



Port of Juneau

To: Joint Assembly/Docks and Harbors Board Subcommittee
CC:
From: John M. Stone, P.E., Port Director
Date: May 27, 2008
Re: Reviewing Downtown Cruise Ship Alternatives

In follow-up to our March 21 meeting, I established an Advisory Group to assist you in developing a decision-making process for reviewing cruise ship dock alternatives in downtown Juneau. I am reporting that the Advisory Group met on May 15, 2008 to work on the assigned task. This memorandum reports the results of the meeting, and also seeks guidance on further work you from the Advisory Group.

Members of the Advisory Group are:

1. CBJ Port Director (John Stone)
2. Downtown Business Association (Larry Spencer)
3. Merchant's Wharf (Daniel Glidmann)
4. Goldbelt, Inc. (Gary Droubay)
5. Mental Health Trust (McKie Campbell)
6. AJT Properties (Reed Stoops)
7. Cruise Lines (John Binkley)

(Note: Michael Conway of MAC Services, LLC (Juneau) facilitated the May 15th meeting.)

Based on available information about the purpose of the Joint Subcommittee and the Advisory Group (taken from the March 5, 2008 CBJ Special Meeting minutes), we reached consensus on the following purposes:

1. **PURPOSE OF JOINT ASSEMBLY/HARBORS BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE** : Layout a decision making process the Assembly can use to review cruise ship dock alternatives in downtown Juneau and ultimately select a proposal for moving forward that resolves long-standing

Ex. 030, p. 1

CBJ02836

issues concerning a new cruise ship dock in the community. Elements of the process include:

- Getting a well-rounded view of things and input into the process
- Reporting on timelines and participation for a direction to go in the longer term to resolve the issue
- Focusing on the process of decision making (rather than specifics of where)
- how it will be done
- how long it will take
- who it will involve
- What happens if no consensus is reached?

2. PURPOSE OF THE JUNEAU DOCK PROPOSALS ADVISORY

GROUP: Develop and recommend a process to the Subcommittee to accomplish the work described above.

Our recommended overall process for accomplishing the task of the Subcommittee and the Assembly is briefly listed as follows:

1. Parties working on projects submit their proposal concepts (carefully defined) sufficient for review process described in step 2 below. (deadline: June 6). Each party must show public funds, if they are included as part of the project proposal.
2. We will submit the proposals to the ad hoc subcommittee and Assembly for initial concept review and approval of the proposal concepts before moving forward on additional work described below. (deadline: upon receipt of proposals in step 1). This will also be the first official opportunity for the public to be informed of the concept proposals.
3. Conduct a port navigation study on the approved alternatives (CBJ lead w/ industry & project proposers involved in study design). (deadline: start study after approval from subcommittee & Assembly).
4. Conduct simultaneous reviews of proposals sufficiently “ready” for evaluation (product of ongoing detail work beyond concept design in Step 1 by proposers). (deadline: start after Assembly approval in Step 2; these reviews will be due in ~ 2 weeks) Reviews will be performed by the following sectors:

Joint Assembly/Docks and harbors Board Subcommittee

May

Page 3 of 3

industry operations (separate from NAV) review
downtown business economic review (on existing properties)
financial review by CBJ (impact on tax revenues to CBJ/ financial
impacts by other non-CBJ projects on CBJ)
public review (hold public workshops)
Conduct the following additional studies (deadline: end of summer
2008)
Transportation (pedestrian & vehicle flow/staging)
Economic impacts overall
Safety & security

5. Joint Assembly / Docks & Harbors Board Subcommittee deliberates on the information developed in the reviews and studies and makes its recommendations to the Assembly. (deadline: mid-fall)
6. Determine if an amendment to the Waterfront Development Plan is required. (deadline: after consideration by the Assembly)

If the Subcommittee considers the above steps as meeting their expectations, the Advisory Group is willing to continue its work to assist the Subcommittee in accomplishing the task. We will need to develop a more detailed action workplan to accomplish the process and request funding for consultants to accomplish the specialized work identified in the workplan.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss the recommendation in more detail with either me, or the Advisory Group as a whole.

Call me at 586-0294 if you have questions.

Ex. 030, p. 3

CBJ02838