

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

I. Call to Order

Mr. Ridgway called the meeting to order at 5:00pm in the CBJ Assembly Chambers.

II. Roll Call

The following members were present: Don Etheridge, Bob Janes (5:05pm-6:05pm), David McCasland, James Becker, Bob Wostmann, Mark Ridgway and Weston Eiler (via phone until 6:45pm).

Absent: Budd Simpson and Dan Blanchard

Also present: Carl Uchtyl – Port Director, Gary Gillette – Port Engineer, David Borg – Harbormaster, and Matthew Creswell – Deputy Harbormaster.

III. Approval of Agenda

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

Motion passed with no objection.

IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items - None

V. Approval of Wednesday, October 17th, 2018 Operations/Planning Meetings Minutes

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 17th, 2018 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

VI. Consent Agenda - None

VII. Unfinished Business - None

VIII. New Business

1. LUMBERMAN Update

Mr. Uchtyl said there was a meeting coordinated by the Southeast Alaska Watershed Coalition and the Southeast Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership. They invited State DNR, Coast Guard, Docks & Harbors, and Mr. Becker who is the chair of DIPAC. The concern from this group is the upcoming winter and the tides around Thanksgiving that the vessel may not be securely anchored. It is believed the vessel is only on one secure anchor currently. At the meeting DIPAC volunteered to contribute a 750# anchor and Debbie Hart with the Southeast Alaska Fish Habitat Partnership agreed to, as a collaborator, coordinate to have a tug come out and set the other anchor. In the meantime, DNR has still taken a position where they do not have funds to address the Lumberman. Mr.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Uchytel said he did review SB92 which is the law for abandoned and derelict vessels. At the meeting, Mr. Carpenetti, who is a lawyer, indicated that Docks & Harbors has the authority to impound the vessel with the new law. Mr. Uchytel questioned the City Attorney and the response he received was “with the passage of SB92, CBJ now has the authority to impound the Lumberman assuming it represents the definition of derelict per the State statute.” The State has not fully updated the code with the passage of SB92 but it appears the State has the primary duties. DNR has the responsibility to remove the vessel if State funds are available. We may report the Lumberman to the State Attorney General's Office for Criminal prosecution. If the State refuses to take care of the Lumberman, SB92 empowers us to do so. So, we do have the power to impound the Lumberman, but the State has the duty to do this first.

Committee Questions

Mr. Becker asked if the State would have to get ownership of the vessel before they could do it? With maritime law, you can't take someone else's vessel.

Mr. Uchytel said there still has to be due process involved with whoever takes action. However, with the passing of this bill, we do have statutory authority now.

Mr. Wostmann said it was mentioned that someone should file a criminal complaint. Would that be a trigger event to get the State to move or is this something we would not want to get involved with?

Mr. Uchytel said the feedback from the City Attorney is that we can always go after the owner. There is still a responsible party but he is indigent and not sure what we would get out of going after him. That process would probably be a waste of time to pursue.

Mr. Wostmann said he was involved in filing a criminal complaint in a different forum with somewhat similar circumstances. One of the precursors they were obligated to do was to file a criminal complaint to create the authority for another agency to act.

Mr. Uchytel said he will ask the City Attorney if we should be filing a criminal complaint.

Mr. Ridgway asked if he knows of the State impounding vessels elsewhere?

Mr. Borg said there have been fishing vessels impounded by the State in Hoonah.

Mr. Ridgway asked under what circumstances were they impounded?

Mr. Borg said generally fishing vessel permits not paid for.

Mr. Wostmann said there are technical challenges in setting two anchors on a vessel riding a current. Do we know who will be installing the anchor so they know where and how this second anchor should be placed?

Mr. Uchytel said in this issue everyone is cautious to step forward because once you touch it you own it. That is why the non-profit taking the lead has fit in well to organize efforts to secure the vessel. He said he has committed harbor staff to setting the second anchor. There will be another meeting Friday afternoon with DIPAC and Cruise Line

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Agencies of Alaska, who has the Skookum Yarder, which is the little tug used for handling garbage and logistics for the cruise ships. Drew Green, Dave Borg, myself, and Eric Prestigard will meet at DIPAC to look at the anchor and gear and come up with a plan how it should be set with the least amount of risk possible. DNR did send out a letter of non-objection for a placement of a second anchor on the Lumberman for the purpose of preventing worsening of the situation.

Mr. Eiler asked if having Harbor staff install the second anchor exposes the Department or the City to any liability. Are we indemnified if one or both anchors break?

Mr. Uchytel said if he asked a cautious lawyer they would probably say to not do anything at all and wait until it breaks free. However, he does not feel good about that. Someone could always come up with a reason not to do it.

Mr. Becker said we have already lost one anchor off this vessel. Does anyone installing the second anchor have experience with this?

Mr. Borg believes the safest thing to do is to run an anchor off the stern.

Mr. Becker asked with enough slack to be able to swing?

Mr. Borg said it is an anchor and is not 100% science.

Mr. Uchytel said the non-profit organization found the responsible party downtown and had him sign a document that said he did not object to coordinated efforts to place another anchor on his vessel.

Mr. Janes asked what business does Docks & Harbors have to put another anchor on a boat that is not ours if there is potential liability? Is the boat better off with doing nothing?

Mr. McCasland asked what is the problem with letting it swing like it is currently?

Mr. Uchytel said with the high tides and winds over the winter, one anchor may not be sufficient to hold it in place. The idea is to place a second anchor. There is a potential hazard and we have to do something.

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Etheridge said it is important to do something to protect ourselves from damage that could harm our facilities or boats moored at our facilities. He does not see any harm in assisting with putting another anchor onto it, especially with the owner signing off with agreeing to put another anchor onto it. This will help with the liabilities on it. It is important to keep it as secure as possible.

Mr. Wostmann said he agrees that Docks & Harbors should try to do something rather than ignore the problem. With his experience with anchors, he believes the stern anchor is the better choice.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Mr. Becker said he is not opposed to setting another anchor.

Mr. Ridgway suggested to check with the Coast Guard for methods of securing a second anchor on this vessel.

Mr. Uchytel said the Coast Guard has publically stated that the area north of the bridge is not a navigable waterway and that is how they are saying this vessel is not their responsibility. With it not a federal channel, they don't need to deal with this derelect vessel.

Mr. Ridgway said he encourages staff to move forward with the cognition that there is potential liability involved and it may have some technical issues.

MOTION: None

2. Archipelago Property Update

Mr. Uchytel said last night at the Planning Commission meeting they approved four items necessary for the Archipelago property to move forward on the public portion. Next Monday is the Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting with the Assembly at 6:00 pm. On page 11 in the packet is a paper with cost justification. The Purchase and Sales Agreement (PSA) still remains with CBJ Law and Morris Communication. He is told it is getting closer to being resolved. He said Mr. Gillette and himself met with the City Manager, City Attorney and City Finance Director last Thursday and they are encouraged to put together a cost justification for the Archipelago project from the public side. An issue that has come up is the cost of the retaining wall and if it is a good deal for the City. It will be reflected in the appraisal Horan & Company will do once the PSA is approved by CBJ Law. He believes he can prove the retaining wall benefits the City more than the private developer.

Mr. Gillette went over his presentation. The new cruise berths that were built allows for Juneau to accept larger ships. More people are arriving and the projection for 2019 is 1.3M which is 12% more from last year. From April 2017 to February 2018 we went through a planning exercise from Marine Park to Taku Dock. The purpose of that plan was to accommodate the new passengers that are arriving in our community. The concept plan will go from Marine Park to Taku Dock but it became clear that the goals we were trying to meet required open space, more bus staging and covered shelter area for people to wait for their busses. These were some of the top items supported by the community and the only area left to do this was on the Archipelago empty lot, so the plan quickly focused toward that lot. The lot has been for sale for about eight years and after a few months into the process, the owners of the lot decided to develop the property. They will develop an area on the map upwards of a red line and that is the property line that has been agreed upon with Docks & Harbors. The area below the red line, water side, will be our portion to develop. The staging area Docks & Harbors will develop will hold 12 each 25 passenger small vans, and there will be a covered shelter area with restrooms. We also have an open space with landscape features with benches and trees. Those features will be located so it can be a flexible space for large groups or smaller group settings.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

The current ownership is Lots 1 and 2 are owned by Archipelago and Lots 3 and 4 are owned by CBJ. To get to the property line discussed earlier, CBJ will purchase some uplands and tidelands and Morris Communications will purchase some of CBJ uplands in the middle of the lot. The total project budget is \$23.5M. We have discussed doing this project in phases. Because of budget and timing, but mostly timing, it would be in our best interest to phase the project. The plan now is to build the staging area with the pilings, the retaining wall, the deck space for the staging area and when we are finished with this portion of the project we have agreed to allow the Morris group to use some of that space for laydown for when they work on their project. As they begin building their two buildings, they will need less area for staging of their construction supplies and we would be able to come back in and start construction of our building and the canopy in the parking lot area. The schedule works nicely with both projects and we should both be finished about the same time which would be the spring of 2021. Mr. Gillette went over the design drawings. The building will have restrooms, a big staging room area, and rolling doors or folding doors to provide a big open feeling. There will be a lot of glass and open space. As we went through the public process for this project, this building design is what we heard the public wanted.

Mr. Uchytel said this was on the consent agenda at the Planning Committee last night and it was pulled for questions and public hearing. One of the Commissioners questioned if we are building the downtown waterfront for the cruise ships only or for the community. Mr. Uchytel said the best answer he can give is that we will open and use all the facilities to the maximum extent possible consistent with the judge's ruling on the CLIA lawsuit. There are concerns with using all passenger fees to procure facilities that are used by locals and whether we need to have a local non-cruise passenger fee as part of the funding package. On page 13 in the packet is the availabilities of monies for this project to move forward. City staff has a plan to fund this project.

Committee Questions

Mr. Ridgway asked to go back over the funding package. He wanted to know if the issue is on local usage of the facilities if they were paid in part by Marine Passenger Fees.

Mr. Uchytel said no one knows what the ruling on the CLIA lawsuit will be. The Plaintiff in the lawsuit believes anything paid with Marine Passenger Fees is for the exclusive use of the Cruise Industry. We feel the Urban Design Plan was a blue print for the community wants and that is how we are proceeding until there is a ruling that says otherwise.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the open space being presented now is what was presented in the designing efforts that the public voted on. He remembers hearing a lot about green space and no so much of a deck over.

Mr. Gillette said there was also an element to have a waterfront attraction, something to attract people in the off season to create more vitality for downtown. This wasn't totally designed so we wanted to remain flexible. We also heard about concerts in the park and plays and again this was also flexible. The one problem with green space by Marine Park

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

when it is wet it is not very useable. We feel this open space building is more useable but then it is also flexible. We wanted to leave options open for future.

Mr. Ridgway asked if, depending on the outcome of the CLIA lawsuit, the local Juneau community may not be able to use this in the off season?

Mr. Uchytel said he does not see that being possible and our intentions are to look at this as a community use space to be used in the winter months also.

Mr. McCasland asked if there is concern of the homeless people hanging out in this open space area?

Mr. Gillette said the building will be able to be secured.

Mr. McCasland asked about the fire pit areas?

Mr. Gillette said yes that can happen with those type of facilities but it is dealt with everywhere and not a reason not to do this.

Mr. Uchytel said a question that has been asked is why Docks & Harbors should participate at all and why is it a good deal for public funding? Is this too good of a deal for Archipelago? Horan & Company is going to determine the cost of submerged, sloped and uplands value which is a fixed commodity. The question from the City Manager's staff is why the property line is located where it is and is this too good of a deal for the private developer. The property line follows the 15' contour which we believe is a good location because we don't end up buying more expensive uplands, deck over uplands and follow the retaining wall. It provides good value to Docks & Harbors, and also provides sufficient uplands for the private developer to build. Mr. Uchytel talked about other options and outcomes with the other options but staff believes the presented property line will be the most beneficial for Docks & Harbors.

Mr. Ridgway asked if contractors were hired to determine the cost differences for the other options?

Mr. Uchytel said the question from the City Manager was why should Docks & Harbors build the retaining wall and what is the cost justification to do so? That is why I reached out to a contractor and staff to come up with reasons that we believe it is in the public good to proceed with Docks & Harbors funding the retaining wall and the property line location.

Mr. Janes asked if the egress and ingress investigation onto South Franklin control has been looked into. Who was going to control it and who was going to pay for the control? Is there a plan on how this will operate on a busy day?

Mr. Gillette said we have met with DOT and they have agreed this is the preferred option. We changed the egress away from the building and changed the normal path flow into the lot which gives them the site distance they need. We have applied for the permit and they will review it and come back with any other conditions they feel need to be addressed. In terms of protecting the public, they have indicated in some of their meetings they may

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

want to require a guarded crosswalk at that location if the site distance is minimal. Initially, DOT does not see any big obstacles and our permit application is being reviewed by the rest of their staff.

Mr. Etheridge asked if there has been concern from industry to pay for this project with Marine Passenger Fees?

Mr. Uchytel said CLIA has not reached out to him on this project. CBJ Law believes this is a legally defensible project. Earlier this fall Mr. Uchytel said he gave a tour of our facilities to the CEO of Royal Caribbean and showed him the plans for this project and he thought this was a great idea.

Mr. Etheridge asked if Mr. Day & industry are supportive of this project?

Mr. Uchytel said that is a difficult question but he believes TBMP members/operators and passengers will benefit from this project.

6:01 – 5 Minute Break

6:07 – Meeting called back to order

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytel what he needed from the Committee tonight.

Mr. Uchytel said he wants to make sure the Committee is informed of what staff is doing moving forward with this project. He said he goes to the Committee of the Whole next Monday. Assuming things go well with the Assembly, the plan is to introduce an Ordinance for the PSA, which CBJ Law is reviewing, on November 26th. The Finance Director is working on a funding package which will look something like page 13 of your packet. If this is passed up to this point, action for the Assembly will be on December 17th. We are trying to move appropriately and keep things on schedule. We intend to go out with a procurement later this month which will be approximately \$800,000 for the Government provided steel pilings and rebar for the retaining wall that will run concurrent with the Assembly action. This would mean the contractor can begin work as soon as the bid is awarded and staff believes there is relatively low risk. We will not open the bids and cancel the procurement if the Assembly comes back and says they do not want to proceed with this project.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO REAFFIRM SUPPORT FOR THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT WITH FUNDING AND JUSTIFICATION AS PRESENTED AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Mr. Eiler objected because he believed the Chair skipped public comment.

Mr. Ridgway asked for public comment and there was none. He then asked for Committee Discussion/Action.

Public Comment-None

Committee Discussion/Action

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Mr. Eiler said he supports keeping the momentum on this project, but there are missing details that are causing a log jam. We haven't seen the new PSA or what Archipelago is willing to do regarding sharing costs. When early designs and proposals were taken to the Assembly, some of their members felt rushed by us trying to move forward without having their questions answered. He questioned if it is wise to having a leading procurement for rebar and pilings before bringing this project to the Assembly and a PSA finalized. He is concerned with how we are trying to move this forward as a Board without having reviewed a new PSA. He feels this is an incomplete process from the Board's but he is supportive of a public private partnership.

Mr. Ridgway said the motion is fairly generic and does not imply the Board has written, seen, or approved the PSA which in his understanding is currently at CBJ Law and they are doing significant changes. He asked the Board members if they think their role is? Is it to be supportive of the staff and their choices which are in the best interest of Docks & Harbors Mission and to have them look to limit liability and make sure to have fiduciary responsibility with the Board's faith in the staff with the bland statement to have staff continue the work? On the other hand, if the Board members believe this motion is specific that we understand the fiduciary responsibility and understand and approve the details of the PSA and fully support the project as is, those are two different things. He said he is not sure the Board will even see the PSA before it is finalized.

Mr. Uchytel said he has a copy of the latest version of the PSA. However, the Assembly has tasked the City Manager with the negotiations on the PSA. He said Mr. Watt will defer as much as possible to Docks & Harbors staff and Board but the Assembly has charged Mr. Watt with the PSA details.

Mr. Ridgway said he has worked with staff and this motion is basically stating that this is a valid project. The Committee is not saying this is a good deal or bad deal and the Assembly has left that up to the City Manager. The support is for the process and not details of the deal.

Mr. Etheridge said the Committee is just providing the support for Staff to go to the Assembly and let them know the Board still supports this project. The cost of this project is so high, the Board does not have authorization to approve funding so that approval will be at the Assembly level anyway. He said everything has to be lined up so when staff does go to the Assembly and it is approved we can move forward right then. We need to be one step ahead of the Assembly to move quickly and have the Board backing.

Mr. Wostmann said he agrees. This motion is an opportunity for the Board to say to staff we like what we see at this point and support moving this forward as expeditiously as possible. He suggested a small change to the motion; The Committee acknowledges there are still remaining issues to be resolved but at this point in time we believe the project is one that we can support and support staff with moving forward.

Mr. Ridgway said all of these motions are to support staff and the decisions they are making.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Mr. Uchytel said Mr. Horan can't do the appraisal on the property until the PSA is completed. They are working on it now, but the remaining details can't be put in place in the appraisal until the final PSA. The recognition that several details to this project are incomplete is true.

Mr. Eiler said that with those issues clarified, he believes he can support a motion to move this forward. He suggested for staff to ask the City Manager and the Mayor about advancing procurement for materials.

Mr. Etheridge asked if he still has objection to the motion.

Mr. Eiler said if the amendment by Mr. Wostmann stands he will remove his objection.

Mr. Ridgway said the motion has already passed.

Mr. Eiler said he is fine with the motion as is as long as his comments are on record.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO REAFFIRM SUPPORT FOR THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT WITH FUNDING AND JUSTIFICATION AS PRESENTED AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion Passed

3. Approval of the 2020-2025 Capital Improvement Project (CIP)

Mr. Gillette said on page 14 and 15 in your packet is Docks & Harbors six-year plan for Capital Improvements. FY20 would go into the budget if approved. This shows the projects that we are seeking money for or have funding for and plan to do in the years shown.

Committee Questions

Mr. Eiler asked about the project listed to deck over the area in front of the People's Wharf. He wanted to know what was that project.

Mr. Gillette said this was part of the Urban Design Plan. It is down by Tracy's Crab Shack and in front of the People's Wharf building. This is an open space area in the Seawalk that was identified as a potential restroom location. It was also identified as the location for the USS Juneau Memorial. This was supported in the plan but currently we do not have funding for it. Staff will apply for State Marine Passenger fees again in 2021. The other part of this would be to add a guard rail along the front of the Seawalk now that it is not considered an active dock.

Mr. Uchytel said every year at this time City Engineering asks every department to put together their five year CIP list. It doesn't mean the monies are available and priorities are as listed. This is a way for City Engineering to track and the Assembly will then approve the CIP list.

Mr. Gillette said FY20 would receive the first funding for projects and we have five out of the eight listed dependent upon grant funding. This is a project wish list and if we did receive the grants we would need to come up with matching funds and we have identified

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

places that we could do that. For the last three projects listed on page 15 staff has applied for the Federal BUILD grant which was the former TIGER grant program. It is highly unlikely we would get all three but we are hopeful we will get one. If we do get the grant money we will then need to go through the process of appropriating the money, getting the Assembly to approve it and move forward with the project. If we don't get any grant funding they will move to another year to apply again. There has been one on the list for three years and we have not received any funding. We just keep applying until we do get funding and then we move forward.

Mr. Ridgway asked if everything lined up and Docks & Harbors received all the grants, how would Harbor staff deal with a major influx of project funds? Would you need to plus up staff or are these primarily design builds.

Mr. Gillette said if we did receive all five of the grants that we applied for we would be very busy and would probably have to staff up to accommodate. If we got the money we would figure out how to move forward with the projects.

Mr. Uchytel said we are still hopeful to secure the permits for the dredging, blasting, and wall for the float installation project at Statter Harbor IIIB this year so we can start the project next year. Law has determined we will need a 15% local match with the Marine Passenger fees. For the local match we are going to try to use the value of the property as property in lieu of local match. We are trying to be creative when trying to finance these projects as required.

Public Comment- None

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Eiler commented that the plans for the decking over of the area by People's Wharf should be revisited. He supports the development but he is not sure that restrooms are the best use for that area of our waterfront. He said if Docks & Harbors does get lucky and receives all the grant funding we have applied for, he would like that project revisited.

Mr. Ridgway agreed with Mr. Eiler. He said in the future he would like more time to review the list so he can familiarize himself with the projects better before making a decision.

MOTION BY Mr. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE DOCKS & HARBORS 2020-2025 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP) LIST AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion Passed with no objection

4. Docks: Enhanced Security Facilities

Mr. Uchytel said last December for the FY19 Marine Passenger Fee request we made a request for \$170,000 for biometric Transportation Workers Identification Credential (TWIC) readers. They make a lot of sense for busier ports, but it does not make sense to have it here where it would be used on known locals. We sent letters stating that this is not needed here and we didn't know the outcome of our letters until September when the

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Coast Guard said they are not going to implement the readers and they put it on the indefinite list. The money that was going to be used for the TWIC card readers, staff is asking to be reprogramed and used on security booths for the two publically owned floats. With the new security facility plan approved by the Coast Guard, we now check every passenger that comes back to their ship. What we have currently is inefficient and we want a better walk through security check point. He said he asked the City Manager and he is good with the change if the Board approves. It will go to the Assembly for final approval.

Committee Questions

Mr. Ridgway asked if there was going to be some point in time when we would absolutely need to have the TWIC reader?

Mr. Uchytel said it is unlikely.

Public Comment-None

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Wostmann said he is in favor of this motion.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO RECOMMEND THE TRANSFER OF \$170K OF FY19 MARINE PASSENGER FEES IN THE DOCKS ENTERPRISE OPERATING BUDGET TO A NEW CIP PROJECT FOR ENHANCED SECURITY FACILITIES AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection

Mr. Eiler left the meeting at 6:45pm.

IX. Items for Information/Discussion

1. Annual Report to the Assembly

Mr. Uchytel said Docks & Harbors is required per Title 85 to present the state of the Harbors to the Assembly annually. He said he drafted the report and it is on page 17 in the packet. This basically talks about the number of people Docks & Harbors served, projects that we have been working on, and projects we intend to do. The fee schedule will also be included.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Ridgway asked if there would be any benefit in letting the Assembly know the value of the assets as well that are managed by Docks & Harbors.

Mr. Uchytel was unsure.

2. Small Cruise Ship Infrastructure Master Plan – Request for Proposal

Mr. Uchytel said this is an RFP for the \$150,000 in Marine Passenger Fees from the City Manager that is basically a study to see where we can invest in facilities to support small cruise ships. The study extends from Auke Bay to Downtown to pin point locations to accommodate the small cruise ship niche.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Ridgway asked about the schedule?

Mr. Uchtyl said the procurement schedule is in the packet. We also encourage Board member to participate in the RFP selection process. If any members would like to participate to let staff know.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the Board members would have the opportunity to see the draft master plan.

Mr. Uchtyl said yes.

Mr. Wostmann asked if there is a process to select the RFP review committee?

Mr. Uchtyl said there is no process for that. He usually has himself, the Port Engineer, the Deputy Port Engineer, the Harbormaster, and any Board member who would like to participate.

Mr. Ridgway said he would like to be on the RFP review committee.

3. Safety & Security of Harbor Facilities

Mr. Uchtyl said on page 37 in the packet is a letter from Mr. Wendel raising security concerns at Amalga Harbor which he said he also forwarded to all the Board members. He was using Amalga Harbor and overnighted while deer hunting and came back to find his window broken and the glove box rifled through. He is basically saying Harbor patrons pay money for a launch ramp and they deserve to have a safe, secure facility. He is proposing that Docks & Harbors needs to put cameras and lights at Amalga Harbor. Mr. Uchtyl said he did reply to his email and stated that security is important to us and staff does take it seriously but there are challenges in bringing power and cameras to Amalga Harbor and Echo Cove. Patrons do pay \$90 for a launch permit but Juneau is unique in that we have launch ramps that are 50 miles apart and there are high expectations that all facilities are useable and snow removed. Docks & Harbors collected approximately \$155,000 in launch ramp fees in 2017. Now that we have our asset management system, it shows we spent \$110,000 just in moving snow in 2017. Like everything, we need to prioritize our resources and we want safe, secure facilities without a doubt but we have to provide reasonable responses to questions like this.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Ridgway asked if he heard back from Mr. Wendel after Mr. Uchtyl responded.

Mr. Uchtyl said no. He heard Mr. Wendel posted his letter on facebook but not Mr. Uchtyl's response.

Mr. Wostmann said he was the Board member who asked Mr. Uchtyl to bring this to the Committee for discussion. He said there is power at Amalga so he is curious what it would take to have cameras installed?

Mr. Borg said there is one light bulb.

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Mr. Wostmann asked if it was not practical to put a security camera on a pole?

Mr. Borg said we could do that but we can't get a signal to us because there is no cell coverage.

Mr. Ridgway said he encourages staff to projectize looking into any inventive way of leveraging someone else to monitor remote cameras or have remote site monitoring.

Mr. Etheridge said before getting too deeply into this we need to bring this before the Assembly again. Staff did a lot of review on this years ago and provided different price ranges and camera options for the different Harbors and the Assembly said no way.

Mr. Ridgway said that is why he wanted it projectized and put \$75,000 on it for review. This would be at least a proactive response to an individual that just had to pay \$600 to replace his window and it would be passed by the Assembly.

4. North Douglas Launch Ramp Improvement Concept

Mr. Uchytel said in the CIP list staff put \$5M in for improvements at North Douglas. In the past the Board has been requested to do some work at North Douglas but has not been on the top of the list. The change now is the amount of waste rock Kensington is producing. He met with the General Manager of Kensington on numerous accounts. They have a need to get rid of rock and we have a potential to build something at North Douglas. One of the issues is it is a big fill. We need 165,000 cubic yards and the ramp needs 55,000 cubic yards of fill. To put this in context it is larger than the fill needed at Statter Harbor which is 110,000 cubic yards. If we can work out a deal with Kensington, we do know the Municipal Harbor Grant Program does cover launch ramps but only launch ramps. We could possibly get a 50/50 match for the launch ramp area but not for the parking lot. He could contact State of Alaska Fish & Game to see if there is any grant money available for this project. He said staff looked at this and have said lighting will be necessary for the launch ramp area. If we did want to move forward with this we would need to get more property from DNR.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Ridgway asked if anyone looked at relocating the ramp?

Mr. Uchytel said they did not.

Mr. Ridgway asked if staff could add to PND's scope of work to do 10 hours of work looking at options for relocation.

Mr. Uchytel said looking at a different location could probably be added to the Small Cruise Ship Study.

Mr. McCasland asked if lights have to be put at the launch ramp?

Mr. Borg said he hears that is needed often.

Mr. McCasland asked with the new design if the float would be left in year-round?

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
For Wednesday, November 14th, 2018

Mr. Borg said that is what we want to do.

Mr. McCasland recommends to not have lights at North Douglas.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the potential funding for this was a BUILD Grant?

Mr. Uchytel said no, we can get a 50/50 match up to \$5M and if Fish & Game supports it, that could be used as the match. At some point we may need to ask the Assembly to approve a Revenue Bond or Geo Bond for a lot of these projects we want to get completed.

Mr. Ridgway asked what is our level of responsibility to look at broader potential impacts? Do we have to analyze additional traffic on the highway, potential light pollution, or broader planning efforts?

Mr. Uchytel said we don't have to do a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Because there is already a facility existing, they will be more willing to accept the changes.

Mr. Becker said there is a process currently going on trying to get a second channel crossing that this may be able to be lumped in with.

X. Staff & Member Reports-

Mr. Uchytel said Docks & Harbors Christmas Party is at DIPAC this year.

Mr. Wostmann asked if the project with the individual that wanted to put Kayaks at Statter Harbor for winter use moved forward?

Mr. Borg said we have been engaged with Ms. Hart.

Mr. Wostmann asked if this was able to happen?

Mr. Borg said yes, we are waiting on information from her at this time.

XI. Committee Administrative Matters

1. Next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting- **Wednesday, December 12th, 2018.**

XII. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 7:10pm.