

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Ridgway called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. in City Hall Conference Room 224.

**II. Roll Call**

The following members were present: Bob Janes, Budd Simpson, David McCasland, Dan Blanchard, Jim Becker (arrived 5:23pm), Weston Eiler (via phone), and Mark Ridgway.

Absent: Don Etheridge

Also present: Carl Uchtyl – Port Director, David Borg – Harbormaster, Matthew Creswell – Deputy Harbormaster, and John Osborn – Harbor Operations Supervisor.

**III. Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Uchtyl said he deleted Unfinished Business #3 Vessel Salvage and Disposal. We have not advanced it far enough to bring it to the Committee's attention at this time.

**MOTION By MR. SIMPSON: TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

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

**V. Approval of Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Operations/Planning Meetings Minutes**

**MOTION By MR. SIMPSON: TO APPROVE THE JULY 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

**VI. Consent Agenda - None**

**VII. Unfinished Business**

**1. Auke Bay Boatyard Lease**

Mr. Uchtyl said this is the proposed language that's working it's way through the CBJ Law Department (Law). This is version five. It's ready to go to the Assembly with minor tweaks from Law. He is asking the Committee today and the Board next week to approve

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

the language assuming no substantive changes. This is a ten year lease arrangement with Harri Commerical Marine. We had Horan and Associates conduct an appraisal. It was appraised at \$36,000. Harri Commercial Marine submitted an operations plan which is attached in the packet. We have added a couple of paragraphs with a desire to see the maintenance records of all the equipment that Harri Commerical Marine is responsible for: the sealift (self-propelled hydraulic boat lift), the washdown pad, and 125 portable boat stands. Another requirement we want is for Harri Commerical Marine to provide the SWPPP on a yearly basis so we can keep track of any changes at the Auke Bay Boat Yard. It's ready to move forward as soon as Law can do a final review. If there are substantive changes that Law points out, Mr. Uchytel will bring this back at a later Board meeting. The lease expired in April and things are moving too slowly.

**Committee Questions**

Mr. Ridgway asked what the blank attachment on the insurance item will be?

Mr. Uchytel said it will be insurance that indemnifies the City and places Docks & Harbors as a secondary insured to the policy. CBJ Risk will define that. It will probably be \$1 million.

Mr. Ridgway asked if a \$1 million liability policy is standard?

Mr. Janes said yes, all across industry with companies that work together.

Mr. Simpson asked if the sub-sections being added have been vetted by the current operator?

Mr. Uchytel said he has sent everything to Law and Mr. Duvernay and he has heard no objections.

Mr. Janes said he assumes staff has been there when the sealift is operating and has looked it at carefully when needed. He asked what the condition of the machine is now?

Mr. Creswell said we had one of our harbor boats pulled with it recently. He hasn't done an inspection on the sealift, but it seems to be working fine.

Mr. Borg said we had it checked out prior to transferring it to them by the actual sealift mechanic. We flew him up, he went through and gave them training and got a clean bill of health, an actual written report on the status of that piece of equipment.

Mr. Janes said that's good as long as the training is passed on. We don't have anything in the lease that addresses training. There should be maintenance and training records on operators that are par to the owners manual.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Mr. Uchytel said we haven't required that in the past for the marine lift and typically we don't dictate the means and methods of the contractors that we lease our equipment to. We could do it, it's just something we haven't done in the past. We don't make sure that welders are certified on site and all these other things he suspects we could if we wanted to go down that path.

Mr. Janes said it's a valuable piece of equipment and we should consider making sure that equipment is treated with the protocols that are necessary. If somebody was looking at getting out of a lease, they could stop maintaining it. He will leave it to staff to decide.

Mr. Ridgway asked if Mr. Uchytel asked CBJ Risk if \$1 million is a good threshold for the liability? He's seen very expensive boats fall out of lifts. A lower level of liability might tie into a need for additional requirements including training certificates.

Mr. Uchytel said Law and Risk put together the language about the commercial general liability insurance. He can go back and make sure Risk thinks this is appropriate for the work that's employed there.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytel to take a look and amend it as needed then bring it to the next Board meeting for approval.

Public Comment- None

Committee Discussion/Action

**MOTION: TO APPROVE THE LANGUAGE OF A NEW 10-YEAR AUKE BAY BOATYARD LEASE TO HARRI COMMERCIAL MARINE SUBJECT TO STAFF REVIEWING THE INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS AND TRAINING AND REPORTING BACK TO THE FULL BOARD NEXT WEEK AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

2. Donation of 65 foot Gangway

Mr. Uchytel said last month Rotarian Kim Keifer made a request on the behalf of the four Rotary clubs and Rotaract for the donation of a 65' gangway that was previously used as an ADA required ramp along the seawalk. In January we completed a project to taper that seawalk portion and the gangway is no longer necessary. Right now it is excess to the needs of Docks & Harbors. The project in the Lemon Creek DZ area is a joint project between Rotary, Trailmix, and CBJ Parks and Rec. At the beginning of last month, this body was asking about the process to donate property. He did consult with Law and they provided him the code language that says the City Manager can approve transfers to charitable organizations up to \$50,000. Once we determined that Parks and Rec was a partner in this, the recommendation was to do an interdepartmental transfer to Parks and

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Rec. A new gangway of this size would be valued between \$40,000 and \$50,000. This gangway is approximately 15 years old and in excellent shape. Just to be transparent, he did receive an offer this week for \$20,000 that an organization said they would pay for it.

**Committee Questions**

Mr. Ridgway said that does change our last view of this.

Mr. Simpson said in today's paper he noticed Trailmix had suffered a significant theft of materials that's going to set them back on an unrelated project. It is the same non-profit organization we are attempting to support here, and he still supports the donation.

Erik Boraas, Executive Director of Trailmix, Juneau, AK

Mr. Boraas said it's rough. They had bridge materials stolen for the Treadwell Ditch Trail and there's nothing they can do about it.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytel if there are any other details on the offer to purchase?

Mr. Uchytel said it was Drew Green, he was supposed to be at the meeting tonight.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Boraas said they are excited to have this opportunity. The majority of the money for the improvements to the trails by DZ have come from the Rotary Club. The City has given \$10,000. If Docks & Harbors is willing to donate the gangway, it will be a clutch part of that project. They won't be able to do it without that. They'll have to raise more money. If it's not going to be used they would love to have it. They have already made plans with CBJ Streets to get it installed. He thanked the Committee.

**Committee Discussion/Action**

Mr. Uchytel said they are ready to move this weekend. He asked what it will do to their schedule if it's another week before it is approved by the full Board?

Mr. Boraas said they are prepared to move the gangway tomorrow morning. Rotary has planned a volunteer event on Saturday, so if they can get that gangway in as soon as possible they can double their efforts on actually building the trail.

Mr. Simpson said there are seven of eight members of the Board present. They are voting to do this. He doesn't want to slow them down because of a technicality.

Mr. Ridgway said since we are transferring this to another entity within the City, Parks and Rec may be able to move it more swiftly than our Board meeting next week.

Mr. Borg said he can call Parks and Rec tomorrow and make the arrangements.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

**MOTION By MR. SIMPSON: TO TRANSFER THE FORMER 65 FOOT ADA RAMP TO CBJ PARKS & RECREATION FOR THE PUBLIC USE IN LEMON CREEK AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

~~3. Vessel Salvage and Disposal 05 CBJ 40.010(g)~~  
~~— Presentation by the Harbormaster~~

**VIII. New Business**

**1. Cancellation of ATS 123 Lot 2 Lease**

Mr. Uchytel said we have a lease called Nowell Avenue Development, which is a Trucano enterprise. This is ATS 123 Lot 2. Trucano assumed the lease in the mid 80's, kept it until 2004, turned back the lease, and then in 2013 leased it from us again for about \$2,200 a year. Now he wants to cancel the current lease because the property is encumbered with easements from AEL&P, there is a ADOT right of way, and there are overhead powerlines. There is a cancellation and forfeiture clause stating that "the lease, if in good standing (which it is), may be cancelled in whole or in part, at any time, upon mutual written agreement by Lessee and CBJ." The Board could deny the request to return the lease, but Mr. Uchytel's experience is that we try to remain in good standing with our constituents.

**Committee Questions**

Mr. Eiler asked if Trucano also has leases to the left of the parcel? What is the ownership of that area?

Mr. Uchytel said it is kind of a donut hole. There are several lot lines. The electrical distribution center is on the ADOT right of way. When the bridge was completed in 1980 that required AEL&P to relocate power lines. Trucano has a triangular shaped parcel that he leases from us. He also has his yard. It's all AEL&P, Trucano, or ADOT right of way.

Mr. Ridgway asked when people are cancelling a lease upon which improvements have been made, do we ever do surveys to ensure those improvements are not a potential liability for us?

Mr. Uchytel said we very rarely close out leases. The ordinance allows for the right of first refusal and most lessees want to continue the lease. This is a difficult parcel to develop. There are probably no improvements built here. Either in the lease itself or in ordinance it says improvements can be removed by the lessee or if not it reverts back to the lessor. He has not had to deal with that. Maybe we should go in and see if there is any

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

hazardous waste that has been generated there. Typically we don't do it because it's a relatively rare occurrence.

Mr. Ridgway asked if there have been other leases where the lessee has desired to cancel the lease ahead of schedule and what has been the past reaction of the Board?

Mr. Simpson said he remembers a couple of instances like that and the Board accepted, in these cases they were reductions in the square footage of a lease.

Mr. Uchytel said Goldbelt recently gave back the corner of the the parking lot near the Seadrome Building. They couldn't find a use for it so we did take back that lease. Now we lease that out for parking to Allen Marine.

Mr. Janes said he is not against giving this lease up right now. He does think for this lease and any other leases in the future, we should have an inspection of the property, maybe a professional environmental report.

Mr. Simpson said the point is well taken because things like that happen. He suggested staff do a visual inspection to see if it appears there is anything on this that needs to be checked. He doesn't see the Board or the former lessee spending thousands of dollars on a parcel where there is no reason to think there is a problem. He suggested that in the consensual termination document they indemnify us if at some later time it turns out that there is a problem.

Mr. Ridgway asked if he is hearing a request for staff to look at adding a clause requiring some level of inspection for future leases?

Mr. Janes said we could add that. He thinks we should do a quick visual inspection. If we want it to be policy in the future, something like that should be on the lease.

Mr. Borg said he drove by the parcel today and it looked perfect.

Public Comment- None

Committee Discussion/Action

**MOTION By MR. MCCASLAND: TO ACCEPT THE CANCELLATION REQUEST FROM NOWELL AVENUE DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR LEASE OF ATS 123 LOT 2 AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

2. Purchase Option of Boat Shelter (AF-026)

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Mr. Uchytel said in ordinance, there is a requirement that any time somebody has a boat shelter for sale, the Board has the right of first refusal to purchase it. Over the years, previous Boards have said they have no intentions of buying boat shelters at this time, and given the Port Director authority to communicate that to the owners with the expectation he would come back to the Board and inform them. Typically they run for \$35,000 each half.

**Committee Questions**

Mr. Eiler said he thinks the way the Board has been handling this is fine, delegating that authority to the Port Director. He asked staff to compile a report showing what the turn over of those shelters has been. In his two years on the Board, 7-10 of them have sold. If we look at the long term plan for that area, that might be something we want to track.

Mr. Becker asked if we are in the business of accumulating these shelters or are we wanting to inspect that it's suitable? What is the reason for our right of first refusal?

Mr. Uchytel said one possible explanation he's heard is when the State owned the harbor, they had this defacto tideland lease. It was not authorized under State ordinance or statute that people had these privately owned structures but they placed them over State tidelands. A work-around was the State would be able to purchase them as they sold in the future to resolve that issue. When the State transferred the harbors to the City in 2002, he thinks they just transferred the policy that ADOT was using. They still don't have a tideland lease. It is weird having private structures over our tidelands without any type of lease. The only additional fee they pay is a \$0.13 per square foot boat shelter surcharge.

Mr. Simpson said with the big rebuild we just did in Aurora Harbor, we went to a lot of extra expense and trouble moving those shelters around and building floats that were suitable to hold the shelters. It's not free to us that those shelters exist there and he thinks if over the years when these purchase options have come up we had been acquiring them, we could have actually gotten rid of most of the shelters during the rebuild and we'd probably be better off. We don't have funding to do that. There is one for sale right now for \$25,000 for a half shelter. It's not that much money in the scheme of things. He's not suggesting we buy this one, but in retrospect it would have been nice if we had been acquiring them and getting them off the system.

Mr. Ridgway said in addition to the expense of moving them, he doesn't know if it's the most efficient layout of the fingers on the dock. He asked if Docks and Harbors wanted to repurpose the area currently occupied by boat shelters, could the Board just say leave? He doesn't believe there are lease terms. What would that entail?

Mr. Uchytel said he doesn't know if we would offer to buy them out or if it would be some kind of eminent domain process. CBJ Attorney Robert Palmer has suggested we should have an individual lease with each of the 21 different shelters. It gets weird because there are shelters with two owners. We've had people call and say they just

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

bought half a boat shelter and they don't know who the other half owner is. People do interesting things with boat shelters.

Mr. Ridgway said we wouldn't need the shelters themselves. In his mind, we wouldn't buy the shelters, we would tell people to move their shelters.

Mr. Uchytel said he doesn't know what that would look like to say we have decided the best interest of the harbors is to evict the shelters.

Mr. Janes said those shelters are going to continue to depreciate. He fears a fire in one of them spreading through them. He feels that our relationship with the shelters is not a good one right now. We need to clean them up. He doesn't know if the revenue we're getting is what we should be getting. He doesn't know if the liability language is up to date. It would put a big part of our harbor into disrepair if one of those caught fire on a windy night and it went down the lines. He thinks with their shelf life going down we should be addressing a way to decommission them- buy them back, consider them not safe, we need a policy for that because they're going to get older every day.

Mr. Becker said a few years ago one collapsed on the boat and across E float it caused his son's boat to go down partially and the boat next to his. We might research how the City handled that situation. Trucano went in with a crane and lifted the thing but it was down for a long time. It was snow load that actually made it go down. If they're not maintained those things can rot away just sitting there.

Mr. Eiler said he has no problem with private ownership of these boat shelters but they are a unique feature amongst Southeast Alaska harbors. He thinks it would be worth the Board including in it's long term planning if a substantial portion of these are turning over. It seems like a quarter or a third of them are. Accumulating those or accumulating them on one row could be a long term solution. The option being then you could either remove them and have them as just another part of the harbor, or you could have those decommissioned and then the City could construct covered moorage which would be a very attractive option that would distinguish our harbor from others in Southeast. It's a bigger issue than we're going to be able to untie at this point but if we at least track turnover of these, that will give us a trend and the Board can reassess that in the future.

Mr. Ridgway said he is a very happy occupant of a boat shelter and when he noticed one might be for sale he was very interested in it. He doesn't believe that qualifies as a need for him to recuse himself. He believes he is in the exact same boat shelter Mr. Becker mentioned because it has sunk at one point and you can tell it was under water for some time. That said, he would take Mr. Eiler's suggestion and Mr. Janes' comments and combine them into a request of staff to take a look at the issue and what is the long term plan for it.

Mr. Uchytel said we had several meetings with boat shelter owners for Aurora Phase II. He thinks the Board is underestimating the passion a lot of boat shelter owners have with



**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

their private property. He broached the subject of requiring them to be sprinkled. We can have those meetings, but they will not be pleasant Docks & Harbors Board meetings when we start dictating what to do with property that's in private ownership. We also went through great expense. Basically Aurora Harbor Phase II was to accommodate the boat shelters. We invested \$4 million into greatly enhancing the serviceability of the boat shelters with increased electrical power, all the floats, we even extended an entire fairway by 10 feet so we vastly improved the saleability of the facilities. We moved the boat shelters apart, we made the lengths of the mainwalks longer. He will do the will of the Board but we spent a lot of money. This discussion should have been two years ago about what we want to do with boat shelters, not six months after we've completed a major recapitalization project. He does not want to move the shelters from one float to another. That's a disaster waiting to happen. We moved them, held our breath, worked with the contractor to be as careful as possible, and we don't want to move these things again.

Mr. Ridgway said when he said combine the items that Mr. Eiler and Mr. Janes discussed he heard three ideas: 1) Maybe get some data. 2) The infrastructure is aging and they're aging themselves out. 3) Unique aspect to our harbor. We also just spent \$4 million to make it super nice for boat houses. Thinking of all that and inclusive of that, he believes the request for staff would be to look at whether there is any sort of long term aspect of the boat shelters being in Aurora that we should look at? We just recapitalized the harbor, they're not going to go anywhere soon, the people who are in them are very passionate because they are awesome. It's a difficult issue, there are a lot of folks involved. He doesn't think anyone on the Board is suggesting we get rid of them next week. Mr. Janes had a point that they are aging. The \$0.13 per square foot doesn't pencil out when we're talking about a \$4 million recapitalization project and all the effort that went into it. We're realizing that they do sink and they come with special issues but also maybe a special attraction to our harbor. He requested a little bit of data on what the turnover rate is and a small information package on that issue, a one-pager tops.

Public Comment- None

Committee Discussion/Action

**MOTION By MR. JANES: THAT THE BOARD WAIVE IT RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL TO PURCHASE BOAT SHELTER AF-026 OWNED BY WILLIAM EDGAR & LINDA LANE AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

**IX. Items for Information/Discussion**

**1. Strategic Planning/Amalga Fish Cleaning Station**

Mr. Uchtyil presented the strategic project list that he shares with staff every week. We always want to do the will of the Board so based on what he heard at the strategic retreat

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

in May, these are the projects we are working on. As things get done, he crosses them out. That's how he tracks what we're doing. Today he wants to call the Board's attention to the Amalga Harbor Fish Cleaning Station. Harold Moeser, who is a Docks & Harbors employee, put together a very nice report on our options for the Amalga Fish Cleaning Station. The problem out there as reported by the public is the boarding float is small, it's a busy location, we have over 100 trailer parking spots out there and 50 vehicle parking spots. People come in with their boats, mostly under 24', they tie up and they clean their fish. There is not enough boarding float space to do that and vessels start queuing up, tempers rise, so we're looking for a solution to that. Harold came up with four different options. One was do nothing, another was move the fish cleaning station uplands. The one staff really liked was to have a remote fish cleaning station outside Amalga Harbor. We could put a simple 20' x 28' float out there anchored and allow people to come out, clean their fish, then proceed in to recover their vessel. We thought that was the cleanest option. We also looked at extending the boarding float. The study was done at the end of 2015. We entered into a cooperative agreement with ADF&G. They get sportfish money, it's a 25%-75% match. We give 25% both for the study and for the construction. We waited to see how the Statter Harbor Launch Ramp Facility may affect the use at Amalga Harbor. We still believe something should be done so we want to pursue a solution. We have received some communications from ADF&G that they do not like these remote fish cleaning stations. They believe it inhibits their ability to do creel counts. Mr. Uchtyl wrote a letter to Mike Wood with ADF&G to ask for confirmation that it's a no-starter, and Mr. Wood came back with a letter saying they will not support a remote fish cleaning station. The cooperative agreement ends at the end of December, but we can choose to extend it. Today Mr. Uchtyl is wanting to reconfirm that the Board wants to pursue the option to extend the fish cleaning float. The estimate is close to \$200,000. Mr. Wood also suggested we could have a float and a walk up fish cleaning station there, so you would come haul out your boat and walk over to another float, clean your fish, and dump it in the harbor. We have not explored that option but it might have some merit.

**Committee Discussion/Public Comment**

Mr. Ridgway asked if ADF&G has looked at other options for how to maintain their ability to sample fish? Can they have a camera or can they skiff out to a floating dock? They're saying they wouldn't be supportive of the remote fish cleaning float because of their diminished ability to do the creel survey.

Mr. Uchtyl said emphatically they will not support a remote fish cleaning station. There is one in Sitka, we know it has been done but they are not going to support an extension of the grant funding for that option.

Mr. Janes said this last idea of having a cleaning float in the water with a ramp walking out to it is a brilliant idea. You can walk out to it, you're still on the water, it's not at the end of the dock. He thinks that merits some research.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Mr. Uchytel said users are not going to want to pull their boats out, park their boats, walk their fish back to the float, clean the fish, walk it back to the trailer and then go home.

Mr. Borg said the big issue right now it people tie their boat up down there and use the wash down system when they clean their fish. That's the allure to that whole situation.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytel what the path forward is?

Mr. Uchytel said he just wants the Board to either stop us and say they don't want to do any improvements out there or give us guidance to go ahead and keep working on a design for a solution and he'll work with ADF&G to extend the cooperative agreement.

Mr. Ridgway said if the numbers are right, 45% of sport caught groundfish are coming through Amalga Harbor.

Mr. Janes asked if that was prior to our new parking lot?

Mr. Borg said we probably had a 50% reduction in use out there. He was very surprised during this year's salmon derby, he was out there quite a bit and there were half of the boats there that we had the year before, and we had better weather.

Mr. Ridgway said if nothing else maybe that will give us time to look for a solution that will meet everyone's needs.

Mr. McCasland asked if people would be mad if we just got rid of it completely?

Mr. Borg said they would clean fish on the dock and that makes a mess.

Mr. Ridgway said the Board would like Mr. Uchytel to continue doing what he's doing.

## **2. Small Boat Harbor Ladder Requirements**

Mr. Uchytel said we are asked regularly when we are going to get safety ladders. With the new Board members, he just wants to let people know they are not required. The owners of marinas and harbors can install them. We've started installing rescue ladders at Statter Harbor and Aurora Harbor so if somebody falls in, it's a manner to retrieve them. The new floats are designed with the idea of trying to keep all the wood and all the runs out of the water so there is an 18" freeboard. OSHA has requirements for working wharves, but in a marina or harbor there is no requirement. A lot of facilities put them in, a lot of them don't. There is risk in not doing them but it's not compelled by any type of regulatory guidance. In the packet are some examples of safety ladders. He is willing to answer any questions about safety ladders because he expects at some point it will come up and he wants to be proactive in the discussion.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Mr. McCasland asked if we should install these in every harbor?

Mr. Uchtyl said we could put them on each main float, we could put them on each stall, our rescue ladders are where the head floats and mainfloats intersect. There is no right or wrong answer, it's just a policy discussion of how much to invest. We've got lots of things we could put money into like boat shelters and fish cleaning stations. Safety ladders are another item for consideration.

Mr. Blanchard said he keeps his boats in Seattle during the winter and this was a big issue for the Port of Seattle. They had this same discussion and decided not to do it, and it came back and bit them really hard. Once we breach this situation we put ourselves on a little bit of liability. One of these saved his life off a boat that was burning one year. He went into the water and the dock was way too high and he would have drowned had he not had that. He wonders when we sit and discuss safety items like this how much liability we take on if we don't make a decision to go ahead with what other ports and harbors throughout the Northwest are putting in place.

Mr. Ridgway asked if Mr. Uchtyl has compared Juneau's policy or lack thereof with other locations?

Mr. Uchtyl said he has not surveyed every harbor in Alaska. Seward has rescue ladders in every slip. He guesses more often than not an Alaska harbor is not going to have them.

Mr. Ridgway said we don't have anything in Title 85 or any written policy whatsoever, but we do have some rescue ladders available. He would like to request staff look at developing a reasonable middle of the road policy, that it sounds as if they're already kind of following, and perhaps document that. Then we have something for reference.

Mr. Janes said there must be an industry standard or a harbor standard of what you try to shoot for. First we need to know what the standard is and then we need a budget that would give us some sense of how we meet that standard, and then we have something to talk about. How much is this going to cost for all of our harbors? Once we do it in one, we're going to have to do it in all of them. We need more information before we can make any kind of decision about whether this is even an affordable idea. He suggests that we have staff look at that standard, estimate how many we need, and give us a little bit of a budget rather than just \$250 each.

Mr. Ridgway said it doesn't sound as if there is a standard.

Mr. Blanchard said Fishermen's Terminal in Seattle had a terrible problem with this. They used to have small piers rather than floats and they were all up about four or five feet off the water. Three or four people died in one winter falling off their boats because they couldn't get themselves out. Since then they have put floats in which are up about as

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

high as ours and the Port of Seattle came up with a policy for where those ladders now lie. We can sit and argue all day long about what is too much and what is not enough.

Mr. Ridgway said this information item is discussed as “Ladder Requirements” and he believes staff is looking for the Board to help define those. He agrees with Mr. Janes that a little more information is needed. In terms of the options obviously when we’re talking about safety cost is an issue and it’s not. He believes they can reasonably request staff to come up with some sort of proposal for a standard that would minimally meet some sort of safety goal and a rough cost to come with it.

Mr. Uchtyl said there are no industry standards. He can talk to colleagues and see what people are doing and provide that, but he can’t provide a national code requirement because it doesn’t exist.

Mr. Ridgway said he would encourage staff to come up with what they think is a good idea with regards to standardized installation of safety ladders.

**X. Staff & Member Reports**

Mr. Becker said he knows the people at Juneau Marine Services very well and the travel lift they have is 35 years old. The University owns the travel lift and Juneau Marine Services maintains it. It’s in horrible shape. It’s never been under a cover or anything like that. They want a new one and they cost about \$200,000. He thinks maybe the City should own it. We do have an agreement with Juneau Marine Services, they’re good people to work with, and in the event that we have an application to get a bigger travel lift either at the Rock Dump or the Yacht Club, that application is probably flawed in so far as there is some provision in it that if you ask for money that’s going to compete with an adjacent community like Hoonah, that would probably kill it. If we could put in a new travel lift at Juneau Marine Services and we could put a bigger one outside, boats could come in through the bigger one and get lifted out. This is a plan that’s just germinated right now, he knows its going to be a long time. He did notify Jeff Duvernay that he was going to make these comments tonight but he is out of town. He just wanted to let the Board know he is talking to Mr. Duvernay about this.

Mr. Ridgway asked if that is a BUILD Grant issue?

Mr. Uchtyl said we submitted three BUILD Grant applications. The \$25 million ask for the Juneau Fisheries Terminal which is finishing the crane dock, drive down float, net shed, and some additional moorage has a reasonable expectation of approval. The next one is another \$25 million ask for a Marine Services Yard. That one will not be competitive because we just don’t have the return on investment that they’re looking for. That’s coming from the DC lobbyist that sees hundreds of these. He doesn’t think the Marine Services Yard or the Non-motorized Transportation Link which is the seawalk between Statter Harbor and the Auke Bay Marine Station will be funded this year. The reviewers of the BUILD Grants look very precisely at what’s being submitted and they

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

recognize the goal is not to steal business from an adjoining community. The idea is to bring new money into the community. What Mr. Becker is suggesting is if our vision that we've laid out was this larger 150-175 ton lift capability, it may run into reviewer problems because they could see it as stealing work away from Hoonah. We need to show that we are not stealing, we are growing this industry that keeps more vessels in Alaska as opposed to going to Seattle.

Mr. Ridgway said there are two things here, an effect on a BUILD grant that could be amended to give us a better chance, and a 35 ton travel lift that is toast.

Mr. Becker said it's been repaired a lot. This is just something that's developing and he wanted to let the Board know that he's working on it independently and more will come. There is a need for a large travel lift and he would like Docks & Harbors to control that.

Mr. Uchtyl said there are a lot of things going on next week. There is a National NOAA Hydrographic Survey Panel Review. He'll be sitting on a panel for that. There will be lots of people here from DC. It'll be at Centennial Hall. He is representing the Alaska Association of Harbormasters and Port Administrators on navigation needs as well as presenting as the President of the ASCE section on engineering needs from NOAA. In addition to that NOAA meeting, we are also hosting a contingent of about 6-7 folks from DC and they're doing the NOAA research vessel homeporting study for one of their new vessels. He is also hosting Donna West from the Corps of Engineers and she's going to be looking at the maintenance dredging in Aurora and Harris Harbor. Hopefully she will bring some news on the request for beneficial upland disposal of dredging materials with the idea of adding property south of the Yacht Club. The day after Labor Day he will be in Anchorage, he has been appointed by the Governor for something called ACAST, Alaska Civilian Armed Services Team. This is the first meeting and they'll be talking about what the State can do to encourage more military including Coast Guard to Alaska. When he goes up for that he'll also be going back to the Anchorage Corps of Engineers folks to talk about the wave attenuator project out at Auke Bay.

Mr. Janes asked if Mr. Uchtyl is representing the Docks & Harbors Board when he is at ACAST? He doesn't know how they would all feel about more military presence in Alaska.

Mr. Uchtyl said he has been appointed as a person to represent municipality and tribal interests. He is not there representing Docks & Harbors. He applied for the ACAST Board because he was upset that the Coast Guard FRC ended up in Sitka and not Juneau. Someone from DC reached out to him and encouraged him to apply.

Mr. Blanchard asked Mr. Uchtyl to explain the NOAA homeport and what they're looking for?

Mr. Uchtyl said it all goes back to the Coast Guard FRC, working with our lobbyist in DC, and asking what the opportunities are to bring more federal jobs to Juneau. He was

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

in DC for a lobbying visit with another professional organization so he stopped by NOAA and told them Juneau would be a great place to bring a new research vessel that's coming to Alaska. They came in May and we showed them around Juneau. They liked what they saw and now they are coming back with some contractors to evaluate Juneau as a potential homeporting option for a 160' vessel. There are things to work out but we think we have a good community that would support NOAA and we're looking for opportunities to bring jobs to Juneau.

Mr. Ridgway asked if Mr. Uchytel is working with a team of people from CBJ or if he is manning this by himself?

Mr. Uchytel said when we had them here in May the Mayor, the City Manager, JEDC, the CBJ Finance Director, and Docks & Harbors staff were there. This time he might bring Brian Holst from JEDC and Craig Dahl from the Chamber of Commerce. He wants to make sure they know the community wants them here. Right now they could not tie up where the NOAA dock is. He put together a white paper before his visit to DC and said we're interested in developing our waterfront, we want to be partners with NOAA, we want the seawalk to go through there, we want to have control of the dock so we can utilize it for small cruise ships in the summer, etc. He doesn't know how much we can promise to deliver. We'd love to have them out at the Auke Bay Marine Station, it's a good collaborative area for NOAA to be located. We just have to do a better job than we did with the FRC.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytel to please let the Board know if he sees any opportunity for them to get involved, they are all in tremendous support of encouraging NOAA to homeport their vessel here.

Mr. Janes said he thinks we should go out and be hosts. He doesn't know what our legalities are for after hours mixers but we need to host this as any city, municipality, or country would do to bring in people that we want and show them what we have. If we do have the ability for informal conversation with these people, after all the meetings, that's really important.

Mr. Ridgway said at the strategic retreat, as we discuss prioritization of capital projects and how we spend our money, we could potentially review reassessing our prioritization to further encourage use of the float at the Auke Bay Marine Station.

Mr. Simpson scheduled the Committee assigned to evaluate the Port Director to meet at his office at 4:00pm on Thursday, August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2018 right before the Board meeting.

**XI. Committee Administrative Matters**

1. Next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting- **Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018.**

**XII. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 7:03pm.**