



DOCKS AND HARBORS OPERATIONS & PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 20, 2023 at 5:00 PM

City Hall Conf. Room 224/Zoom Webinar

- 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 present in person or via zoom: Jim Becker, Don Etheridge, Debbie Hart, Annette Smith, Shem Sooter, Mark Ridgway.

ABSENT: Paul Grant and Matthew Leither.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Carl Uchtyl – Port Director; Matthew Sill – Port Engineer; Matthew Creswell – Harbormaster; 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:**

Mr. Kiry Day, Juneau, AK 99801

Mr. Day thanked the Board for all their work on the Board and staff for their work year-round.

- E. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. November 15th, 2023 – Hearing no objection, the November 15th, 2023 Operations Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

- F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

2. Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Prioritization

Mr. Uchtyl said on page 12 and 13 of the packet is the CIP list that was brought to the last Board meeting as an information item. He said he sent out, per Board direction, a Survey Monkey for the Board to prioritize the project list. It is a long list and so he broke it down into Docks and Harbors Fiscal Year projects. He received four responses from the Board. On page 17 in the packet is a schedule based on the interpretation of the survey. He can bring this back again next week if more Board members wanted to participate. He sent this out to staff as well and he said he has that data. He went over the Harbors list and explained the rationale behind why a project was where it was on the list.

Committee Questions

Ms. Smith asked if the Statter Breakwater should be on the list because she has heard that people in that area do not want more boat traffic. She also asked, regarding the Echo Cove Float, how much more staff time will be needed at that facility with the new float?

Mr. Uchtyl said the Statter Harbor Breakwater must be replaced. What it looks like is a different story. The Army Corps will conduct the public meetings and we provide information on what we would like it to look like. It is the Army Corps responsibility to build on our behalf. He said regarding more staff at Echo Cove, staff does get out there when we can. Adding a float will not require more staff but it is an amenity for the facility. Goldbelt currently uses Echo Cove in the winter and they pay a commercial use permit for their boat that takes Kensington employees to the mine. They would appreciate a more substantial float for those operations that would be more useful all year round.

Ms. Hart said she believes this is one of the roles of the Board to prioritize projects for both Docks and Harbors. One suggestion to the spreadsheet would be to color code what is Docks and what is Harbors to easily see the difference. She asked with the Aurora Harbor improvements, could we add the Aurora Harbor Office Replacement with Aurora Harbor Phase IV project to tie them together and asked if other Board members felt the same way?

Mr. Uchytel explained when staff put together the 1% sales tax initiative, we were very vague on describing the needs of the Harbor. Staff said it was for floats, buildings, upgrades to the boatyard, and lighting. All those things are true, but he thinks combining them confuses people. He believes it is better to have them separate. He pointed out on the list on page 17 in the packet. The Harbors and Dock projects are separated by double lines, then priority 15 and down are for FY26 and out-years.

Mr. Etheridge commented he does not believe a building would qualify for the ADOT matching grant.

Mr. Ridgway said prioritization of CIP projects falls in one of the buckets he talked about at the Assembly of the Whole meeting. The Board currently has an informal rate setting policy that this Board developed. It is helpful to remind the Board how the rate setting happens. For the prioritization of the projects, he does not want it made up every year. He wants a repeatable, defensible process as to how the Board looks at CIP's every year and follow a similar process. The start would be that projects are identified from Board and staff members. Staff has the best information for operation needs. The Board and staff CIP projects would first be prioritized by staff with an estimated amount for the project and then to the Board to follow the process of ranking in a survey monkey. He would like to have this process documented in the coming months so it can be used year after year. Mr. Ridgway asked what the timeline is for the CIP project list?

Mr. Uchytel said it is due to CBJ Engineering at the end of the month.

Mr. Ridgway recommended for Board members that have not completed the Survey Monkey to take the survey and rank the projects. Is the Board ranking the end all be all? He does not know how the Board priority and the staff priority match up.

Mr. Uchytel said ranking the projects is fine, but it should not totally be chosen by ranking. Typically, these projects are discussed at a Board retreat and that did not happen this year. Several things are factored in to determine the priority and a big thing is funding.

Mr. Becker commented that the UAS issues with the property at the Aurora Harbor needs to be settled before we can move forward with several things. He said UAS is waiting to get the full purchase price of \$8M and he does not believe it will sell but how long are they going to wait? He said he believes there needs to be a settlement so we can continue with the priority list for that area. The Aurora Harbor office could move to one of the UAS buildings and that would solve that project. He said he did not see the UAS property purchase on the list and he wanted to know how to move forward with this topic again? He said we must protect our interest in that property.

Mr. Uchytel said it was missed being transferred from the Survey Monkey list to the list in the packet. He said it needs to be added as a future year purchase. He asked if the Board wants to do no projects and save up money to purchase the \$8M property? If that is what the Board wanted, that would need to be communicated from the Board to staff for guidance for planning, saving, and executing.

Ms. Hart asked Mr. Uchytel to help her understand the difference between Juneau Fisheries Terminal and the UAS property purchase. She commented that staff did this great survey during the Salmon

Derby and she asked if staff cross walked between the survey and the priority list. She would like to see some of our priority list reflective of the survey results.

Mr. Uchytel said the Juneau Fisheries Terminal is a grant project s which staff has applied for to develop the crane dock. The idea was to dredge the one side of the crane dock to make it useable on both sides, add a net shed, and maybe an icehouse. He noted that he did forget to move the UAS purchase over to the CIP list and it was number two on the staff priority list. Staff put number one as the Aurora Harbor drive down float. For the Board members, UAS purchase was number three on their priority list. Number one was the Aurora Harbor drive down float, Number two was the Juneau Marine Services but they are all very close in priority. The survey we had three years ago was focused on North Douglas and the most recent one was looking at other options. Echo Cove was in the survey results as never doing anything so that was why that was put on the CIP list. That could be a fix for a smaller amount of money.

Mr. Ridgway commented that staff should put out a survey annually that will be considered in decision making for the CIP priority list.

Ms. Smith commented that priority is one thing, but the Board should still be flexible enough to jump on a lower level project if funding was available.

Mr. Ridgway agreed this should be flexible.

Mr. Uchytel continued explaining the Docks projects and the rationale for the priority.

Mr. Ridgway said he believes the Docks safety railing is very important.

Ms. Hart recommended having an open house at the Yacht Club inviting the Assembly members ahead of the Assembly meeting to show the design and provide the reason for the railing.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the Docks Safety Railing is going to be reconsidered at the next Assembly meeting so he suggested not do anything until after the next Assembly meeting.

Mr. Etheridge commented that if the Assembly and Board members are going to attend a Yacht club meeting, it will need to be an open public meeting.

Mr. Uchytel said currently the Dock safety railing will be reconsidered at the next meeting after a member said they would like to reconsider their vote. The next meeting will pick up at the point where that vote failed. Any type of influence between now and the eighth may not be appropriate.

Mr. Etheridge agreed to wait until after the meeting on January 8th. If this does fail, we still may be able to go in a different direction.

Mr. Uchytel commented that he added the Archipelago purchase of \$9.2M on the Marine Passenger Fee request and he will also add the Statter Harbor Phase IIID to that list as well. All of these projects will go through the Tourism Manager, the City Manager, and the Assembly if they are to be funded.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the Tourism Manager could be added to the flow chart for the Board CIP List Prioritization.

Ms. Hart said the Downtown Lightering Float project will be moved up on her priority list because it is one thing on the Docks side that addresses community needs. She asked if there is a design for the Lightering Float replacement? She asked if staff looked into a removeable float that could be used one day a week?

Mr. Uchytel said we do not have a design because we do not have a good place to put it. He commented to not call this a Lightering Float.

Mr. Ridgway asked why the Lightering float is under FY28?

Mr. Uchytel said at one time he thought to add the Lightering Float to the Small Cruise Ship Infrastructure but because that project is not going anywhere due to the Coast Guard investigating homeporting an icebreaker, there is not an easy answer to place a float downtown. There is currently a loading zone at the IVF and that could be open "so much time" a day for public use instead of the replacement of the Lightering Float.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the old Lightering Float was used and did not generate revenue and with the unintended consequences of 16B and the safety of the float planes, the Lightering Float needed to be removed with Board approval. He suggested to bring this back to the full Board next week and the Board members who have not taken the survey to do so based on what Mr. Uchytel explained tonight.

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion/Action

MOTION By MS. SMITH: TO HAVE THE FINAL CIP LIST FOLLOWING THE EXISTING PROCESS BROUGHT BEFORE THE FULL BOARD AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

G. NEW BUSINESS

3. FY25 Marine Passenger Fee (MPF) Priority Request

Mr. Uchytel said on page nineteen in the packet is a memo to Ms. Pierce. He updated and deleted items asked for in previous years. They are not in any priority order. He went over the list in the packet on pages 20 - 28.

Area Wide Port Operations - \$275,000

Port-Customs and Visitor Center Buildings Maintenance Support - \$142,000

Safety Rail along Dock Face - \$1.5M

Dock Electrification - \$5M

Additional Personnel for "Port of Call" Access Control - \$300,000

Purchase of Archipelago Property, LLC Uplands - \$10M

Lone Sailor Statue - \$100K

USS Juneau Memorial - \$6M

Reestablishment of Emergency Vessel Loading Float - \$1M

Curb/Gutter/paving and Seawalk for Statter Harbor Phase IIID - \$2.5M

Committee Questions

Mr. Ridgway asked how the purchase of the Archipelago property became a need of Docks & Harbors?

Mr. Uchytel said the Marine Passenger Request is open to every member of the public. This is kind of outside the CBJ process but it was added to our list so the Juneau-Douglas Museum could be placed at that location and not the open deck over area recently completed by Docks & Harbors. He wants that area left open. This was approved by the Board last year but it was not funded.

Ms. Hart asked for more information about the request for MPF for the Emergency Vessel Loading Float.

Mr. Uchytel said this is the Lightering Float but he gave it a different name. The community does not want another Lightering Float.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the request for the Archipelago uplands purchase should move to a CBJ ask but he is okay to leave it on our list.

Ms. Hart asked if the list should be prioritized?

Mr. Uchytel said we are providing a list of project ideas for the Tourism Manager and the Assembly to consider.

Mr. Etheridge said the City Manager's priority list will go to the Assembly.

Ms. Smith said her concern with prioritizing is we may not get something funded. This list tells the Tourism Manager that this list is all good stuff to fund and please consider funding of these projects.

Public Comment –

Mr. Kirby Day, Juneau, AK

Mr. Day asked about the USS Juneau Memorial suggested locations. Does CBJ own both areas considered?

Mr. Ridgway said yes.

Mr. Day said in terms of the Archipelago property purchase, it would be good to purchase because Morris Communications at this point does not have any interest of doing anything. Morris Communication could sell this property, and anyone could purchase it and put something that we do not want at that location. He said CBJ should purchase this property, but he is not sure it should be funded by Marine Passenger Fees. He also commented in terms of the Marine Passenger Fees put in a priority, he has been told in the past that it does not make a difference. Both private and public provides a list and the CLIAA settlement drives what the money can and cannot be spent on.

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Becker said he supports the Archipelago property purchase on the list because if someone else purchases this they could put whatever they want there.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE FY25 MARINE PASSENGER FEE PRIORITY REQUEST AS PRESENTED AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

H. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

4. Gateway Park Improvements – Norway Point

Ms. Hart said on page 29 in the packet shows an area of the Yacht Club. She discovered a couple years ago that Docks & Harbors manages the little green area between Aurora Harbor and the Yacht Club. The Yacht Club area is a gem for our community and is heavily used. The little park area shown on page 30 in the packet could have some multi-generational equipment and she has been in communication with Dr. Emily Kane on the Juneau Commission of Aging which is recognizing we have an older population in Juneau and a lot of these people are lonely, need more exercise, and this area could help with that. She is also presenting this to the Yacht Club and other funding entities and Dr. Kane is a part of this. She asked the Board what recreational equipment the Board would see is appropriate for this area because it is a park managed by Docks & Harbors. She believes this will benefit the Harbors and the Yacht Club.

She would do fund raising for the equipment and is not expecting this to be more than \$25K. Ideas for equipment were added on page 32 in the packet.

Committee Discussion

Mr. Ridgway commented he would be cautious about adding park equipment management responsibilities to the Harbors Officers. It is a nice quiet spot. He suggested to talk to Parks & Rec about management.

Public Comment – None

5. Former Ketchikan Breakwater – PND Report

Mr. Sill states after evaluation, there are about 20-25 years of useful life remaining on the Breakwater with proper care. It would cost approx. \$4.6M to replace in 2023 with all components included. He is looking to have an update with fair market value soon. He talked about locating this float at the Auke Bay Loading facility and showed various studies on wave environment in that area. The Breakwater could limit wave reduction by 20%-25%, but if shifted any closer it could include drawbacks such as limited turning space and hindering boat traffic. The float itself is in excellent condition overall. Wave analysis at ABLF concludes that this may not be the best use of the breakwater.

Committee Discussion

Mr. Ridgway asked if the float can allow tie downs, and what are the possibilities of its use.

Mr. Sill said one side of the float has cleats.

Mr. Ridgway asks what would be the ideal float space use?

Mr. Sill said staff has had discussion about fishermen using it for net mending work and storage.

Mr. Creswell does not envision the breakwater as a storage space, but rather space for net work space.

Mr. Ridgway asked if Harbors has a need for this float, and should we purchase it? He asks Mr. Becker if he believes fishermen would use the breakwater for net work space.

Mr. Becker stated the conditions of use would have to be clear to fishermen. They would use and possibly abuse the space, and possibly leave equipment for long periods of time.

Ms. Smith asked what it would take to add cleats to the other side?

Mr. Sill commented that if we used this for moorage, it would be possible to add cleats.

Mr. Ridgway asked if staff has use for the float?

Mr. Creswell stated, with the right placement and procedures in place, it would be utilized.

Mr. Ridgway suggested the Board give further direction to staff on this item and he does not believe there are currently other purchasers interested. He asked Mr. Uchtyl if Harbors has funding to purchase this.

Mr. Uchtyl stated that we have \$2.9M fund balance and if this is something the Board would like to prioritize, we could purchase it.

Mr. Etheridge says he does not want to make any more decisions on this float until the Board knows how much it costs.

Mr. Ridgway suggested staff investigate how it could impact the budget, pursue price negotiations with the owner, and report back.

Public Comment - None

6. Douglas Harbor Parking Lot – Lighting Plan

Mr. Sill said he has heard positive feedback with the first light pole installation in Douglas. The plan is to install four more lights by mid-January in the parking lot. He showed plans for additional lighting to illuminate the remaining areas of the lot. He is working to collect cost data. It will be \$400K for poles along the Harbors (seawall) and \$370K for poles along the roadway (Savikko Road).

Committee Discussion

Ms. Smith said she is concerned about light pollution affecting housing units in the area and complaints that may arise from homeowners. She asked if the seawall option was the only one that could mitigate that.

Mr. Sill said both options will illuminate the lot.

Ms. Smith asked if motion activated lights have been considered?

Mr. Sill said the motion activated lights at the cruise ship docks fail frequently due to moisture in the area.

Mr. Sooter suggests staff take a closer look at the lot use before light placement regarding parking and snow removal.

Ms. Hart asked about planning for a future restroom during this placement.

Mr. Sill said the lot will remain dirt until plans are set in place to accommodate uplands facility items.

Mr. Ridgway asked if public input from homeowners in the area should be sought before final light placement.

Public Comment – None

7. Vessel Disposal Surcharge (VDS) – Update

Mr. Creswell went over a power point presentation on pages 73 – 78 in the packet. He stated that stall holders must provide proof of vessel insurance or pay a monthly vessel disposal surcharge (VDS). Approximately 240 vessels over the last year have paid this fee. Actual costs associated with disposing of vessels far exceed the amount collected. Of the last four vessels disposed of, only one was subject to being required to pay this surcharge and the remaining three were transient live aboard, therefore the surcharge did not apply. D & H staff would like to limit liveaboard to assigned stalls only. The Harbormaster could retain the discretion to authorize oversize transient vessels and current liveaboards could be grandfathered into current regulation. Mr. Creswell suggests several options such as: raising VDS fee to reflect actual cost of disposal; require ALL uninsured vessels to pay VDS; require uninsured vessels to pay daily rate; limit or prohibit live aboard vessels in transient areas; asses VDS to all vessels; or, require all vessels to be insured.

Committee Discussion

Mr. Ridgway asked if all Statter Harbor liveboards would be eliminated entirely?

Mr. Creswell stated that if they have an assigned stall on “A” or “B” float or have been grandfathered in to current regulation, they could remain and potentially require them to sign up on the stall waitlist.

Mr. Ridgway commented that the cost of vessel disposal is obviously something we need to continue to keep high on the radar. He asked Mr. Creswell how the impound process works.

Mr. Creswell explained the regulations and timeline for impounded vessels. He stated that some vessels are sold at auction, and some are considered unsafe for further use and need to be destroyed and not sold at auction. If a patron cannot pay the fees associated with the impound process the account is forwarded to CBJ collections and if it remains unpaid it is forwarded to Asset Recovery Group. The patron is ineligible to have another vessel in our harbors until that payment is satisfied.

Ms. Hart hopes to keep this topic on the table in future Operations meetings and asked if other harbors in Alaska are dealing with this.

Mr. Uchytel stated that most Alaska harbors deal with similar issues.

Mr. Creswell recapped the most recent vessel impound scenarios. He talked about vessels being impound-eligible due to non-payment and some vessels receive notices for sea trials.

Mr. Ridgway stated the Board will come up with suggestions to direct staff on this topic in future Board meetings and is welcome to staff suggestions on how they might like to handle VDS and impounded vessels.

Public Comment - none

8. FY25/FY26 Budget – Update

Mrs. Larson shared FY24 – FY26 Harbors/Docks Fleet budget and actual on pages 79-85 in the packet. She also shared Travel and Training Budget for staff on page 86 of the packet.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Hart is pleased that our staff has the training opportunities shown.

Mr. Uchytel said the Personnel budget will be available soon and reminds the Board this would be the time to increase the FTE's for the Security position if that is what the Board wanted to do.

Public Comment - None

I. STAFF, COMMITTEE AND MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Creswell attended the Douglas Advisory Committee and gave a brief overview of Douglas Harbor projects.

Mr. Sill reported the Aurora Harbor project has begun.

J. BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Next Operations-Planning Committee Meeting January 17th, 2024

K. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Etheridge moves to adjourn – Hearing no objection, the meeting adjourned at 7:53pm.