I. Call to Order (5:00 p.m. Conference call in # 713-2140 PID# 370829)

II. Roll Call (James Becker, Chris Dimond, Don Etheridge, Steve Guignon, James Houck, Budd Simpson, Annette Smith, Bob Wostmann and Mark Ridgway).

III. Approval of Agenda

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED OR AMENDED

IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items (not to exceed five minutes per person, or twenty minutes total)

V. Approval of Wednesday, April 22nd, 2020 Operations/Planning Meetings Minutes

VI. Consent Agenda - None

VII. Unfinished Business

VIII. New Business

1. Budget Update
   Presentation by the Port Director

   Committee Questions

   Public Comment

   Committee Discussion/Action

   MOTION: TBD

IX. Items for Information/Discussion

1. Auke Bay Loading Facility – Right of Way Encroachment Permit
   Presentation by the Port Director

   Committee Discussion/Public Comment

2. Archipelago & Statter Improvement Phase III – Construction Update
   Presentation by the Port Engineer

   Committee Discussion/Public Comment
3. Docks & Harbor Board Recruitment
   Presentation by the Port Director

   Committee Discussion/Public Comment

4. BUILD Grant Submission – Juneau Fisheries Terminal Completion
   Presentation by the Port Director

   Committee Discussion/Public Comment

X. Staff & Member Reports

XI. Committee Administrative Matters

   1. Next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting- Wednesday, June 17th, 2020.

XII. Adjournment
I. Call to Order

Mr. Ridgway called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m. in cloud conferencing. The call in information was 713-2140, PID# 370829, others were present at the Port Office.

II. Roll Call

The following members were present: Jim Becker (phone), Chris Dimond (phone), Don Etheridge (in person), Steve Guignon (phone), James Houck (phone), Budd Simpson (phone), Annette Smith (phone), Bob Wostmann (phone), and Mark Ridgway (in person).

Absent: None

Also present: Carl Uchytil – Port Director, Erich Schaal – Port Engineer, and Matthew Creswell – Harbormaster, Jennifer Sims – Administrative Assistant III, and Teena Larson – Administrative Officer.

III. Approval of Agenda

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

IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items - None

V. Approval of Wednesday, March 18th, 2020 Operations/Planning Meeting Minutes

Minutes of March 18th, 2020 were approved as presented.

VI. Consent Agenda – None.

VII. Unfinished Business – None.

VIII. New Business

1. Permit Adjustment - Loading Permits (05 CBJAC 10.060)

Mr. Uchytil said he is requesting the Loading Permit fees be reviewed by the Board to determine if they need adjustments in this uncertain cruise ship season. The downtown and the Statter Harbor permit is charged to the busses that use our facilities. The downtown company fee is $400 plus a $9 per seat fee and the Statter Harbor company fee is $300 plus a $15 per seat fee. The question before the Board is do we want to take any action now to adjust these fees. Mr. Uchytil said the Board did receive one request from Alaska Fjordlines who runs a ferry service between Skagway, Haines and Juneau. They use our parking lot at Statter Harbor as well as our passenger for hire area which will be discussed next. Their request to the Board was to consider adjusting the fees due to the uncertain season. This was the only request received to date. Mr. Uchytil asked the Board if they want to continue this fee with a company and seat fee?
Board Questions –
Mr. Houck said he intends to abstain from voting on this topic because he purchases a loading zone permit for his company. He will not purchase a loading zone permit until he hears if there will be a season. He does not believe $400 for the entire season is too high, but he believes if the season does not start until later it should be a reduced fee.

Mr. Wostmann asked what portion of the fee would the various vendors consider more onerous. The Company fee or the seat fee?

Mr. Uchytil said during the fee review, that was the big question. Who impacts Docks & Harbors greater? The large bus companies would say they bear the biggest burden from this fee because they have 70 coaches with x-amount of seats and they are impacted the most by these fees. You also have the smaller vehicles with only six seats that also have to pay the company fee and they would say they are impacted more. It really depends if you are talking to the large operator or the smaller operator on where the fairness is.

Mr. Wostmann said if there is going to be any accommodation in term of fairness, both fees should be adjusted.

Mr. Uchytil said the Board can take action tonight or defer to later in the season. The Board will need to make a decision on what they believe is fair and equitable.

Mr. Ridgway said he wanted to remind the Committee that this was brought here tonight because it was requested to review these fees at a previous meeting.

Ms. Smith asked if this fee is a one time fee?

Mr. Uchytil said on page 15 in the packet are the loading zone permit fees. There is a one time company fee and a per seat fee at the beginning of the season.

Ms. Smith asked if there is a way to prorate the fee?

Mr. Uchytil said yes, the Board can prorate this fee. The reason this is not a high priority is because no one has purchased this fee for this season yet.

Public Comment –
Mr. Kirby Day, Juneau, AK 99801 – Speaking representing TBMP. He said he does not believe Juneau will have ships until late July if then. The Board has time to discuss and adjust this fee. If ships do come in late July or August there is going to be less demand and fewer people coming on the ships. This will make it difficult on every business in the Community. There will be less ships but the scheduling has the large number of cruise ships coming on one day so the bus companies will still have to permit all their busses but just to accommodate for one day a week as well as ensure the social distancing is practiced. The loading zone fees at the Princess Dock have been waived for this summer. One thing to think about is once a schedule is determinint, the Board could reduce the seat fee by 50% or to drop the seat fee completely and just pay the Company fee or for the smaller companies with just one vehicle, drop the company fee and just
charge a seat fee. He believes mixing and matching fees and work with the companies would be the best in these times. This will be his same testimony for item #2.

Committee Discussion/Action
Ms. Smith said thinking about the unknown for the season, she would recommend waiting to make a decision until there is something more definite.

Mr. Etheridge agreed to wait to set a fee until later.

Mr. Uchytil said he believes the Fjordland will still operate for locals if cruise ships come or not and he recommends to have staff work with the individual companies who are wanting to operate.

Mr. Wostmann asked even if the fees are waived, would staff still issue permits?

Mr. Creswell said yes to obtain all the requirements for the permit and ensure they are operating as they should.

Mr. Wostmann said he agrees to postpone a fee structure for a permit this year but if a company does want to operate, issue a permit for free for the time being and let them know if an actual season develops that they might be assessed a partial fee for the remainder of the season.

Mr. Ridgway said even though we don’t know what the season will look like, this might incentivize businesses. Options for a motion would be to have staff work individually with companies interested in operating this year, wait to make a decision at this time until we know more about the season, or say the permits are half price.

Mr. Etheridge said he has a problem with the half price option because of the uncertain season. His recommendation is to wait to determine a fee until later. If Fjordland is just bringing locals from Haines and Skagway to Juneau, there would be no fee. If they start running tours, they should start paying. He recommended to have staff work with the individual companies.

Mr. Houck said nothing seems to be moving very quickly right now. When notice is given if there will be a season, a company will need to get all the documentation required for the permit. The permit could be prorated and a company could pay based on when they purchase the permit. He does not believe this needs to be solved right now.

Mr. Ridgway recommended to have staff monitor this and if it becomes an issue to come back to the committee with a proposed motion.

**NO MOTION**

2. Permit Adjustment - Passenger-for-Hire Fee (05 CBJAC 20.080)
Mr. Uchytil said this is for the charter operator. There is a per company fee and a per passenger fee. The regulation is on page 16 in the packet and it is for the uninspected vessels (six passengers), and inspected vessels. Does the Committee want to adjust this fee for this year?
Committee Questions

Mr. Ridgway asked if there are any permits this year?

Mr. Uchytil said no.

Public Comment –
Kirby Day, Juneau, AK
He asked if the per passenger is per seat like the vehicle fee or per passenger carried?

Mr. Uchytil said this is per passenger carried.

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Ridgway recommended to direct staff to work with the individual companies and when this becomes an issue to bring back to the committee with a proposed motion.

Mr. Wostmann said this is not an immediate issue and to wait until more clarity on the season. He likes Mr. Houcks idea of the fee being cheaper as it gets later in the season.

Mr. Etheridge said he believes there is enough time to wait until more is known on the cruise season.

NO MOTION

IX. Items for Information/Discussion

1. University of Alaska - Downtown Lease
Mr. Uchytil said Mr. Sam Kito who is an engineer employed by UAS is also on the phone. Mr. Uchytil said he wanted to bring to the Board’s attention that our lease with UAS will expire May of 2021. The Aurora Harbors lease area (parcel A, B & C) is shown on page 18 in the packet. The process is to obtain a new lease because this is a valuable maritime area for Docks & Harbors. He said he is unsure if there would be a possibility to purchase this area at some point. The requirement of the existing lease is the lessee is given the right of first refusal for an extension to the lease. If UAS would want to get rid of this property, he believes Docks & Harbors may have some legal rights to renew our lease even if someone else purchased it. The lease process will be led by UAS and there will be an appraisal to determine the fair market value. Currently we pay approximately $12,000 annually which is based off a percentage of revenue collected from sub-leases and crane usage. When the lease was signed CBJ paid $500,000 up front.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Sam Kito said the lease does expire in May of 2021 but it will allow us to go into a hold over in case there is trouble with coming up with an agreement. Anything CBJ has invested in the property still belongs to CBJ unless something else is agreed upon. He said there has been some discussion within the University about what a higher and best use of this property might be for the University. One of the things that was anticipated when this lease was entered into was that UAJ at the time would have a marine focused
program, however, some of those programs have ended up in Ketchikan. We still do have need for the large building for our shop activities but UAS does not have need for the waterfront. That is why UAS is considering selling this property because we don’t have any long term maritime interest in this area. UAS is currently in the process of working on a scope of work for an appraisal for a fair market value for the extension of 33 years for CBJ and also have the appraiser look at assessing the property for a sale. The University lands division in Anchorage will be managing this procurement. He said the University would determine a value and at that time it would be worthwhile to bring the appraisal back before the Board to have the discussion on if CBJ can agree on the value. He said UAS is willing to work on this current lease area and they understand the importance of the waterfront to CBJ.

Mr. Becker said he believes there should be a maritime focus on this property. One of the discussions with UAS in previous years was that UAS was contemplating moving their Juneau assets to the Auke Bay Campus. At that time CBJ was trying to come up with a property trade with UAS. He asked Mr. Kito if that was still an option with UAS?

Mr. Kito said he believes a trade could be on the table. Currently UAS has three programs at this location. Two of which are dependent on the building. One is a nursing program which could be moved to the Auke Bay Campus. The challenge would be on the Mine Training program and Construction Trades programs that UAS does not have comparable space for these programs. If comparable space could be identified it might be feasible for the University to vacate the building. Another component is that UAS leases the auto shop area to the Juneau School District which generates some revenue but UAS anticipates that would stay with the building.

Mr. Wostmann asked if the lease extension is executed, would there be a new lease rate based off an appraisal?

Mr. Uchytil said that is a fair statement.

Mr. Wostmann asked what he thought the new rate may be? He said the $12,000 annual payment is not very much.

Mr. Uchytil said he is unsure. He did note there was a substantial payment made upfront.

Mr. Kito said CBJ paid $500,000 that was committed to Egan Library improvements that was to only be used for that project and then the annual amount which is a percentage of the crane use and sub-lease revenues. He said the annual rate is truly the thing that needs to be reassessed. There is an option to lease this area at less than market value, but that provision appears to only be used if UAS can demonstrate that the property is being used to further its interest in marine trades and there is not a strong connection with the existing property. In this case, UAS would have to go to a fair market review of what the lease is.

Mr. Wostmann said that would indicate to him that there would be an incentive to purchase this area.
Mr. Uchytil said he remembers when he met with UAS about five years ago with Mr. Becker and Mr. Greg Fisk with the interest to purchase this property it was estimated at around $3M.

Mr. Becker said he remembers trying to offer a land trade with the University that would be beneficial for the Auke Bay Campus. With everything on the table he would like to see CBJ obtain this property with or without the large building so this area can be developed to a greater potential for Juneau.

Mr. Ridgway said in review of the Committee discussion.

- Committee would like to move forward with this lease.
- He encourages staff to provide the UAS lease to the Committee so they can review the current lease terms.
- He wanted to let UAS know that this area is very important to Docks & Harbors future.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Kito if there is a preference to reissue the lease or go toward something more permanent in terms of transferring property.

Mr. Kito said talking with UAS staff, the area that CBJ leases UAS is leaning more toward selling the water parcels to CBJ if a price can be agreed upon.

2. Electrification RFP Selection Committee – Board Participation

Mr. Uchytil said this is to electrify the downtown cruise ship docks and is currently be advertised for proposals. He would like to know if any Board member would like to participate on the proposal selection committee?

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Etheridge said he would like to be on the selection committee.

Mr. Wostmann said he would like to be on the selection committee as well.

Mr. Ridgway asked if a member decides later he would like to be on the committee, can they still do so?

Mr. Uchytil said yes.

X. Staff and Member Reports.

Mr. Creswell reported;

- Staff pulled the two end sections off the Old Douglas boarding float that were breaking away and unrepairable. The other four sections are still used a lot but not in the best of shape. We will leave them for now and staff will watch to make sure they remain safe to use.
- Staff is cleaning the gravel out of the parking lots and getting the harbors ready for the season the best we can with the limited amount of staff.

Mr. Uchytil reported;

- He sent a test email to the Board from the Tell it to Docks & Harbors Board off the website to make sure it works. He knows at least one Board member
received the test email. He asked the Board members to let him know if they did not receive the test email he sent.

- He said the Brickyard will be closed temporarily for cleaning and then used for transit buses for a few weeks in May. It will be open and available for other parking needs throughout the summer.

XI. Committee Administrative Matters

Mr. Uchytil asked what documents the Finance Sub-Committee members would like to see at the meeting on April 29th?

Mr. Etheridge asked Mr. Wostmann to get with Mr. Uchytil on his request.

Mr. Wostmann said he would like to look at the CIP projects in depth and what expectations or scenarios the Committee should be considering for the FY20/21 budgets.

XII. Adjournment at 6:49 p.m.
1. On May 13th, the Assembly Finance Committee accepted the Docks & Harbors developed revised FY20 budget and the proposed budgets for FY21 and FY22 as shown below. The budgetary numbers will be brought forth for adoption by the Assembly not later than June 15 in accordance with the CBJ Charter. The Assembly Finance Committee recognizes the unpresented fiscal tumult, as such the adopted budgets are widely accepted as being in flux.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues/(Expenses)</th>
<th>Revised FY 20</th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Docks Enterprise</td>
<td>$2.16M/($2.04M)</td>
<td>$2.22M/($2.15M)</td>
<td>$2.22M/($2.19M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Enterprise</td>
<td>$4.79M/($4.19M)</td>
<td>$4.59M/($4.36M)</td>
<td>$4.68M/($4.31M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Regarding the Docks & Harbors estimation for the remainder of FY20, we continue to revise our budgetary outlook based on actual numbers ending April 30th. We have also moved $33,500 from the surplus sales of old Statter floats and impound boat auctions into our FY20 revenues which in previously years would have supplemented our fleet reserve account, which recapitalizes our vehicle and major equipment purchases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Docks Enterprise</td>
<td>$1,555,424</td>
<td>$1,362,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Enterprise</td>
<td>$4,117,191</td>
<td>$4,014,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. There remains several stopgap opportunities which the CBJ Assembly may be able to assist Docks & Harbors should the situation arise. First is the potential for CBJ to receive $53M through the Governor’s proposal and legislative approval which is the local apportionment from CARES Act Funding for COVID relief. I remain confident, that should CBJ receive this disbursement that Docks & Harbors will not be left of the financial discussion. Additionally, the City Manager included MPF funding in FY21 Budget for our operations.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Docks and Harbors - Port Management</td>
<td>315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks and Harbors - Port Customs Office Building Maintenance</td>
<td>133,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$448,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. With the hiring of the new Harbormaster out of Statter Harbor Office and by not augmenting seasonal employees, the two full time Statter harbor officers will be unable to sustain a summer schedule without significant degradation to operations. The two harbor officers are expected to provide 7-day a week inventory coverage, as well as maintaining Statter Harbor, the Statter Launch Ramp facility, Amalga Harbor, Echo Cove and manage the Auke Bay Loading Facility and to a lesser extent the Auke Bay Marine Station. We have similar needs downtown especially with a year-round harbor officer recovering from surgery for the summer. Based on the revised forecasts, I am recommending that Harbors Enterprise tenure offers to three seasonal harbor employees to return for to the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasonal Employee</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Officer</td>
<td>Statter Harbor</td>
<td>$7154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Officer</td>
<td>Statter Harbor</td>
<td>$7154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Technician</td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>$5666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In addition to seasonal hires, I am proposing to expend money from our Docks Enterprise and Harbors Enterprise to hire part time limited (PLT) employees to assist the two harbor employees with the effort to remove the trash off the LUMBERMAN. I estimate the level of effort to complete this task to be six persons, one month or approximately $20K. I am also recommending we spend approximately $5K to minimally update a camera system near the Harris Harbor ramp. These additional expenditures (seasonal employees, PLT and security cameras) will fall within the expenditures under paragraph 2.

#
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Duties and Responsibilities of the Docks and Harbors Board Defined

The duties and responsibilities of the Docks and Harbors (D&H) Board are defined in the D&H Board Bylaws and Title 85. The Board undertook the task of reviewing and updating its Bylaws. The revised Bylaws were approved by the Assembly in June 2014.

The Board has taken on the task of reviewing Title 85 and related regulations as issues arise. This is an effort to clean up language that is obsolete, redundant or ambiguous. Some issues that relate to the duties and responsibilities of the Board may be found. All suggested revisions will be forwarded to the Assembly for approval.

Overall, the duties and responsibilities of the Docks and Harbors Board are well defined.

Skills and Knowledge Sets Required

An effective Docks and Harbor Board member must have the following attributes:

Cares about what is going on with Juneau’s D&H with a balanced, non-biased perspective.
Wants to be involved and is committed to helping make a difference for all D&H users and the community.
Committed to an open public process.
A good listener and active participant in Board discussions.
Capable of critical thinking.
Analytical and forward focused.
Good communication skills - both written and spoken.
Active in some aspect of maritime activity – such as boating in general, sport fishing, commercial fishing, diving, tourism, marine service and supply, marine engineering and construction, etc.

The Board is not well served by an individual with a personal agenda regardless of their level of knowledge or experience.

Current Docks and Harbors Board Membership (2019 – 2020)

The current members of the Docks and Harbors Board are a diverse group of long time Juneau residents. All have experience in boating and individual members have the following professional experience:

Lawyer (will be termed out in June 2020)
Retired marine construction and maintenance journeyman and tour boat captain
Downtown merchant with a day job
Government relations specialist and Legislative aid
Commercial fisherman
Owner of a tour guide company
Owner of summer seasonal operation
CFO of information technology company
Captain of whale watching charter

These Board members represent a well-rounded group that possesses the skills and knowledge needed to be an effective board. In addition to what is apparent from their resumes, each board member has gained through Board work, varying degrees of knowledge about all aspects of Juneau’s docks and harbors.
APPLICATION FOR 2020 BUILD TRANSPORTATION DISCRETIONARY GRANT
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Alaska 1st Congressional District
Alaska Rural Area

CONTACT
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I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Docks & Harbors Department seeks to update current infrastructure and develop additional facilities at the Juneau Fisheries Terminal to support the City’s growing maritime sector. This sector is a major contributor to Juneau’s economy and contributes to the national economy through the distribution of seafood, as well as seasonal employment for numerous out-of-state workers. The Fisheries Terminal Completion project will provide a fully functional commercial area to serve this sector. It will separate commercial and recreational user groups, reduce congestion, provide transient moorage, increase accessibility and increase the mobility of goods.

Project Need

The current facilities used by the commercial fishing industry are inadequate to meet the needs of local and regional fishermen. Located in downtown Juneau, between Harris and Aurora Harbors, the existing facilities consist of a rock-filled sheet pile bulkhead with a concrete apron, fender piles and two hydraulic cranes facing into a small vessel basin known as the Fisheries Terminal. This facility primarily supports loading operations for commercial fishing vessels. Issues with the current facilities include:

- Existing crane dock is busy and overcrowded.
- There is no facility that allows direct transfer from vessel to shore or vice versa.
- Existing moorage floats are at the end of their service life and have reached capacity.

The Fisheries Terminal Completion project will address these issues. The facility upgrades will provide Juneau’s commercial fishing fleet necessary services, while consolidating commercial operations to better serve the needs of the seafood sector. The project consists of three components, with a future uplands improvements phase (Figure 2). Project elements include:

PROJECT GOALS

Provide needed infrastructure to Juneau’s maritime industry to support economic growth by:

1. Expanding terminal to fully support commercial operations.
2. Developing a drive down facility to streamline transport of products and supplies.
3. Replacing moorage floats currently at the end of their service life to safely continue service to commercial vessels.

1. Crane Dock Expansion

Expansion of the existing crane dock by constructing a new sheet pile bulkhead facing north into Aurora Harbor. It will be filled with rock, then finished with a concrete apron, fender piles and two hydraulic cranes. At the west end of the dock, a new ice house will also be constructed.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Need Addressed: Mitigates overcrowding and ensures timely loading operations for commercial fishing vessels.

2. Drive Down Float
Construction of a drive down float consisting of a 17’ by 140’ transfer bridge connected to shore at the northwest corner of the proposed pile supported deck. The bridge leads to a 50’ by 120’ vehicle accessible drive down float equipped with a five-ton hydraulic crane. Water, fire suppression, power and lighting utilities will be extended down the bridge to provide services on the main float.

Need Addressed: Allows year-round, all tide ability to load and unload gear, cargo, provisions, crew, stores, etc. and increases the safety and efficiency of doing so by providing direct access to vessels via a vehicle transfer bridge from shore to the float.

3. Moorage Float Replacement
Demolition of the existing moorage float and boat haulout, and replacement with two new moorage floats, an ice house and net shed.

Need Addressed: Ensures user safety by providing updated facilities and increases moorage capacity.

The completed Fisheries Terminal will result in decreased congestion and increased efficiency of operations, safety and economic activity as further detailed in Appendix A: Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA).

TRANSPORTATION CHALLENGES ADDRESSED

The Fisheries Terminal Completion project will address numerous basic transportation challenges, including safety, congestion, mobility of goods and “parking” for vessels (moorage), in a manner that best protects the environment and public space as shown in Table 1. Land is limited in Juneau and this project will expand and upgrade an area already dedicated to marine activities to better use the available land and avoid construction on pristine tidelands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
<th>SOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are at the end of their service life and in a state of disrepair.</td>
<td><strong>Moorage Float Replacement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Replacement of existing float to address safety issues and ensure facility is in a state of good repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of drive down facility limits accessibility and causes safety issues.</td>
<td><strong>Drive Down Float</strong>&lt;br&gt;A facility will give user the ability to drive a vehicle adjacent to a vessel, which is safer and more efficient compared to fixed dock operations, particularly in Juneau, where there are large tidal swings of up to 22’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONGESTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current facilities serve multiple user groups, causing overcrowding that hinders operations, impairs site access, and causes damage and crowding at the adjacent parking and staging areas.</td>
<td><strong>Crane Dock Expansion</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dedicated facilities for commercial use, freeing up current facilities for solely recreational use and relieving congestion issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILITY OF GOODS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities makes it necessary to transport raw, unprocessed resources from the state for primary and secondary processing in other states or countries.</td>
<td><strong>Crane Dock Expansion</strong>&lt;br&gt;Development of infrastructure to allow for expansions of local processing and direct marketing, while consolidating commercial fishing activity to better serve the needs of local and regional fishermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited crane availability causes operational problems for movement of fishery resources off catcher and tender vessels and into commerce and inhibits future growth.</td>
<td><strong>Crane Dock Expansion</strong>&lt;br&gt;Additional facilities at the crane dock will mitigate current overcrowding issues that cause delays in transporting commercial loads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of drive down facilities causes inefficiencies in operations.</td>
<td><strong>Drive Down Float</strong>&lt;br&gt;Development of a drive down float will create vehicle accessible dock infrastructure that will provide users year-round access to perform vessel maintenance and the ability to efficiently load and unload gear, cargo, provisions, crew, stores, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting local fishing fleet to the transportation network.</td>
<td><strong>Drive Down Float</strong>&lt;br&gt;New drive down facility will allow for fish to move directly from vessels to the road system, making it significantly easier to bring seafood to processing centers and to market, a considerable economic advantage to local fishermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VESSEL MOORAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current vessel moorage is at the end of its service life and at capacity.</td>
<td><strong>Moorage Float Replacement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Replacement of existing floats will keep this facility in a state of good repair and adding additional floats will increase moorage capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PROJECT HISTORY

Pre-Concept Economic Climate

During the mid-1980s, the fishing and seafood industry in Juneau was in dire condition. Although Juneau was home to several hundred fishermen, fundamental industrial infrastructure was extremely deteriorated or non-existent. In 1987, the run-down, 60-year old Juneau Cold Storage, the largest seafood processing operation in the city, burned to the ground. A few years later, the dilapidated and ill-managed Douglas Cold Storage shut its doors and was eventually a total fire loss. Fishermen who chose to live here had little if anything in the way of service facilities. The harbors were run down, there was no haul out facility or marine service yard, and no local buyers. Even though substantial fish resources were taken from Juneau area waters every year, conventional wisdom of the day had it that “the fishing industry in Juneau is dead”.

Fisheries Terminal Concept Development and Land Acquisition

In 1986, the original Ad Hoc Fisheries Development Committee made 26 detailed recommendations to the City Assembly to revive the industry. Key amongst these was creation of a Juneau Fisheries Terminal - essentially a smaller version of Seattle’s famed Fishermen’s Terminal. This consisted of a facility that combined vessel moorage with service facilities, marine trades, marine-related retail and office space, gear storage and loading/offloading capabilities. The City and then newly formed Docks & Harbors Board took up the challenge. Between the two main downtown small boat harbors (which housed most of the commercial...
fishing vessels) was a tract of land owned by the University of Alaska. It housed a new Marine Technology Building with associated small dock, welding training shop and a then new 35-ton Marine Travelift. However, the site was not fully used. In an innovative agreement, the City and University agreed on a long-term lease for much of the property. CBJ Docks & Harbors took over management of the Travelift, a substantial part of the uplands, and two tideland parcels that lay between the south jetty of Aurora Harbor and the rubble mound breakwater of Harris Harbor.

Public Loading Dock (Crane Dock – Phase I) Development and Construction

CBJ Docks & Harbors quickly moved to make improvements to its leased area. In 1988, plans were developed for a public loading dock. The site chosen was the rubble mound jetty at the south end of Aurora Harbor, which separated that harbor from the leased tidelands. Unfortunately, there was not enough funding to complete the project as originally conceived. In fact, the design called for construction only on the south side of the rubble mound breakwater, creating some 157’ of usable dock face. Two new, 4,000 pound capacity hydraulic cranes were included. The paved staging area surface measured some 45’ in width from the dock face to the inside of the timber safety barrier at the top of the rubble mound slope on the north side of the structure. In all, some 9,500 square feet of paved surface was created, including approach areas. Approximately 7,000 square feet of this was usable for staging purposes. This original Crane Dock - now referred to as Phase 1- was completed in 1992.

Development of Other Upland Infrastructure

In that same time frame, much of the leased uplands was platted as a small vessel service yard and eventually sublet to Juneau Marine Services, which has invested an estimated $400,000 in equipment and other improvements. They also operated the Travelift and managed a small vessel service float. The new yard was a boon to the local fishing fleet, which now had access to
good upland service facilities for the first time. The Travelift, which had seen only very sporadic use for the University’s small research boat, was kept very busy hauling fishing boats and other craft at the service yard.

**Project Funding Dries Up**
Following construction of Phase I, the already limited funding for work on the overall Fisheries Terminal Project dried up. Since then, almost all of CBJ Docks & Harbors’ available resources have been devoted to rehabilitating the four small boat harbors under its management. Much of that basic moorage infrastructure was in very poor condition when transferred to CBJ from the State of Alaska. Nonetheless, it has remained a long-term goal to complete the Fisheries Terminal project.

**Current Development Efforts**
CBJ Docks & Harbors is also in the planning process for replacing its old, cramped and generally inadequate harbor offices. The goal is to construct a new building to house harbor functions, and provide office and retail spaces for marine-related businesses. The University is also revamping and upgrading its trades training programs at its Technology Center. Training is available in diesel mechanics, hydraulics, electrical and welding, all of which are important trades for the fishing and marine service industries. The synergy of the University’s programs with the boat service yard and activity of numerous private support businesses offers important workforce development opportunities.

**PREVIOUSLY COMPLETED COMPONENTS**

**1990 - Juneau Fisheries Terminal**
- Dredging of the basin
- Installation of the sheet pile bulkhead
- Electrical for the cranes and lights
- Water service to the sheet pile bulkhead

**1990 - Fisheries Float Electrical**
- Lights and electrical pedestals added to the existing moorage float

**1992 - Juneau Fisheries Uplands Improvements**

Uplands work around the boat yard and sheet pile bulk head including:
- storm drains
- curb and gutter
- asphalt paving

Phase 1 of the Crane Dock was designed in 1988 and put into service in 1992 at a cost of $2,279,820. Based on engineering estimates for this expansion project, the original Crane Dock would have current replacement value of approximately $4 million. Several elements of that original project will contribute to lowering costs for this Crane Dock expansion component:

- The end cell of the original dock (facing onto Gastineau Channel) could not be used to create usable dock face. However, by connecting it with the proposed new sheet pile structure and adding corner support piles and a wide pile cap/deck structure a total of 112 lineal feet of new dock structure can be created. This is essentially “bonus” dock space that can be gained by completing the north face.

- In addition, the anchor piles and internal sheet pile “tie-back” structures of the original Phase 1 construction may be used to complete fully closed sheet pile cells for the new structure with substantially less steel as the tie-backs extend quite far towards the north face.

A total of 269 lineal feet of new dock face will be created, of which 112 lineal feet is 42% “bonus” for the project. Multiplying that bonus against the total estimated project cost ($8.1 million for the crane dock component) gives a figure of $3.37 million which would not be gained but for the existence of the original Phase 1 Crane Dock.

**BROADER INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT CONTEXT**

The Fisheries Terminal Completion project is one component of the 2017 Juneau Downtown Harbors Uplands Master Plan: Bridge Park to...
Norway Point\(^2\) (Master Plan). This Master Plan is a phased approach to enhance Juneau’s downtown waterfront and provide infrastructure to support the various harbor user groups. The plan’s goal is to develop Juneau into a premier port in Southeast Alaska.

While the maritime sector makes substantial contributions to Juneau, analysis associated with the Master Plan show these contributions are under-recognized due to how jobs and income are measured. A BCA for the Master Plan showed completion of all plan components (Figure 4) would generate economic outcomes between $5.3 and $7.9 million annually, as well as grow and support the larger maritime economy. The total benefits of the Crane Dock Expansion component was estimated at approximately $2 million annually.

BENEFITS TO COMMUNITIES IN RURAL AREAS

Juneau is a remote rural community with access to important aquatic resources. Since the community is not connected by the road system to the rest of the state, marine infrastructure is critical to the economy, as well transporting goods nationally and internationally. The Fisheries Terminal Completion project is a key factor in accomplishing this and preserving and expanding jobs in the commercial fishing and seafood processing industries.

A Catalyst for Economic Growth

Even though the Fisheries Terminal project is still far from complete, it has stimulated important economic development in Juneau. Many local businesses rely on the existing Crane Dock, which is a vital fish and seafood unloading point. Larger local business, such as Taku Fisheries and Alaska Glacier Seafoods, relied on the Crane Dock facility to transfer catches when started, and even now depend on it to supplement their own docks. Dozens of smaller seafood operations also depend on the dock to move

---

Figure 4 – Juneau Downtown Harbors Uplands Masterplan

2 http://www.juneau.org/harbors/documents/Final-BridgeParktoNorwayPointMasterPlan-3-30-17.pdf
their seafood products from boat to shore. These include smaller shore-based processors like Horst Seafoods and Taku River Reds, and the many direct market operations that process and sell their own catch, like Primo Prawns, who process and freeze their high value spot prawn catch onboard, and offload at the Crane Dock. Moreover, many marine service providers in Juneau also depend on it for heavy equipment lifts (engines, winches, etc.) and other service functions. All manner of fishermen use it for loading and offloading nets, crab and shrimp pots, longline gear, bait, provisions and general fishing supplies.

From an effectively dead industry in the 1980s, the existing facilities have served as a catalyst for growth, transforming Juneau’s seafood industry to the vibrant and growing $50+ million business sector it is today. But, as the economy has grown, the current infrastructure has become inadequate for user needs. The Fisheries Terminal Completion project would further develop existing infrastructure and build on the foundation the current facility has laid for economic growth.

Future Operations Supported by the Fisheries Terminal Completion Project

**Commercial Fishing Activities**
- Loading and unloading of crab and shrimp pots during summer and fall Dungeness crab, winter Tanner and king crab, and fall spot prawn seasons.
- Loading and offloading salmon fishing gear throughout summer gillnet season, and summer and winter troll fisheries.
- Loading and unloading gear and supplies throughout the March through November halibut and black cod Individual Fishing Quota longline season.
- Supporting multiple fishery seasonal gear and equipment changes, such as installing deck shelters and wave walls, loading deck freezers, switching out gillnet drums, longline haulers and deck winches, etc.
- Enabling major in-water maintenance and upgrade projects, such as engine and other major equipment replacements.

**Seafood Processor Activities**
- Offloading salmon, crab and halibut and other catches direct from fishing vessels for movement by truck to processing plants.
- Offloading salmon catches from company and chartered tenders for delivery to processing plants.
- Servicing tender vessels with ice and supplies.
- Providing ice directly to fishing vessels.
- Offloading salmon, crab, halibut, spot prawns and other direct marketed species from vessels for movement by truck to cold storage, to the airport for fly-out export, or for delivery by truck to local restaurants, stores and individual consumers.

**STATEMENT OF WORK**

The Juneau Fisheries Terminal Completion project is a straightforward marine dock infrastructure project primarily oriented toward servicing the commercial fishing and seafood industry. It will complete and greatly expand the original (Phase 1) Crane Dock constructed in 1992.

Table 2 shows the main characteristics of the original structure, the proposed addition and the completed (combined) structure.

### Crane Dock Expansion

Component I consists of expanding the existing crane dock (Figure 5). The existing crane dock is located along the southern entrance to Aurora Harbor and consists of:
- a rock filled sheet pile bulkhead with a concrete apron
- fender piles
- two hydraulic cranes facing south into the Fisheries Terminal small vessel basin
This facility primarily serves loading operations for commercial vessels. The crane dock will be expanded by constructing a new sheet pile bulkhead on the opposite side of the existing facility. This expansion will mirror the existing facility. It will be filled with rock then finished with a concrete apron, fender piles and two new hydraulic cranes. Dredging will be conducted at the face of the new dock section to provide sufficient water depth for vessel loading operations. At the dock’s western end, a new ice house will be constructed to support commercial fishing operations.

Construction was originally completed on the south side of an existing rubble mound jetty, using earth filled sheet pile cells, concrete pile caps with timber bull rails, timber fender piles, asphalt surfacing on the fill and two, 4,000 lb capacity electrically powered hydraulic cranes. The original concept included carrying the structure around to the north side of the jetty, but funding was not available. The original structure (Figure 4) is still in very good condition, with many decades of service life left. However, it has long been very crowded during critical times of the year. Completing the dock to its original conceptual design has been a priority for CBJ Docks & Harbors and the commercial fishing seafood industry for many years. Construction techniques and general specifications similar to those used when constructing the existing dock will be used when constructing the existing dock (Figure 6). The proposed completion project will employ the

### Table 2 – Project components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usable Dock Face (Linear Feet)</th>
<th>Usable Paved Surface Area (Square Feet)</th>
<th>Cranes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Crane Dock</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Completed 1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crane Dock (Component I)</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive Down Facility (Component II)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed Fisheries Terminal</strong></td>
<td>426</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5 – (above) Fender pile and bull rail construction on south side of existing crane dock; (right) Existing Crane; (below) North side of the rubble mound breakwater where the new dock face will be constructed.*
Figure 6 – Schematic of Fisheries Terminal Completion Crane Dock Expansion Component
same, well-proven cellular sheet pile construction methodology, and will:

- Add 157 lineal feet of new sheet pile bulkhead to create a total of 269 lineal feet of new usable dock face, increasing total usable dock face by 170% from 157’ to 426’.
- Create an additional 6,700 square feet of paved working staging area, increasing the existing working area by more than 95% to 13,500 square feet.
- Increase the number of working cranes 250% from 2 to 5.

Drive Down Float
Component II, the drive down facility, will be located just inside of the south entrance to Aurora Harbor to provide vessel loading and offloading operations. The facility will consist of a 17’ by 140’ transfer bridge connected to the shore at the northwest corner of the proposed pile supported deck. The bridge will provide access to a 50’ by 120’ vehicle accessible drive down float equipped with a 5-ton hydraulic crane. Steel pipe piles surrounded by energy absorbing pile hoops attached to the float will moor the drive down float. To reduce structural loads on the main float, a submerged auxiliary float will provide primary support for the bridge. Water, fire suppression, power and lighting utilities will extend down the bridge to provide services on the drive down float.

The drive down facility is a unique and valuable piece of infrastructure to the maritime industry as it allows for all-tide vehicular access to the vessels moored at the float. While the crane dock provides valuable infrastructure for heavy capacity freight loading/unloading operations for large vessels, the drive down float is better suited for smaller vessel operations, including provisioning vessels (loading/unloading crew, passengers and small freight, such as crab pots) and conducting maintenance on vessels. The crane dock is unable to provide ADA accessibility because vessels are located beneath the dock due to the variations in tide and ladders, which one must use to access the vessel/dock. The drive down float allows for vehicles to directly access the vessel with crew/passengers, tools, provisions or other small cargo, increasing safety and efficiency of operations.

Moorage Float Replacement
Component III consists of demolishing the existing moorage float (Figure 7) and boat haulout. They will then be replaced with two new moorage floats, an ice house and net shed. The boat haulout and boat yard services will eventually be relocated. The basin will be dredged and expanded towards the south as far as the constraints of the Harris Harbor rubble mound breakwater will allow and two 150’ floats will be installed, doubling the moorage capacity. To maximize upland operations and safe pedestrian and vehicular circulation, a retaining wall will be constructed along the easterly shoreline with architectural guard rails mounted along the top of the wall. Each new float will have a separate gangway leading from the retaining wall and will be constructed within the dredged moorage basin. Utility services, consisting of potable water, fire suppression, power and lighting, will be provided to the floats.

The existing float is losing its structural capacity and becoming a safety concern. It needs replacement to keep the facility in a state of good repair, ensure revenue from moorage fees will not be lost and increase user safety.
 existing float also does not have the capacity for the moorage demand of the Fisheries Terminal. Relocation of the boat haulout will create the space to install a second moorage float to double moorage capacity.

Additionally, a new 30’ by 80’ net shed will be constructed in the uplands at the northeast corner of the basin. This shed will provide a covered utility building that can be used for net repair, sorting gear and other support activities that benefit from having a sheltered location. These types of covered work areas are currently lacking in Juneau. Based on similar facilities in Sitka, Alaska, the shed can also serve as a community space and be used for festivals, celebrations, weddings or enjoying lunch on the waterfront. Sitka has a net shed at Crescent Harbor, which serves these purposes for the fishing industry and public enjoyment, and is also one of the waterfront focal points. The building incorporates historic Southeast Alaska architecture and depicts strong, bold and symbolic forms to connect the land to the water while offering very practical uses.

**HOW DO YOU GET 269 FEET OF NEW DOCK FACE WITH ONLY 157 LINEAL FEET OF NEW SHEET PILE CONSTRUCTION?**

The 157 lineal footage figure used for cost estimation includes the tie-back and end structure of the sheet pile cells. The new structure will connect to the old at several points to obtain the best value for the monetary investment. The new sheet pile structure will wrap the end of the dock in a similar fashion to the original construction. This end structure extends about 16’ beyond what is normally usable as dock face. This area can be made usable after the two end structures are joined by adding bearing support piles at the corners and finishing the area with deck, pile caps and bull rails. This project will effectively add a “bonus” 112’ of dock face on the end of the dock as follows:

- **16’** of new usable face on the existing south dock face (currently 157’).
- **80’** along the Gastineau Channel end of the dock.
- **an extra 16’** on the new north dock face.

This results in 269 linear feet of new usable dock face for the cost of 157 linear feet by constructing five sheet pile cells on the north face. This is an efficient way of using the existing structure to maximize the benefit of each dollar invested in new construction. The cost of finishing this section of dock will be reduced by using the existing anchor pile and sheet pile tie-backs in completing the sheet pile cells on the north face, resulting in a high value for each dollar spent. These existing anchor structures extend approximately 57’ from the existing Phase 1 dock face on the south, meaning the tie-back structure from north dock face will only need to come back 23’ to accomplish widening the entire structure to 80’. The area immediately seaward of the new dock face will be dredged to -15’ mean lower low water and the dredge spoils will be used as part of the fill for the sheet pile cell structure to the extent practicable.
II. PROJECT LOCATION

The Fisheries Terminal Completion Project will be constructed at the existing crane dock, located between Aurora and Harris Harbors, in downtown Juneau at 58°18’12.18” North and 134°25’56.11” West (Figures 9 and 10).

Per the Notice of Funding Opportunity for the Department of Transportation’s National Infrastructure Investments Under the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2020, projects eligible for BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grants include (4) port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure) and (5) intermodal projects. The Juneau Fisheries Terminal Completion project qualifies as a basic port infrastructure investment with intermodal attributes.

The project is located in the City and Borough of Juneau, Alaska, which had significantly fewer
than 200,000 residents as of the 2010 census (total pop. 31,247). Accordingly, this project qualifies as a “Rural Project.”

Opportunity Zone
Juneau is not considered an Opportunity Zone.

Designated Urbanized Area
According to the 2010 Census, Juneau is not considered an Urbanized Area, although it is designated as an Urban Cluster (UC 43561 Juneau, AK).

III. GRANT FUNDS, SOURCES AND USES OF ALL PROJECT FUNDING

PROJECT COST
$24,942,123

FUNDING SOURCES AND AMOUNTS
If awarded, BUILD grant funds would be the sole source of funding for all three project components.

NON-FEDERAL FUNDING COMMITMENTS
While the City does not have any non-federal funding commitments for this project, the City and private stakeholders have invested a substantial amount into supporting infrastructure with direct implications for the Crane Dock expansion component, totaling approximately $1,415,000.

In addition, based on the value of adjacent tidelands and uplands, CBJ Docks & Harbors estimates the value of the site dedicated to the Crane Dock expansion component to be $125,000, or about 1.5% of the proposed project cost for the Crane Dock Expansion component. While we recognize this amount is not eligible to be counted as project match under BUILD grant rules, these values are worthy of note in terms of investment by Juneau.

NON-FEDERAL FUNDS
The Fisheries Terminal Completion project qualifies as a rural project and is eligible for greater than 80% BUILD grant funding. The 20% matching funds are not required. Nonetheless, we are very aware of the competitive nature of the BUILD program and the importance of local match if available. Unfortunately, CBJ Docks & Harbors does not have cash match available.

HOW EACH FUNDING SOURCE WILL BE SPENT
Each of the three project components can be constructed independently of one another, while addressing the selection criteria, and are considered stand-alone project components. Table 3 outlines the total allocation of funds by project component. Tables 4-6 show a detailed cost estimate for each component. The cost estimates are based on similar, recent public project experience in Southeast Alaska. If awarded, BUILD grant funds would be the sole source of funding for all three project components.
### Table 3 – Fisheries Terminal Total Project Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>USE OF FUNDS</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE PROJECT COSTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Crane Dock Expansion</td>
<td>$5,945,500</td>
<td>23.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Engineering and Permitting</td>
<td>$785,095</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Contingency (15%)</td>
<td>$891,825</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Construction Administration and Inspection</td>
<td>$475,640</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Drive Down Facility</td>
<td>$7,513,000</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Engineering and Permitting</td>
<td>$1,126,170</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Contingency (15%)</td>
<td>$1,126,950</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Construction Administration and Inspection</td>
<td>$601,040</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Moorage Float Replacement</td>
<td>$4,717,350</td>
<td>18.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Engineering and Permitting</td>
<td>$707,603</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Contingency (15%)</td>
<td>$674,562</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Construction Administration and Inspection</td>
<td>$377,388</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,942,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 – Gear Waiting to be Loaded on the Existing Crane Dock
## COMPONENT 1  CRANE DOCK EXPANSION PROJECT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1505.1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$540,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060.1</td>
<td>Demolition and Disposal</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202.1</td>
<td>Useable Excavation</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202.2</td>
<td>Class A Shot Rock Borrow</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202.3</td>
<td>Class B Shot Rock Borrow</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204.2</td>
<td>Base Course, Grading C-1</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501.1</td>
<td>Storm Drainage Improvements w/ BMP's</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601.1</td>
<td>Water Services</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2702.1</td>
<td>Construction Surveying</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708.1</td>
<td>Bullrail</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2869.1</td>
<td>Sheet Pile Bulkhead</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2881.1</td>
<td>Dredging and Disposal</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896.1</td>
<td>Fender Pile</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2996.1</td>
<td>Pile Anodes</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3303.1</td>
<td>Concrete Paving</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3305.1</td>
<td>Concrete Face Beam</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000.1</td>
<td>Ice House</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13200.1</td>
<td>5 Ton Hydraulic Crane &amp; Base</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000.1</td>
<td>Power and Area Lighting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BID PRICE

- **Contingency (15%)** $891,825
- Environmental Permitting and Compensatory Mitigation $100,000
- Topographic Survey and Geotechnical Investigation $150,000
- Final Design and Contract Documents $535,095
- Contract Administration and Construction Inspection $475,640

### TOTAL RECOMMENDED PROJECT BUDGET

$8,098,060
### COMPONENT 2 DRIVE DOWN FACILITY PROJECT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1505.1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$683,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060.1</td>
<td>Demolition and Disposal</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601.1</td>
<td>Water and Fire Services</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2702.1</td>
<td>Construction Surveying</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708.2</td>
<td>Architectural Guardrail</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2726.1</td>
<td>Sheet Pile Retaining Wall</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2730.1</td>
<td>Pile Supported Deck</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894.1</td>
<td>Transfer Bridge, 17 x 140</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894.2</td>
<td>Bridge Support Float</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894.3</td>
<td>Bridge Abutment Assembly</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894.4</td>
<td>Reset Gangway and Hinge Assembly</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2895.1</td>
<td>Drive Down Float, 50 x 120</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896.1</td>
<td>Float and Abutment Pile</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896.2</td>
<td>Float Mooring Pile Caps and Frames</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896.3</td>
<td>Deck Support Piles</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2901.1</td>
<td>Float Transition Plates and Apron</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2996.1</td>
<td>Pile Anodes</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13200.1</td>
<td>Five-Ton Hydraulic Crane and Base</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000.1</td>
<td>Power and Lighting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Reqd</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BID PRICE**

- Contingency (15%): $1,126,950
- Environmental Permitting and Compensatory Mitigation: $250,000
- Topographic Survey and Geotechnical Investigation: $200,000
- Final Design and Contract Documents: $676,170
- Contract Administration and Construction Inspection: $601,040

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED PROJECT BUDGET**: $10,367,160

*Figure 13 – Similar Drive-Down Facility in Petersburg, Alaska*
### COMPONENT 3: MOORAGE FLOAT REPLACEMENT PROJECT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1505.1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$428,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060.1</td>
<td>Demolition and Disposal</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202.1</td>
<td>Usable Excavation</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2202.2</td>
<td>Class A Shot Rock Borrow</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2204.2</td>
<td>Base Course, Grading C-1</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205.1</td>
<td>Armor Rock</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501.1</td>
<td>Storm Drainage Improvements w/ BMP's</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601.1</td>
<td>Water and Fire Services</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2702.1</td>
<td>Construction Surveying</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708.2</td>
<td>Architectural Guardrail</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2714.1</td>
<td>Geotextile Fabric</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2718.1</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2720.1</td>
<td>Painted Traffic Markings</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2726.1</td>
<td>MSE Retaining Wall</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801.1</td>
<td>AC Pavement, Type II, Class B, 3” Thick</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2881.1</td>
<td>Dredging and Disposal</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$1,125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2894.1</td>
<td>80’ Gangway</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2895.1</td>
<td>Timber Moorage Float, 16 x 120</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$288,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2895.2</td>
<td>Timber Moorage Float, 16 x 150</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2896.1</td>
<td>Furnish and Install Steel Pipe Pile</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2996.1</td>
<td>Pile Anodes</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3303.1</td>
<td>Concrete Aprons, Sidewalks &amp; SeaWalks on Grade</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3303.2</td>
<td>Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3305.1</td>
<td>Concrete Gangway Abutment</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000.1</td>
<td>Net Shed, 30 x 60</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000.1</td>
<td>Area Lighting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16000.2</td>
<td>Float Power and Lighting</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>All Req'd</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION BID PRICE**  
$4,717,350

- Contingency (15%)  
- Environmental Permitting and Compensatory Mitigation  
- Topographic Survey and Geotechnical Investigation  
- Final Design and Contract Documents  
- Contract Administration and Construction Inspection  

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED PROJECT BUDGET**  
$6,476,903
IV. SELECTION CRITERIA

The Juneau Fisheries Terminal Completion project will provide necessary facilities for the Juneau fishing fleet, while concentrating commercial fishing support to a single location to better serve the needs of local and regional fishermen. The largest project benefit is the development of infrastructure that will allow local entrepreneurs to optimize and expand their operations, increasing shore-based processing and direct marketing. This project has a strong benefit cost ratio of 1.84 when discounted at 7%. These benefits are further detailed in the attached BCA, located in Appendix A.

PRIMARY MERIT CRITERIA

Safety

Safety comprises the most significant benefits to this project. While safety was not measured by statistically significant means, we know approximately 100 local fishermen and 200 crew members use the project area annually. An additional 100 visiting fishermen and crew use the project area transiently in the summer. They spend approximately 13,000 hours moving supplies between the parking lot and their vessels that could be avoided with a drive down ramp. Assuming one minor accident every 1,000 hours that requires a hospital visit for 1-2 hours of care, the new drive down dock will prevent 13 injuries to fishermen and crew annually, reducing hospital visits by 19.5 hours per year.

The crane dock component directly addresses personal and vessel safety concerns of users. In its current condition, the dock is frequently congested both on the water side and on the dock surface area. The existing dock face is 150’ long, but the inner portion is shallow at low tides, which creates hazards for maneuvering and already moored vessels. Also, the turning basin in front of the existing south face is not large and is subject to swift currents. This frequently makes getting to the dock face difficult for larger vessels like tenders and seiners, particularly if there is already a vessel tied up along the dock. The Crane Dock expansion will add 260’ of new dock face – 220’ will be added along the north face, while 401’ will be added on the west end of the dock. The latter addition will make an additional 80’ available, because the existing 401’ on west end of the structure is not presently set up for vessel moorage. There is also greater maneuvering space on the north side.

The same is true for the surface of the dock. The current surface area is about 6,000 square feet and the working area is narrow. When there is a lot of material staged on the dock, or coming off boats, maneuvering vehicles to and from the cranes can be difficult. *Additional dock footage will alleviate overcrowding and improve vessel and personal safety.*

The new drive down float will replace a pedestrian ramp local fisherman use to transport gear using wheelbarrows. Hauling gear manually this way requires hundreds of trips on foot, often in inclement weather. In Alaska the average age of those holding fishing permits is 50 and this is a large amount of manual labor, especially in inclement conditions when wet docks are slippery and can result in falls. Additionally, at low tides the angle of the gangways become increasingly steep and, according to surveys of local fisherman, they become too steep to use safely. This is further detailed in the attached BCA in Appendix A. A drive down float will save local fisherman approximately 13,000 hours annually of walking back and forth over hazardous terrain between their vehicles in the parking lots and their vessels in the harbor.

---

In addition, new moorage floats will increase user safety by replacing the worn down floats, which are at the end of their service life and increasingly unsafe for users.

State of Good Repair
The original, south face of the dock, completed in 1992, is in good structural condition with decades of useful life left. Fender piles and bulkheads have been repaired or replaced as needed; $20,000 was spent to extend and upgrade electrical service in 2007; and the cranes were rebuilt at a cost of $65,000 in 2008. That said, we anticipate that minor maintenance items regarding the existing facility may be addressed while construction crews are mobilized and as necessary to integrate the new structure. The most likely items are repairs to the existing paved surface, striping, etc.

The existing boat haul out pier and moorage floats within the Fisheries Terminal are nearing the end of their service life. They will be demolished and replaced as part of this project. The floats are in poor condition and, if not replaced, the City is at risk of losing this valuable moorage. Having these floats out of service would mean a loss in revenue for the City due to a loss in moorage fees. This would also impact operations and mobility of goods within the Fisheries Terminal.

After implementation of the Fisheries Terminal Completion project, the City is committed to ensuring the expanded and improved terminal infrastructure is kept in a state of good repair, in line with their demonstrated history of maintaining its assets.

Economic Competitiveness

The May 2016 Southeast Alaska 2020 Economic Plan, prepared by Rain Coast Data, identifies the top opportunity for economic development in southeast Alaska as seafood and ocean product development. The seafood industry is already amongst the top three of Alaska’s economic strengths, with room for growth. While there is significant opportunity in Juneau to support this growth, the City is not eligible for many funding sources like Economic Development Administration grants, which have funded similar harbor infrastructure projects in most other Southeast Alaska communities. This is because the overall unemployment rate in

---

**PROJECT SAFETY BENEFITS**
- Reduced injuries and hospital visits.
- Decrease in hazardous docking and moorage conditions.
- Reduction in crowding and congestion.
- Decrease in manual hauling of supplies over slippery docks and steep ramps.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COMPONENT</th>
<th>ECONOMIC IMPACT/COMPETITIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane Dock</td>
<td>Increasing the dock footage will increase the ability of Juneau businesses to compete with much larger, often foreign-owned seafood companies that dominate the Alaska seafood processing market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Down Facility</td>
<td>Constructing this facility will save time, and associated labor costs, of making trips back and forth on foot, increasing the productivity of fisherman and allowing them to better compete in the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorage Floats</td>
<td>Replacing the moorage floats will allow for continued use and reduce costs associated with maintaining a facility at the end of its service life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 [http://www.raincoastdata.com/sites/default/files/Southeast%20Alaska%20Economic%20Plan%202020%20Final_0.pdf](http://www.raincoastdata.com/sites/default/files/Southeast%20Alaska%20Economic%20Plan%202020%20Final_0.pdf)
Juneau is below the EDA eligibility threshold. However, the targeted sector of our economy - commercial fishing and seafood - is not different economically from similarly situated business in other communities. Unfortunately, the strength of other sectors of Juneau’s economy - most notably federal and state government employment - does not readily translate into support for weaker sectors in our community. This long-term imbalance has existed for decades, and is reflected in the poorer state of fisheries infrastructure here. Constructing the Fisheries Terminal Completion project will correct this imbalance by providing additional infrastructure, which will in turn spur economic development.

Commercial Fishing and Seafood Industry Impacts
According to The Economic Value of Alaska’s Seafood Industry 2015 McDowell Group report⁴, Juneau is one of the top ports for the seafood industry in Southeast Alaska and residents own more commercial fishing boats than any other region. Neither Wrangell nor Hoonah are listed as top ports, although they are listed as key ports. Juneau has a wholesale value of $48 million. Hoonah and Wrangell are less than $17 million each based on their ranking. Both communities have marine service yards for these vessels. In Juneau, despite the size and ranking of the city, infrastructure is lacking. Not only does the seafood industry generate income for fishermen, it generates income for the State. In 2014 the value of commercial fishing permits for Southeast residents alone was $138 million. Creating infrastructure for the commercial fishing industry to expand and prosper is beneficial to the entire State economy.

While only Alaska-owned vessels and fisherman have been included in many studies, the reality is that people working in Alaska’s commercial fishing industry come from all 50 states. The Alaska seafood industry contributes to local economies on a national level by providing seasonal employment opportunities for these out-of-state workers. The economic impacts of Juneau’s commercial fishing industry reach regional and national levels.

As Alaska is unable to supply the total number of workers needed, industry expansion means an increase in out-of-state employment opportunities.

Alaska’s seafood exports also contributes to the national economy. Seafood is exported to more than 100 countries and in 2014, these exports were valued at $3.2 billion. This accounts for an estimated 55% of all U.S. seafood exports. Additionally, Alaska’s seafood industry provides tax revenue for local, state and federal governments. Juneau may be a rural community; however, the benefits of investing in the commercial fishery infrastructure have national reach through employment opportunities and in tax revenue as can been seen in Table 7.

Processing and Direct Marketing
As detailed in the BCA (Appendix A), additional working space, twice as many cranes and a

drive down float would be a significant boost for processors and direct marketers. There are 10 million or more pounds of salmon that could potentially be accessed by local operators. In addition, most salmon are currently sent to countries such as China for primary and secondary processing. The development of the crane dock and the drive down float are projected to increase access to salmon and increase onshore processing in Juneau. This would generate an expected $2 million per year in first wholesale output, increase direct marketing by $350,000 annually and grow existing shore processing operations by $600,000 annually. In other words, jobs and economic activity created by local shore processors and direct marketers will be new economic activity, rather than transferring shore processing or marketing activity from other countries. Juneau is well-positioned to invest in value-added manufacturing and develop new businesses in this area.

**Construction Impacts**

The Juneau Economic Development Council Economic Trends Report indicates the construction industry, one which pays above the average wages, shrunk by 2% from 2015-2016 and is considered a cause for concern. Since the State’s overall budget is suffering from the decrease in oil prices, this has caused construction to decrease. Projects such as this one not only create a long-term economic impact, they also help stimulate the economy and create jobs in construction and professional services, including engineering, resulting in short-term and long-term economic benefits. Additionally, the study found the overall economy in Alaska’s capital prospers when there is an increase of these high-paying jobs within the community.

**Employment Opportunities**

In 2016, the second largest sector for self-employment was the fishing industry. The lacking infrastructure and marine service support in Juneau offers room for growth to adequately service the large fishing sector present in Juneau, particularly in a time where State jobs have been steadily decreasing with a decrease of 9.37% from 2015-2016, the largest drop in State employment seen in more than a decade.

**Environmental Sustainability**

The Fisheries Terminal Completion project does not directly address environmental sustainability. However, it is designed to primarily serve the fishing industry, and Alaska is a recognized world leader in sustainable fisheries management. The principle of sustained yield management is enshrined in the Alaska Constitution - the only such natural resource management provision in any state constitution.

As for the crane dock itself, it will be constructed on an existing rubble mound breakwater that was itself placed on previously developed tidelands. No virgin tidelands will be disturbed. The moorage floats will replace the existing ones in kind and will not result in additional permanent impacts. The drive down facility will be constructed off the existing infrastructure to avoid any impacts to virgin tidelands.

**Quality of Life**

**Access to Quality Seafood**

The Fisheries Terminal Completion project is a basic infrastructure project aimed at industrial users. However, it has, and will continue to have, secondary “quality of life” impacts for the
community. Foremost among these is access to high quality seafood. With a population estimated at 31,974 people, Juneau represents the largest market in Southeast Alaska. Although many Juneau residents enjoy catching their own fish and seafood, a majority rely on the fishing industry to access local seafood. The 70 direct market fishing operations in Juneau are a very important link in that supply chain. Most have loyal local customer bases. Many also provide product to local seafood counters and local restaurants. For these direct marketers, the Crane Dock is critical to get their product off their boats and delivered to consumers. Access to top quality, locally caught seafood is something that Juneau consumers highly value.

Recreational and Tourism Vessel Service
The facility also serves non-fishing industry vessels. This is a secondary role, but is nonetheless important for other operators requiring occasional heavy lift or loading capabilities, including owners of larger recreational craft, tour boat operators and regional freight operators. These vessels provide “quality of life” amenity for Juneau residents, visiting tourists and those living in small, remote communities in the region.

Reduction in Cost of Living
The cost of living in Juneau was found to be 11 percent higher than in Anchorage, Alaska and about 30 percent higher than the national average according to a 2008 study conducted by the Juneau Economic Development Council and the McDowell Group⁶. To get goods to Juneau, they must either be transported by barge or air, and most barge shipments only carry freight one way. However, seafood exports create a “backhaul” for the vessels, which generates more competitive rates for northbound shipping, resulting in a decrease in cost of goods to the community. Based on the 2015 McDowell Group study and their interviews with shipping carriers, this backhaul has the potential to reduce northbound freight costs by up to 10 percent. This has been seen in communities such as Kodiak where they have a greater export of seafood than incoming freight.

SECONDARY SELECTION CRITERIA

Innovation
Introduction of Public Infrastructure to Support Independent Fisherman
When the Crane Dock was first constructed, it sparked a minor revolution in the direct marketing of seafood in Alaska. The traditional, nearly century-old development model of the Alaska seafood industry was for independent fishermen to deliver to shore based processors. This was a “straight jacket” for many fishermen. Under Alaska limited entry licensing, fishing permits can only be owned by individual; no individual may own more than a single permit in a given fishery; and the permit owner must be onboard the vessel when the permit is being fished. This effectively ruled out processor ownership of fishing licenses and processor-owned fishing fleets. However, advances in technology made it possible for more and more processing to take place on board vessels. Fishermen wanted to process and market their own catches, but various State regulations on taxation and seafood sanitation were not supportive. Also, processors owned all the docks and most simply would not buy fish from any fisherman seeking to be independent. Juneau was one of the first municipalities to build public infrastructure - the Crane Dock - to help independent fishermen. There were no large established processors here to object.

After investing in the Crane Dock, there was a surge in interest by fishermen who wanted to take advantage of higher prices. They gradually forced changes to State regulations resulting in new licensing provisions. Some of these direct marketers have evolved into much larger companies. Many are continuing to develop

⁶ http://www.jedc.org/sites/default/files/Final%202017%20Cost%20of%20Living%20section.pdf.
new products and innovative marketing - evolving web-based marketing, community supported fisheries (CSF’s), sales at farmer’s markets around the country, and various local marketing initiatives to health food stores, restaurants and individual consumers. The Crane Dock was instrumental in these ongoing developments, and its effects have been felt in other communities. Fishermen from towns like Petersburg and Haines come here to access the Juneau market and use the airport to fly product to Anchorage and the Lower 48. Other communities are now investing in facilities to assist direct marketers and independent small processors. We fully expect the innovative surge sparked by the Crane Dock to continue and expand in the future.

**Cellular Sheet Pile Technology**

When Phase 1 of the Crane Dock was built in 1991-92, cellular sheet pile was a still a fairly new technology. This construction method is effective, as the facility is in good condition to this day. The expansion will mirror the original design. The existing breakwater jetty will be used as the primary footprint for the dock expansion and a marine wall will be constructed over the slope and tie back into the existing marine wall. Using parts of the Phase 1 tie-back system will result in substantially less new structural sheet pile, allowing limited resources to be devoted to other project aspects. Most important of these is finishing the end of the dock - heretofore unusable as dock face. This “bonus” dock face provides a substantial increase - some 71% - over what would normally be available with the same amount of basic sheet pile construction.

**Partnership**

CBJ Docks & Harbors is the project proponent and owner. They operate and manage multiple waterfront facilities and properties throughout Juneau. These includes two cruise ship docks, several small boat harbors and small boat floats, six launch ramps, two commercial loading facilities, two boat yards, and several hundred acres of tidelands and waterfront properties under lease.

There are several partnership arrangements in the overall Fisheries Terminal Completion project. First is with the University of Alaska who is the land owner. CBJ Docks & Harbors has a long-term lease agreement with the University that has placed significant lands, tidelands and equipment assets of the University under the Department’s management. Pursuant to this Agreement, CBJ Docks & Harbors developed Phase 1 of the Crane Dock in 1992 and undertook development of the vessel service yard, which included use of the 35-ton Travelift. These assets have been sublet to Juneau Marine Services since 1997, in what has been a very successful public/private partnership effort to expand Juneau’s marine services sector. A similar arrangement is in place with Maritime Hydraulics. The attached letters of support, located in Appendix C, further demonstrate the benefit and community support this project has.

**Demonstrated Project Readiness**

This project is ready to proceed upon procurement of funding. It is supported by the public and is part of the Juneau Downtown Harbors Uplands Master Plan, which included public involvement as part of the development process.

**Environmental Risk**

As this project has always been part of the original development plan, there is minimal environmental risk associated with completing the Fisheries Terminal. During Phase 1, the site
was permitted for this same use with no issues. In addition, the City has recently received environment permits and approvals for other recent projects in the vicinity. The immediate area has already been highly developed, and there are no habitat issues like eel grass beds or salmon spawning streams in the project area.

Technical Capacity
This project is technically feasible to fully obligate funds prior to the September 30, 2021 deadline. During the Master Plan development process, PND Engineers, Inc. reviewed the concept plans to ensure all major components of the project are feasible from an engineering and permitting standpoint, as demonstrated by the accompanying illustrations (Figures 14-16). They also provided detailed construction estimates for each component. In addition, there are many local, statewide and regional marine contractors who have experience with the fabrication and construction of these major project components.

Crane Dock. The crane dock (Figure 14) will use original design elements and available geotechnical information to mirror the existing dock footprint and effectively create an expanded version of the already valuable facility, but with greater capacity and efficiency. Constructability, durability and long service life are all characteristics of the original crane dock design, which has proven to be effective and is still in good condition to this day.

Drive Down Float. The proposed drive-down float design (Figure 15) has been successfully constructed and used in other locations throughout Alaska. The functionality and versatility of the drive-down float are key attributes to the collective purpose and potential of the Fisheries Terminal. Several fabricators within the northwest United States have extensive experience with the fabrication, assembly and transportation of the proposed drive-down float and access bridge designs.
Moorage Floats. Similarly, the proposed mooring float design (Figure 16) has been fabricated, assembled, transported and installed in many harbors throughout Alaska. The unique selection and configuration of the highest quality materials, both above and below water, yield greater durability and service life beyond many typical vessel mooring float designs. A smaller version of this same mooring float design is currently employed in the City's Douglas and Aurora Harbors.

Financial Capacity

While CBJ Docks & Harbors has a reserve account, all of that funding - and much more - is needed to match possible 1:1 State grants for remaining deferred maintenance in the basic harbor system, of which the Fisheries Terminal Completion project does not qualify.

Docks & Harbors receives approximately $450,000 per year in Fisheries Business Tax, but this is dedicated to revenue bond repayment, which have partially funded other commercial fishing oriented infrastructure. State bonding through the Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority is not an option because direct cash return from facility user fees is not sufficient to support a bond.

Other principal source of funds is cruise ship berthing charges and a $3 per visitor levy for Port Development. However, these funds are already dedicated to bond repayment for cruise vessel dock improvements, and by federal maritime law, can only be expended on projects of direct benefit to those vessels and/or their passengers. Consequently, the Fisheries Terminal Completion Project cannot proceed absent the requested BUILD grant funding.

Project Costs and Benefits

The estimated construction cost for all three elements of the Juneau Fisheries Terminal (drive down float, crane dock expansion, replacement of moorage floats) is $24.9 million. While this is a large amount, the benefits of this project justify and outweigh the cost. The completed project will provide substantial benefits to the Juneau community, including:

- Decrease in travel time for fishermen.
- Increase in shore processing and direct marketing.
- Reduction in facility operation and maintenance costs.
- Mitigation of personal and vessel safety issues.

These benefits and are discussed in more detail in the BCA found in Appendix A.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL RISK

The Fisheries Terminal Completion is part of a development project originally conceived and developed in the mid-1980s. The first phase completed construction in 1992, but funding was not available at the time to complete the proj-
ect as planned. As the additional infrastructure proposed for development as part of this project is a continuation of the original Fisheries Terminal project, initial local approvals and preliminary design have been already completed. The project was also reaffirmed and endorsed by the public and local government in 2017 as part of the Juneau Downtown Harbor Uplands Master Plan. Due to this pre-work, the project is ready to commence as soon as funding is awarded.

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

The expected schedule for this project spans a 36-month timeframe, with time intervals measured from the date of BUILD Grant awards. This schedule will easily accommodate the September 30, 2022 U.S. DOT fund obligation deadline. Should the U.S. DOT only fund select elements, the design and construction tasks can be expedited; however, it will not have a major impact on overall project schedule. Tasks such as permitting, bid/award and project close out will take approximately the same length of time, whether select components or the full project is constructed.

**REQUIRED APPROVALS**

Since the Crane Dock expansion component will adhere to a similar design as the original, Phase 1 construction, we expect the final design process to be straightforward and brief. The project will require review and approval by the CBJ Planning Commission. We regard this as a pro forma review, as the project meets all local zoning and development criteria. The final local matter will be appropriation of grant receipts by the CBJ Assembly. This is also expected to be a pro forma step, as the project aligns with long-term, local economic development priorities and with the recently adopted Juneau Economic Plan. CBJ Docks & Harbors fully expects endorsement from all local government bodies with project review responsibilities. Table 8 further discusses specific review and approvals for this project.
NEPA Status

No NEPA has been conducted for this project. It will be developed as part of the required environmental reviews during the design process.

Reviews, Approvals and Permits by Other Agencies

Non-local agencies with permitting responsibilities include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). A USACE permit will be required for dredging and for construction in tidelands. We expect little if any difficulty. The general site was originally permitted for the same use, and CBJ Docks & Harbors recently received a dredging permit for the recently completed Aurora Harbor rebuild project. That dredge area immediately abuts the Crane Dock site. The immediate area has already been highly developed, and there are no habitat issues like eel grass beds or salmon spawning streams in the project area. While these permitting steps can be tedious, CBJ Docks & Harbors has a long and effective history of permitting significant in-water and tidelands projects. This experience tells us that this project will easily clear permitting requirements.

Environmental Studies or Other Documents

There are no environmental studies or other documents associated with this project.

DOT&PF Coordination

No coordination has been conducted with the local DOT, but the City has a close working relationship with them. We have worked with them on numerous transportation projects and do not anticipate any issues with obtaining local DOT reviews or approvals.

Public involvement

This project is part of the Juneau Downtown Harbors Uplands Master Plan, which went through a comprehensive public involvement process. The process included input of more than 150 Juneau stakeholders and residents during four community workshops, three open house events, three harbor board presentations, integrated design charrettes, stakeholder meetings and intensive public outreach over a 10-month period. Specifically for the Juneau Fisheries Terminal, CBJ and the planning team worked closely with local fishermen to better understand their needs, and how to meet these through infrastructure improvements.

STATE AND LOCAL APPROVALS

As part of the Juneau Downtown Harbors Uplands Master Plan, this project has the support of the community. The preferred Master Plan was endorsed by the public at the conclusion of the February 16, 2017 public involvement meeting. On March 30, 2017 the CBJ Docks & Harbors Board adopted the Master Plan (see Appendix F: Regular Board Meeting Minutes). Letters of support for the project can be found in Appendix D.

FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS AFFECTING STATE & LOCAL PLANNING

As stated above, this project is part of the Juneau Downtown Harbors Uplands Master Plan. Master Plan available to view here: https://bit.ly/2SiaD35
ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT RISKS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Risk
The largest project risk is associated with the moorage float component. The tidelands on which the existing float and new floats are located are currently leased from the University of Alaska and CBJ wishes to purchase this land. The University has indicated they may sell this land; however, no formal arrangements have been made yet.

Mitigation Strategy
The UA long-term management plan is consistent with continuing existing uses and should CBJ be unable to acquire the land the floats can still be constructed and operated under the long-term lease.

VI. BENEFIT COST ANALYSIS

A BCA was conducted under the guidelines of the U.S. DOT for a Discretionary Grant Application to identify, estimate and quantify the expected benefits of the Fisheries Terminal Completion project compared to the baseline condition.

According to the BCA, development of this project will result in a variety of monetizable benefits, the sum of which exceed the project costs considered in the analysis. The following impacts were considered and monetized:

1. Travel Time Saved: Avoided labor costs of vessel operators making time intensive trips back and forth to vehicles on foot over ramp carrying materials by hand, if drive-down float is installed.

2. Economic Activity: Increased shore processing and direct seafood marketing due to build out of Fisheries Terminal.

3. Operating and Maintenance Expenditures: Avoided maintenance costs resulting from having to maintain existing moorage floats and cranes at the end of their functional life.

In addition, while not easily monetized, impacts to fishermen and crew safety were measured for Component II. Table 9 on page 30 summarizes these impacts, showing population impacted, project benefits and a reference to where each impact is discussed in the BCA report. Table 10 on page 30 summarizes the overall findings of the BCA. The ratio of monetized benefits to costs (B/C ratio) is 1.84 at the 7% discount rate.

The complete BCA can be found in Appendix A.
Juneau, while the 13th largest commercial fishing port in Alaska, lacks adequate infrastructure to support Juneau’s fishermen, inhibiting growth of seafood processing and direct marketing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT STATUS/BASELINE &amp; PROBLEM TO BE ADDRESSED</th>
<th>CHANGE TO BASELINE</th>
<th>TYPE OF IMPACTS</th>
<th>POPULATION AFFECTED BY IMPACTS</th>
<th>ECONOMIC BENEFIT</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF RESULTS</th>
<th>PAGE REFERENCE IN BSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Install a drive down float.</td>
<td>Value of Travel Time Saved</td>
<td>Fishermen, operators of commercial vessels, all vessel owners</td>
<td>Avoided labor costs of vessel operators and their crew making time intensive trips back and forth to vehicles on foot over ramp carrying materials</td>
<td>Estimated time/wages cost savings of nearly $1 million annually</td>
<td>Page 11-14 Components I and II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expand the crane dock.</td>
<td>Economic Activity</td>
<td>Fishermen, processors</td>
<td>The value of increased shore processing due to crane dock and drive down float</td>
<td>Increased shore processing and direct sales equaling $2,950,000 annually</td>
<td>Page 15-16 Components I, II, and III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Replace aging moorage floats.</td>
<td>O&amp;M Expenditures</td>
<td>City would no longer have to maintain infrastructure that doesn’t meet community needs</td>
<td>Transfer of maintenance costs to infrastructure that better supports community</td>
<td>Maintenance cost savings of 1.5% of capital cost every 5 years and 3.72% of capital cost every 15 years</td>
<td>Page 17 Component III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Benefits</td>
<td>Safety Benefits</td>
<td>Fishermen/Crew</td>
<td>Safety increase due to hundreds of saved trips on foot carrying gear on wet ramps/docks</td>
<td>Decrease of 13,000 hours of walking back and forth between vehicles and vessels</td>
<td>Page 18-19 Component II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 – BCA Summary Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCA SUMMARY RESULTS</th>
<th>DISCOUNTED 7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$40,489,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>$20,733,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-Cost-Ratio</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>