterprises and the funds are fire walled apart. He commented to Mr. Watt that about a year ago the Board tried to double the cruise ship fees and the Assembly did not act on it, but sent it back to us.

Mr. Ridgway commented that we just went through a fairly expensive rate study and if we were asked to include the recouping of the land value in that study, we would have. However, that was not mentioned to include in the rate study. Taking Docks away from the people who are responsible for the recapitalization of 16B and deferred maintenance for the long term will not be a benefit and will be difficult.

Public Comment - None

6. Harris Harbor Gate

Mr. Sill said there has been ongoing discussion for sometime about security. We have added cameras, and a security nightshift person, but that is still not enough. One of the ways the Lower 48 addresses security is with a security gate and access controls on the Harbors themselves. Recently the Board request that we do a test access control security gate in Harris Harbor. Harris Harbor was chosen because it has one access point and it will be the easiest. Staff looked at a number of options. Due to the dock carts, and tides, installing a gate in the gangway made it impracticable. Staff is looking at a three sided security structure to go at the top of the gangway and he is sending a letter to a number of aluminum fabricators in the Pacific Northwest seeking quotes to come up with a concept from our needs. The intent is not for us to design the structure, but provide to the

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

aluminum fabricators a list of requirements and see what they come up with. He said on page 24 and 25 in the packet shows a three sided structure that will be at the top of the gangway that is about 8' deep so it allows someone to be able to have a cart on the flat while trying to maneuver the door. Some of the features is that we will have key fobs for entry, lights, cameras, and a number pad in case someone forgets their key fob or is a transient boater. They could get the number from the Harbor Officer on duty. Staff is sending the illustrations on page 24 and 25 to the fabricators and when he receives three quotes, and one in the price range that we can afford, we will move forward with this. He is also going to meet with our term contractors to install the structure and electrical.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Smith asked if a security company looked at this to ensure some of our unsavory visitors are not able to get around this.

Mr. Sill said security is always a balance. He has witnessed people rowing a dock cart to get to a different part of the Harbor. People can access the end of the float from a boat. Someone could swim to the float. He said maybe someone could get around this but it would be challenging. We will have cameras so we will be able to see them and identify them.

Mr. Grant commented that maybe it could be a little wider so someone could not walk along the outside edge and then an added design feature at the top so it is not easy to jump over.

Mr. Sill said that has been added in the memo to the fabricators, requesting features added across the top to discourage people from climbing over.

Mr. Wall suggested to make it large enough to store the carts in.

Mr. Sill said we have a \$50,000 procurement limit to get this done, otherwise it becomes a bidding process and it would be a much larger deal. We are trying to fit this first security gate in the \$50,000 price range. Staff will make it as large as possible within our financial constraints.

Mr. Leither asked what the timeline was?

Mr. Sill said we are trying to get this done in the fall. He will know more by the next months meeting.

Mr. Sooter asked if Mr. Sill could ask for an alternate for a roof?

Mr. Sill said yes he could.

Ms. Smith asked if we could get the cost to surround the whole top of the dock and depending on price it could maybe be added as an add on.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Mr. Sill said he is currently soliciting quotes and if the quotes come in vastly below our spending limit, he would then expand the scope of the ask. He believes the current design is going to be between \$40K and \$50K.

Mr. Uchtyl commented that this would not require Board approval because it is below \$50K so it is whatever the Board would like to see. If the Board has comments that Mr. Sill needs to incorporate for the quote the members should do that within the next few days. Staff can bring this back and show the lowest quote.

Mr. Etheridge said he would like the final design brought back before the Board before it is built.

Mr. Grant asked if the Board has independent spending above the \$50,000 that does not require the full bid process?

Mr. Uchtyl said based on the procurement rules, between \$5K and \$50K requires three quotes, over \$50,000 requires formal bids. For Docks & Harbors only, anything over \$100,000 requires Assembly approval.

Mr. Grant asked if the roof could be a separate project subject to a separate \$50,000 limit?

Mr. Uchtyl said once it's installed, you can add things.

Public Comment - None

7. Used Breakwater – Offered for Purchase

Mr. Uchtyl said he had a contractor stop by today. On page 29 in the packet is a floating breakwater that protects the Coast Guard mooring in the Tongass Narrows in Ketchikan. That breakwater is anchor stayed with a dozen anchors. It is 180' long by 24' wide. The breakwater is in excess of the contractor's needs and he would be willing to sell it in a procurement. Mr. Uchtyl said he did not ask the price but he is sure this would be very expensive. Is this something the Board would want to pursue? He received a complaint from an irate fisherman about wake damage in Auke Bay, this could be used at the Auke Bay Loading Facility.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Smith asked if this could be used in the Statter area for the large moorage needs?

Mr. Uchtyl said it is a floating breakwater so it could be used for moorage, but it only has a bull rail on one side. It is designed for 60' of water so it may not fit everywhere. It was a intriguing proposition.

Ms. Smith asked if it is possible to use at Statter, could we increase rates for that moorage?

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, July 19th, 2023

Mr. Leither asked what is meant by being designed for 60'.

Mr. Uchytel said it would probably fit better by Aurora Harbor.

Mr. Ridgway asked the name of the contractor and company?

Mr. Uchytel said Kriss Hart with Western Marine Construction.

Mr. Grant asked the length of the wave attenuator at Statter.

Mr. Uchytel said 1000 feet.

Mr. Grant asked if this could solve the Aurora Basin issue on a temporary basis?

Public Comment - None

I. Staff - None

Member Reports -

Mr. Grant reported that all the public restrooms in Australia are spotless.

J. Harbormaster Report – He will provide a report at the Board meeting next week.

K. Committee Administrative Matters

Next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting-**Wednesday, August 23rd, 2023**

Mr. Etheridge commented there will be Committee assignments next week.

Ms. Hart asked, with the City Managers discussion tonight, would we want to put the fee structure back on our Planning Committee radar to relook at the proposed rate. Also, have a discussion if there is a decision to separate the Docks and Harbor if we wanted to specifically ask the Assembly that they could give us some guidance if they are not happy with moving forward with the rate.

Mr. Ridgway recommended adding it as a discussion item at next weeks Board meeting.

L. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 6:58pm.