DOCKS AND HARBORS BOARD
MEETING AGENDA

October 30, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

https://juneau.zoom.us/j/84231067992?pwd=gVEwWRVqQmsL7hFlbAnDfZlWQpJjAm.1 Webinar ID: 842 3106 7992 Passcode:835761

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL: James Becker, Tyler Emerson, Clayton Hamilton, Robert Horchover, Matt Leither, Nick Orr, Mark Ridgway, Annette Smith, and Shem Sooter.

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

1. Special Order: Docks and Harbors Employee of the Quarter - Oxana Stadnikova

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. September 25, 2025

F. ITEMS FOR ACTION

3. Bid Award for Statter Harbor Geotechnical Work

a. Presentation by Port Director
b. Board Questions
c. Public Comment
d. Board Discussion/Action

MOTION: TO AWARD STATTER HARBOR BREAKWATER GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION (RFP DH26-007) TO DISCOVERY DRILLING INC. FOR $1,439,978.

4. Board's Right of First Refusal to Purchase Aurora Harbor Boat Shelter AE-26

a. Presentation by Port Director
b. Board Questions
c. Public Comment
d. Board Discussion/Action

MOTION: TO WAIVE THE BOARD'S FIRST RIGHT OF REFUSAL TO PURCHASE AURORA HARBOR BOAT SHELTER E26 ALLOWING THE OWNER TO SELL ON THE OPEN MARKET.

G. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

5. SE Alaska Whale Watching Associations (SEAWWA) - Update

a. Presentation by Robie Janes & Serene Hutchinson
b. Board Discussion/Public Comment

6. Aurora Harbor Drive Down Float 35% Design Update

a. Presentation by Port Engineer
b. Board Discussion/ Public Comment

7. Docks & Harbors Board Retreat Planning - November 15th, 8:30am - 4:00pm

a. Presentation by Port Director
b. Board Discussion/Public Comment

H. BOARD MEMBER AND LAISON REPORTS :

8. Port Engineer's Report

9. Harbormaster's Report

10. Assembly Liason Report

11. Port Director's Report

I. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

J. ADJOURNMENT

DOCKS AND HARBORS BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

September 25, 2025 at 5:15 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL: Clayton Hamilton, Robert Horchover (joined later via Zoom), Mark Ridgway, Annette Smith, Shem Sooter (Zoom), James Becker - Chair

Absent: Tyler Emerson, Matt Leither, Nick Orr

Also in Attendance: Carl Uchytil – Port Director, Leah Narum – Administrative Officer, Matthew Sill – Port Engineer, Jeremy Norbryhn – Deputy Harbormaster, Greg Smith – Deputy Mayor (via Zoom), Brandon Ivanowicz – PND Engineers, John DeMuth – PND Engineers

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES - NONE

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - NONE

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. July 31, 2025-No objections

F. NEW BUSINESS

2. Request for Petro49 to receive a new 35-year lease for ATS 857

Presentation by Port Director - Mr. Uchytil referred to Page 23 of the packet for a memo regarding a request from Petro Marine doing business as Petro 49 for a Long-Term Lease of ATS 857 from Chief Financial Officer Jason Werner. The current lease agreement is about a 300 square foot parcel for about $1800 a year. The current 55-year lease will expire next year on September 15, 2026. Mr. Uchytil explained if the Board chose to start a new lease, the maximum period for this lease would be 35 years. Petro Marine has preferential right to renew the lease. Petro Marine is asking to forego the last year of the lease so they can get financing for a new construction project in that area.

Board Questions/Public Comment:

Mr. Hamilton asked what they would be building.

Mr. Uchytil explained that Docks and Harbors is in the process of leasing the National Guard dock property to Franklin Dock Enterprises. PND Engineering has been doing some drawings on behalf of Docks and Harbors with Petrol Marine and Franklin Dock Enterprises. They would like to have a more robust float system along the property for better access for their tankers.

Ms. Smith asked whether there will be an appraisal for the Board to set the value of the parcel of land. She also asked if the Board approves there would be language which would cover the cost-of-living increases.

Mr. Uchytil said the process would be that the Board would need to accept the request to initiate the process for a new 35-year lease. That agreement would then go to City Law offices to create a new lease with the correct language of the contract. The appraiser Horan and Company will ask them to appraise the property. Once the appraisal is done it goes back to the law department. The CPI adjustment can then be added.

Mr. Ridgway asked for clarification if the State gave them the preference to renew their lease.

Mr. Uchytil responded that once DNR gave us the land in the early 2000s. CBJ petitioned the State for all these titles and leases. Docks and Harbors accepted the lease language of the State and that was binding. Until there is a new lease, Docks and Harbors is bound to CBJ code for future lease language.

Mr. Ridgway asked whether there was an effort to transfer our National Guard dock property to another entity.

Mr. Uchytil said the lease negotiation for an easement between CBJ and the property owners for the extension of the sea walk from Franklin Dock to the AJ Dock goes through Franklin Dock Enterprises. The owner, Lee Stoops, of Franklin Docks made a request for direct negotiation with the city for the National Guard Dock property. The city approved that request, so Docks and Harbors is working with the law department, Mr. Stoops for the lease language for that property. That small sliver of land was leased to Union Oil of California in 1971. It's their leased property until they no longer want it or that there is a termination for cause.

Mr. Hamilton asked whether he thought the CPI tool should be used for all the leases going forward.

Ms. Smith responded that she thought the Board should.

Mr. Ridgway asked why the Franklin Dock needed that small sliver of land?

Mr. Uchytil responded that if they didn't have that sliver, the Franklin Dock wouldn't have access to their current fuel dock. Whoever drew the map lines 50-75 years ago, it ensures the City's or State's interests were accounted for.

<u>Board Discussion & Action</u>

MOTION BY MS. SMITH TO ESTABLISH A NEW 35-YEAR LEASE WITH PETRO 49, INC FOR TIDELANDS DESCRIBED IN ATS 857.

Motion passed unanimously.

G. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

3. Aurora Harbor Drive Down Float - 35% Design Review

Presentation by PND Engineers: Brandon Ivanowicz, Civil and Waterfront Engineer presented (page 24 to 52) the 35% Engineers Estimate shows the layout and defines the major elements of the project included in the concept drawings. Considerations include load criteria, wind and wave environment, truck and trailers and vehicle combinations that might use the dock. A priority at the 35% level is to support the environmental permitting process, by researching what is needed to submit the permit.

Ms. Smith observed the highest and lowest tidal data. She asked if there's a difference between observed and served.

Mr. Ivanowicz responded that he thought they would be the same.

Mr. Ivanowicz referred to sheet G1.02 the abbreviations and G1.03 the existing condition site plan. He pointed out how G1.03 serves as a legend for future sheets. The sheet shows the Harbor office building, the 20 ft wide approach dock, and to the north are the current Aurora Habor floats and the transient float. He described the plan for demolition to remove the gangway, the transient float and the three pills that anchor the transient float. Mr. Sill, Mr. Creswell and Mr. Norbryhn have been consulted to identify a salvage location for the gangway and float. He said he thought they may be able to have a contractor salvage and stockpile these for future use. Sheet G1.04 A-B refers to the plan of the 20-foot-wide approach dock, the 60 by 70-foot approach dock extension the 17 by 140-foot transfer bridge and then 48 by 120-foot drive down float. There are details on the transfer bridge and the drive down float. Each sheet provides details of each section. Of interest there are some clearance points that were put in such as the existing approach dock, the 60 by 70 approach stock extension, the transfer bridge and the 120-foot-long float to the edge of the vessel. There's a 175-foot clearance to the minus 10 on the breakwater. He said usually there is 100-foot clearance minimums for harbor entrance, so they had allowed for a generous clearance. From the back of the 110-finger float to the transfer bridge it's 135 feet. This new transfer bridge is within a couple feet to scale and right atop the existing transient float. Mr. Ivanowicz said for practical purposes there is a similar clearance that there is currently on the gangway and transient float. On the backside of the float there will be a 22 foot clearance to the edge of a 14 ft wide vessel. There would not be a lot of room at a minus 5 tide, but enough that a vessel would not go dry. Mr. Ivanowicz highlighted the vessel pass-through, noting that after construction of phase four, there will no longer be access to the inside of the headlock. Currently the only access is underneath the approach dock. Smaller vessels may still be able to access between the piles.

Mr. Ridgway asked if there was a need to replace the existing sheet pile wall and would it restrict access on the north side for future maintenance needs on the south side.

Mr. Ivanowicz explained that because of the depth, a barge would only utilize the south side.

Ms. Smith asks if the max vessel and vehicle weight has been calculated to use the float.

Mr. Ivanowicz says the design accounts for highway vehicle loads, (truck and trailers, semi's) and is idea for 60K lb boom truck which all have similar axle loads. He explains laying out anchor piles and the transfer bridge and abutment. Due to depth and soft soil, they will utilize a conical pile tip that gives the bottom of the pile a bearing plate, so when driven, they have something to bear upon. And you can, you can get higher bearing strengths with shallower driven pile. They will utilize a spin fin for tension, as they grab more soil when they're pulled upon, and together these can reduce the overall pile length and result is reduced cost. The use of a program called Auto Turn has a library of vehicle configurations that assists with determining clearance of various vehicle scenarios. There will be a slope that they propose and build into the top of the approach stock that helps with tide transition. They have many real-life models of this design that currently work well. The vehicles that work best are those backing up.

Ms. Smith suggested that if the approach was angled differently, it could make the turning radius much easier.

Mr. Ivanowicz explained that a transition plate that floats at the end of the transfer bridge will help break up sharp turns.

Mr. Ridgway asked what the life expectancy is of the existing timber dock.

Mr. Ivanowicz discussed many projects that use timber with creosote, but there are less suppliers of it, though there are many other timber treatments that can be used. He clarified if the question was why they chose timber versus steel and discussed the pros and cons of cost and maintenance associated with both. Timber is ultimately more friendly in terms of maintenance and longevity.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the Auke Bay Loading Facility dock sees much use from semi-trucks and if there is a large need in the community for their activities to consider.

Mr. DeMuth discussed the study of various vehicle lengths with various axle loads making successful turns captured in the concept drawings. Mr. DeMuth commented that the design allowed for a 40,000 vehicle, twice the capacity of existing floats in southeast Alaska.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Sill to speak about the determination of design requirements and community needs of this project.

Mr. Sill explained that the criteria were established based on the high demand of the current facility at ABLF. Mr. DeMuth shared the importance of economic growth in providing an additional drive-down facility.

Mr. Sooter commented that 5% grade break at the top of the ramp provided a smooth transition. He said he felt the H 40 load was an appropriate load strength. Mr. Sooter asked if there could be a cost estimate for a full-width trestle to the abutment on the beach but not at risk of messing with the permitting process.

Mr. Ivanowicz referred to document 101, a detail on the working from the uplands. The existing approach dock is H 15 loading decking material. To meet the H 20 loading, a new timber deck will go on the existing portion of the dock and with serve as structural reinforcement. The document shows a 2 ½ inch lift that skims into the asphalt to make sure the site still grades. Next slide referred to the steel pile, caps, timber stringers, timber deck and timber bull rail and handrail. The existing bull rail and handrail will be removed, and the new deck will be installed and then the handrails will be reinstalled. The next document showed the framing plan and pile layout for the approach dock extension. The new steel pile caps and the 20 ft wide pass through that were shown on the overall site plan to allow vessels to drive underneath. Mr. Ivanowicz discussed the bull rail and handrail around the perimeter and the transition weldment to make the curve down. He indicated the pile framing for the transfer bridge. The overall length of the transfer bridge plan is 145 feet which is like the one in Auke Bay. He said the bridge was heavy and that the bridge has its own supports so that it takes all the weight off the float and it's anchored in place. The next document shows the transfer bridge which is 17ft. wide with a steal grid grading and a steel pipe bull rail on each side. The drive aisle is 12 feet, 5 inches. There is not a dedicated pedestrian walkway, but people can still walk up and down. The bull rail at Auke Bay is tucked in closer so that the drive aisle is narrower. The transfer bridge can accommodate all tide cycles. The bridge abutment shows that the pile framing will support the tope endo of the bridge adjacent to the end of the approach dock. The float plan overall is 120 feet long by 48 feet wide. For reference, the Auke Bay is 180 feet long by 48 feet. The Aurora plan is 60 feet shorter but just as wide. There is a transition plate and a float transition apron. Both have grade and slopes built in them. Around the perimeter of the float is a steel pipe bull rail. There are two cranes, two high mass light poles with ballers around them, a water pedestal, life ring cabinets tucked at each corner, an 8' by 10-foot utility shed that would have electrical card reader equipment and possibly some security camera equipment, brooms, shovels and other tools. In reviewing this plan with harbor staff, they had comments about the location of the cranes, who suggested the best thing to do would be put the cranes on the same side so that users could come down off the bridge and there's room to work. There will be 3050-amp power pedestals at each crane location, deck mounted. The float is a steel pipe pontoon float coated with a spray metalized, which is comparable to galvanizing in terms of protection. This spray coating creates an aperture that can be painted and then anodes is placed on it. If the anodes are kept on it, it should last indefinitely. The float is 3 feet off the ground and has a heavy six by six (?) timber deck. The layout of the utility shed will be widened out so that vehicles can get around it but that cuts down to the usable space of the utility shed. That leaves just two foot, 3 inches to walk around the utility shed so there are some space constraints. Discussions are still occurring with Harbor staff to indicate the use and size of the utility shed. The next document indicates the pontoon framing plan. The pontoons would be constructed in six float modules. The pontoons are 16 feet wide by 60 feet long. Sixteen feet wide is the largest one that you can take down the highway without police escort and that keeps it cost effective. The manufacturer will ship those to the site. It's a flange connection, bolted together into place and heavy pile hoops are used to anchor the float at the four corners with big energy absorbing fenders.

Mr. Ivanowicz said in the next document that this is the utility site plan. Currently there's submarine water service on the sea floor that will be used with an HDPE pipe to hook up that service. On the sea floor, there's some concrete sash weights, and then a hose coil loops up to the floats. On the float, there will be two freeze-protected, insulated and heated water pedestals. For fire suppression, there would be a department inlet connection where they can pump from the hydrant to the inlet. This service would run down the side of the approach dock where there are two hydrants on the float. The next sheet indicates the electrical plan. Morris Engineering, the electrical engineers on the project are showing two existing power pedestals on the existing float and 16-foot light poles on the approach dock. For vehicular traffic, these 16-foot light poles are still creating some dark spots, so they are recommending a 22-foot light pole to replace the 16-foot light poles. The next document shows the two 22-foot light poles that replace the 16-foot. There would be light poles around the perimeter of the approach dock, light poles coming down the transfer bridge, and then two tall, 30-foot poles on the approach dock, and then the 230, 50 shore power pedestals adjacent to the cranes. Mr. Ivanowicz went over the cost estimate for the project, which is 35% of the engineers' work broken into significant work items shown in the plans (page 24 of 56).

Mr. Uchytil asked about the load capacity of the crane.

Mr. Ivanowicz responded that it was 10-ton crane.

Mr. Ridgway asked if there were any concerns about the reach of a crane over a boat.

Mr. DeMuth said they would be designing the base underneath the crane. The load and reach depend on the specs from the manufacture and that it would be Docks and Harbors who would determine the criteria. Most cranes can handle 2500 lbs.

Mr. Ivanowicz went over the project schedule from start to finish. Red is the critical path which happens in sequence with no delays and as quick as possible. Those in blue must be done by the time the next red one adjacent to it happens. The project started on July 3rd and PND completed 35% here tonight. There are environmental scientists employed by PND who are working on the project to see how wildlife biology is impacted. Their report, called the biological set assessment, will be sent to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Review team who has 120 days to review the biological assessment, so that is on the red critical path. The next move is to prepare for Army Corps permits and the NEPA documentation. MARAD has three ways they can decide through the NEPA process. One is a categorical exclusion. Another is an environmental assessment, and the third is an environmental impact statement and those three are varying levels of complexity in their review. MARAD has no way to make a categorical exclusion determination, which is the simplest determination of the NEPA review process. It would be ideal if a project like this had relatively little impact in an already developed harbor, but unfortunately, MARAD as a funding agency, cannot make the decision. After the ESA consultation, MARAD can decide through the NEPA process and then the Army Corps permits can be finalized. CBJ will be able to finalize their grant agreement with MARAD and go to bid with contractors around October 12, 2026. There are 130 days or so of submittals and materials fabrication down the Pacific Northwest coast. The winning bid will build the transfer bridge and the float and that'll take six months. Those will ship to site and then from late summer of 2027 through the fall and winter of 2027 they'd construct on site.

Mr. Hamilton asked whether the public comment period is still available to make changes.

Mr. Uchytil said that Docks and Harbors are not required to do public outreach but that they are. They will be doing a 35% review, most likely in October for public users to comment. It doesn't mean changes can't be made but rather this is a narrowing in on the footprint of the project. Major changes, however, would slow the process down.

Mr. Ridgway explained that at the public meeting, users can express their view and provide input on the design.

Mr. DeMuth said that the views from the public are the kinds of information they need to proceed so there are no surprises down the road and that the configuration and layout of the plan is complete.

Board Questions/Public Comment: None

4. Seadrome Property Update

Presentation by Port Director: Mr. Uchytil referred to page 50 of 56 to refocus the Board on the Seadrome Property Appraisal. In October, at the Ops Committee Meeting, the Board will be asked to consider a request from Goldbelt to purchase property to allow them to capitalize on this building and build a new tourist-oriented facility. On page 52, this is a drawing from 2022 which shows the red area that is currently owned by Goldbelt. The green is owned by Docks and Harbor. With so many parcels, and the donut holes, it would be difficult for an owner to develop anything due to the setback requirements and the inability to even lease due to the crossover of property lines. The question in 2022 before the Board is to transfer property from us to Goldbelt and back and forth so that there would be no exchange of money so that Goldbelt would have a big enough space to build a tourist related facility. Docks and Harbors were confident that they would acquire the NOAA dock. This area would be decked over and depict a sea walk, as well as building a small cruise ship dock. This small cruise ship dock would be the infrastructure to support the young crews the UnCruise and the American Cruise Lines. The federal government conveyed that the NOAA dock isn't a viable option. The question now before the Board is, what to do about the donut holes that Docks and Harbors have surrounding the Goldbelt property? Mr. Uchytil referred to a slide that indicated a contiguous sea walk but that was based on a proposal to the board in July of 2022.

Mr. Ridgway asked if a slide of the red and green images be included in the October Ops Committee meeting packet. He asked for the appraisal amount.

Mr. Uchytil responded that the land property has been appraised at $630,000 for selling to Goldbelt.

Mr. Ridgway asked whether we ever had our term contractor, Horan and Company, assess the value of the consolidated green area? He wondered what the acreage would be plus the waterfront property value.

Mr. Sill answered that Goldbelt has assumed a one-to-one property transfer. The value of the upland and the value of our tidelands equal a square foot of that being equal to the value of a square foot of Goldbelt's property. Horan said that submerged lands are worth a third of the cost of usable upland, about 33 cents on the dollar.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Uchytil if Goldbelt is willing to trade another piece of property in exchange for this property?

Mr. Uchytil said no that he thought it would be keeping the transaction cleaner with the sale of property. He thought if the Board was interested in doing a swap that would be something he could approach Goldbelt with but depending on the properties worth it could get muddy.

Mr. Ridgway said he would get Goldbelt what they need so they can move forward. He felt the Board put a lot of thought into issue but that because of Horan's evaluation of tidelands it was no longer viable.

Mr. Uchytil explained that Docks and Harbors and the Board has been going to find an agreeable solution. Goldbelt also has a Board who has said that they are not interested in doing anything with the Seadrome building. Then a year later, a different board and then they say they want to move on it. When we looked at a 50-foot swath of land owned by Docks and Harbors, that's when Goldbelt said they would like to buy it all and have the whole lot for development.

Mr. Ridgway said the 50-foot swath was valuable piece of land owned by Docks and Harbors and if Goldbelt wanted to move forward with their project, that land would be a logical restarting point. He said the land is a real asset in our portfolio.

Mr. Becker gave some of the Board's history surrounding Seadrome Property.

Mr. Ridgway indicated an architect's rendering of the tourist related facility by Goldbelt based on the property transfer. He said what stopped the Board from proceeding was the term contactor and the valuation of the trade not working with city code. He said he felt the property on the right was an opportunity for a lease agreement and would provide income forever, which would be better than selling it. He will research this and email it to Carl as he will be gone in the month of October.

Ms. Smith asked if it was possible to get the rendering so the various proposals and history in the Ops Committee meeting packet in October?

Mr. Uchytil said he would do that.

Discussion/Public Comment-None

5. Update to FY26 Marine Passenger Fee (MPF) Capital Improvement Projects (CIP)

Presentation by Port Engineer: Mr. Sill reported that there are two projects that were funded. One of the projects is for $300,00 to do condition assessment of the AS dock. The goal of that is to evaluate the condition of the dock from the Alaska Steamship dock to the library. The original plans were not found but Mr. Sill suspected it was from the 1960's or earlier. The assessment of the conditions would likely show that recapitalization of the area is in poor shape. As well, the assessment would see patchworks of timber piling down by the tram, but they are quite small. The plan is to issue RFP for local safety for an engineer consultant to do an evaluation of the structure and provide suggestions for how to proceed. The second project is Docks and Harbors, which received 1 million dollars funding for port cameras which would cover Marine Park to Franklin Dock. It is hoped that when CBJ does the final push to the sea walk from the Franklin to the AJ dock that cameras will also cover this area. Much of the funding will be for pulling wires. It is projected that 70 cameras will be purchased. Sixty to seventy five percent of the budget will go towards infrastructure and pulling cables for the internet. Mr. Sill showed a trial camera for a sunny day where kids are jumping off the dock. The trail cameras will be small, on pole with wires under the deck. The goal is for CBJ to have cameras on the same network to share with JPD. The current cameras are 15 years old and are highly unreliable. Most of the cameras depend on wireless internet and that has been problematic.

Mr. Ridgway asked how we determine from a public policy standpoint how many cameras we will need and where they should go.

Mr. Uchytil replied that there are no standards, and we call the safety cameras.

Board Discussion/Public Comment-None

6. Stockade Point Condition Update

Presentation by Port Engineer- Mr. Sill apologized that the Stockade Point report had not been carried over into the minutes for Board members to look at but said that he would include it with the meeting minutes. Mr. Sill estimated that to replace the Stockade Point it would cost about one half a million dollars. The hope was that the replacement dock could be added to contract with Trucano who is already doing the work on the other side. The State came back and said they would not be able to add to the existing grant. The Board requested an estimate on removing the damaged dock or refurbishing of the dock. Mr. Sill updated the report with two options. Option one is to remove the 25-foot damaged section and demolish it. The dump no longer accepts creosote, so it would likely need to be shipped out of state. Mr. Sill said the cost would be $10,000-20,000 to remove it and haul it back to Juneau and either it would need to be shipped out, or it could be stockpiled somewhere which he would prefer not to do. The second minor refurbishment option would require new bull rails, new thick rub strips that would essentially hold the float together a bit longer. He thought that would last perhaps another 5 years. The estimate of the cost would be $20,000-40,000 for pressure treatment of 40-foot timbers to be repaired. Staff's opinion was that the minor repairs would be the best value for continuing to keep the float working.

<u>Board Discussion/Public Comment:</u>

Mr. Ridgway asked what the dimensions of the float are.

Mr. Sill said it is a 10-foot by 150-foot float.

Mr. Ridgway asked what the condition of the 14-foot by 100-foot float is that we had removed from the Aurora Dock.

Mr. Sill said that that was an option. The old pontoon floats at the old fuel dock are high and is an HDPE pipe float and is lightweight. Mr. Sill said there may be a way to ballast it, so it was not bouncy. He said time wise as that dock would not be removed until 2027, however in another 5 years, once the minor repairs at Stockade Point were up, then that float could be anchored down and that is an option.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the repairs called for a vote.

Mr. Sill said if the Board wanted to express opinions about the two options there was time, but that he felt it didn't need vote for the repairs.

Mr. Ridgway said that he did not feel the amount was below the threshold of Board vote. He said the repair was an asset to Docks and Harbors' portfolio and that it was repairs rather than doing a capital replacement.

Mr. Hamilton said that he was proud of not spending money and appreciated that Mr. Sill looked into the repairs.

7. Board Strategic Planning Efforts

Presentation by Port Director: Mr. Uchytil reported that pages 23-56 of the packet projects discussed last year. Mr. Uchytil asked whether the board wants to have a retreat for future project planning. The Board could discuss how Docks and Harbors operate going forward, and how outreach to the community is done. He said Mr. Hamilton had concerns that Docks and Harbors doesn't do enough outreach with commercial fisherman. He asked what the outreach would look like. Some of the topics could be discussed at regular board meetings. Usually retreats are two-4 hours long, which is standard.

Board Discussion/Public Comment:

Mr. Ridgway said he felt that some sort of strategic planning was needed in the coming year so that decisions could be made. He said he felt that retreats were successful in the past and ask that staff move forward with a plan.

Ms. Smith agreed and said she felt there were changes going on. She said regarding the water port on the outside of Douglas, there's building going on downtown and she said she'd like to see the Board focus on the future to accommodate all the changes.

Mr. Becker interjected that when he first joined the Board retreats were all day long.

Mr. Uchytil asked if he was getting directions from the Board to plan a retreat. He asked what the retreat would look like. Does that mean it should be facilitated or an informal discussion to talk about future impacts.

Ms. Smith said that she did not see a need to have it facilitated, but rather, she would like to have an informal discussion to talk about future impacts.

Mr. Ridgway said that he divided over the decision as he could see a benefit to an informal discussion. He said that when it comes to CIP's and lists of prioritization projects that he would like to ask staff what was done before, take a poll and determine the priorities of the 40 projects listed. He sited a past discussion about a dock at DIPAC where people fished off it and there was discussion from a group of people who made it better. He said there was a lot of knowledge on board, and he would like to have broad discussions as well as being facilitated by staff to look at the project list to evaluate and prioritize.

Mr. Sooter said he was in support of a board retreat as it helps orientated new Board members.

Mr. Uchytil asked how much time does the Board want to allocate to a retreat?

Mr. Ridgway said he thought the length should be six hours and separate from the Ops and Board Meeting. He said he thought the morning could be a free form discussion with light management interaction, then a lunch and the afternoon could be dedicated to making decisions.

Ms. Smith agreed and asked if it could be one day that works or there could be an additional day if needed.

Mr. Horchover felt six hours could cover a retreat.

Mr. Ridgway said the beauty of a facilitator was that they recognized the issues and helped prioritize what could be decided on and what could be followed later.

Ms. Smith said that if the Board was going to do future planning, then Mr. Uchytil or other staff, Assembly members or the Assembly Liaison may need to present. She said she felt a facilitator may be helpful when it came to laying out priorities and making decisions.

H. BOARD MEMBER AND LAISON REPORTS:

Mr. Hamilton said he would like to speak to the Board informally. He said that he talked to Scott Gray, from CBJ Streets. He said he was annoyed by Douglas Harbor Parking, and he'd asked Mr. Gray to come to a meeting to discuss it. He said he would like to make something happen before winter.

Mr. Uchytil said in the past CBJ Streets has said they can't help us, so this is new information. Docks and Harbors will reach out to Scott Gray and see if we can get him here for a Board meeting. He said in the meantime, Carver Construction could not give us a bid, so McGraw was approached. McGraw said the work would be more than $50,000. Bids for the work will go out in the Spring of 2026.

Ms. Smith asked that this issue of Douglas Harbor parking lot be put on the October Ops Committee Agenda.

8. Port Engineer's Report – Matthw Sill reported

- Statter Harbor Phase III Uplands Improvements - Dawson had managed to share the site with tour buses throughout the summer and fall. They are getting curbs, sidewalks and the sea walk framed up. As soon as nice weather hits, they will be pouring concrete. Dawson will be pouring asphalt, the first of October, so that it drains. It looks like Dawson will be able to complete the project before winter which was not the original plan. Landscaping will be planted in the Spring.
- Aurora Harbor Phase IV Project – The first part of October boats will be moving. Western Marine Construction will move their crane and barge it in about a week after. Their materials and floats will arrive. They will begin pill driving about the second week of October. Western Marine will start at the approach dock, build that out and start laying floats. They'll start slowly with the drilling of piles then it will move quickly.
- Statter Harbor Roof Replacement – Dawson has the contract for the roof replace. Weather permitting, they will begin next Monday. There will be some fences around the offices and bathrooms, but they will be open. Dawson will rip off the old roof and put a new metal roof on.
-

Mr. Horshover asked if Aurora Harbor was still slated for security gates.

Mr. Sill replied there was no plan for security gates at Aurora Harbor. He said the gates have been working well at Harris Harbor though.

9. Harbormaster's Report – Jeremy Norbryhn reported

- The Army Corp of Engineers - is visiting this week to do focus groups as part of the breakwater project feasibility study. They had four focus groups: recreational boats, passenger for hire operations and launch ramp users and fisherman/calling vessels. They concluded today. Next week they will be doing some pot surveys with biologists to see what type of sea life is down on the sea floor. He said he would be in a meeting with them tomorrow as they want to do a walk around and watch daily operations and see how Statter Harbor operates.
- Parking meter revenue – Today he met with Ms. Narum and Mr. Creswell and some of the people from Parks and Reck along with IPS, the meter company. They are assigning a forensic account to see why there has been a shortage of revenue. People were getting receipts from meets that said that parking was approved but the amount was never posted to their or our account that the money was received. Some of the discussion went over the flows on the parking meter as it is not user friendly. Videos were shown to IPS representatives of how customers must hit the button twice instead of once, and it doesn't tell you to take your card out when you insert it. He was hopeful that this could be remedied over the winter.
- Seasonal staff have started to depart, which leads to winter preparation. All the snow equipment is getting inspected and mounted. With the weather getting bad, staff have been watching the docks and securing lines. Night security has been keeping an eye on the weather.

- Winter Hot Berths – are being assigned in all harbors.
- Sea Lift – has arrived.

Mr. Horchover asked at the parking kiosk out at Statter Harbor, has Docks and Harbors made a consideration of putting anymore in?

Mr. Norbryhn said that was not something they had considered. Staff have shown customers the QR code and how to load the app so that it is accessible. He said the other three kiosks. One at the office where people come to take the catamaran tours and two others near the launch ramp lot.

10. Assembly Liaison Report – Greg Smith reported:

- At the August 18 regular Assembly meeting, they approved $924,000 the Aurora CAPD appropriation resolution. They also approve of the $75,000 per year Petro Marine lease at sea walks as well as the new tram lease with Goldbelt.
- On September 8th FC and committee meeting, the Assembly was still trying to figure out what to do with the Marine Park design, amid some budget constraints. At that meeting, the Assembly got and an update on the sea walk and shore power projects under the context of marine passenger fees. Mr. Smith said that it sounds like there are opportunities to move some of these projects forward, especially the sea walk and the Rock Dump as well as, the Coast Guard and Huna Totem dock areas.
- Coghlan Cut – any attempts to reduce the speeds would need to go through the Coast Guard to make the rule. The rule would apply to all boaters. SEWA has done some work on their end.
- The Assembly will be meeting with Goldbelt regarding the new cruise ship dock on the backside of Douglas. This will provide them an opportunity to learn of the master plan, the city's involvement and get some questions answered.

11. Port Director's Report – Carl Uchytil reported:

- This may be Mr. Smith's last meeting. Normally there is a new liaison every year. The comment about having a liaison at our retreat may be a new person. It may be October or possibly by November we'll have a new one.
- Mr. Norbryhn at Statter Harbor has been working on what's called a "sofar buoy." Docks and Harbors is collecting waves and acoustic information to support the Army Corp study. Docks and Harbors will be issuing the contract for the geotechnical work but would rather have the Army Corps with their professional contracting staff to do it. Docks and Harbors would like to keep the project moving forward as it's about a million-and-a-half-dollar contract. The funds are a 50% match with the Army Corps. The Army Corps engineers will be at the next ops committee meeting. The project manager and the economist have been invited every month to come to share their experiences over the past two days.
- The Board was forwarded the Huna Totem public notice from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). This is a 30-day public notice which means DNR intends to convey the 10 acres that Docks and Harbors has requested for the submerged lands necessary for the Huna Totem to build their dock. This allows people to comment on it. The expectation is that Docks and Harbors will get the title lease revenue which will be upwards of $300,000.
- Mr. Smith mentioned SEWA, the Southeast Whale Watching Association. They were invited to next month's Board Committee meeting. Serene Hutchinson from Juneau Tours will be coming next month to talk about SEWA and the Coghlan Cut and what

they have planned.

- End of Season Meetings were held at the Juneau Yacht club this past week to consult with vendor booth permittees, transportation companies from downtown and Statter Harbor user groups.
- At the Assembly meeting on Monday, they approved the Lone Sailor Statue to be assigned to the Peratrovich plaza area. The Pioneers of Alaska will enter and agreement with the City Manager on maintenance and details on that process.
- On October 20-24, Docks and Harbors will host the annual Alaska Association of Harbor Masters and Port Administrators Conference in Juneau. Originally it was scheduled for Dutch Harbor, but the Harbor Director was let go. It's a statewide conference and the Rear Admiral has been asked to be speaker as well as the Lieutenant Governor. Both have indicated a desire to do so. Docks and Harbors may be able to comp Board Members to come to the dinner, but they will need to let Mr. Uchytil know.

I. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

Mr. Uchytil asked that out of respect for staff that Board Members make every attempt to attend Board meetings. He said staff work diligently to get the agenda out by Saturday before the meetings. He asked that the Board please pay attention and let us know whether they are coming or not.

Ms. Smith said that she thought she might not be at the Ops Meeting in November.

Mr. Ridgway said that he would be gone in the month of October.

Mr. Horchover said he will be in town next month and unfortunately has been out of town and did not have internet access.

J. ADJOURNMENT – 8:19pm

MEMORANDUM

DOCKS AND HARBORS
CITY/BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
155 HERITAGE WAY, JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

EMAILED MEMORANDUM

TO: Bidders Date: October 28, 2025

FROM: Carl Uchytil
Carl Uchytil, P.E.
Port Director

SUBJ: POSTING NOTICE OF BIDS
Statter Harbor Breakwater Geotechnical Investigation
Contract No. DH26-007-2

This memo is to post a notice of the results of the bid opening on October 28, 2025 for the subject project. Two (2) bids were received; one (1) bid was accepted. The responsive bidders and their total bids are as follows:

BIDDERS	BASE BID	ADDITIVE ITEMS	TOTAL BID
Discovery Drilling Inc.	$557,110	$882,868	$1,439,978
Engineer Estimate	$680,000	$1,444,000	$2,124,000

*Denali Drilling submitted a bid that has been deemed non-responsive.

The apparent low bidder is Discovery Drilling Inc. This Posting Notice of Bids serves to inform bidders that the CBJ intends to award the Base Bid and Additive Items in the amount of $1,439,978.00

Recommendation to award the Base Bid and Additive Items in the amount of $1,439,978.00 will be forwarded to the D&H Board for approval at the Regular Board Meeting on October 30, 2025 and to the CBJ Assembly for approval at the Regular Assembly Meeting on November 17, 2025.

This notice begins the protest period per Purchasing Code 53.50.062. Protests will be executed in accordance with CBJ Ordinance 53.50.062 "Protests", and 53.50.080 "Administration of Protest." The CBJ Purchasing Code is available online at: http://www.juneau.org/law or from the CBJ Purchasing Division at (907) 586-5258.

BID SUMMARY

Reviewed by: Matthew D. Sill, P.E. **Certified by:** Carl Uchytil, P.E.

Statatter Harbor Breakwater Geotechnical Investigation Contract No. DH26-007-2 Tuesday, October 28, 2025				Engineer's Estimate		Discovery Drilling Inc. P.O. Box 111165 Anchorage, Alaska 99511	
PAY ITEM	**PAY ITEM DESCRIPTION**	**UNIT PRICE**	**QUANTITY**	**UNIT PRICE**	**AMOUNT**	**UNIT PRICE**	**AMOUNT**
1	Mobilization	Lump Sum	All Reqd	Lump Sum	$ 100,000.00	Lump Sum	$ 235,450.00
2	100-foot Borehole with Split Barrel Sampling and Backfill	Each	2	$ 100,000.00	$ 200,000.00	$ 51,800.00	$ 103,600.00
3	100-foot Penetrometer Test	Each	2	$ 70,000.00	$ 140,000.00	$ 23,500.00	$ 47,000.00
4	Vessel of Opportunity and Support Vessels	Day	6	$ 40,000.00	$ 240,000.00	$ 28,510.00	$ 171,060.00
	Base Bid Total				**$ 680,000.00**		**$ 557,110.00**
5	100-foot Borehole with Split Barrel Sampling and Backfill	Each	4	$ 100,000.00	$ 400,000.00	$ 51,800.00	$ 207,200.00
6	100-foot Penetrometer Test	Each	4	$ 70,000.00	$ 280,000.00	$ 23,500.00	$ 94,000.00
7	Vessel of Opportunity and Support Vessels	Day	12	$ 40,000.00	$ 480,000.00	$ 28,510.00	$ 342,120.00
8	1-Hour Stand-Down due to Adverse Weather	Each	32	$ 4,000.00	$ 128,000.00	$ 2,980.00	$ 95,360.00
9	1-Hour Stand-Down due to Marine Mammal Monitoring	Each	24	$ 4,000.00	$ 96,000.00	$ 2,980.00	$ 71,520.00
10	Removal of Equipment from Seafloor	Day	2	$ 30,000.00	$ 60,000.00	$ 36,334.00	$ 72,668.00
	Additive Items				**$ 1,444,000.00**		**$ 882,868.00**
	Total Bid				**$ 2,124,000.00**		**$ 1,439,978.00**

Port of Juneau

155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801
(907) 586-0292 Phone • (907) 586-0295 Fax

From: Port Director

To: Don Etheridge

Date: October 30th, 2025

Re: BOAT SHELTER (AE-26) – FOR SALE

1. In accordance with 05 CBJAC 40.020, Mr. Don Etheridge provided notice of sale of Boat Shelter (AE-26) in Aurora Harbor on October 22nd, 2025. Docks & Harbors has the first right of refusal to purchase this structure at fair market value.

2. The applicable "Boat shelter sales" regulation states:

   05 CBJAC 40.020(f) - Boat shelter sales. Reserved moorage status within a boat shelter may transfer between the seller and buyer of a boat shelter. In order to transfer the reserved moorage status within a boat shelter, the owner of a boat shelter shall inform the Port Director of the owner's desire to sell a shelter before offering the shelter for sale to the general public. The Docks and Harbors Board has the first right of refusal to purchase the shelter at fair market value. If the Board does not exercise its first right of refusal within 30 days after notice, the owner may offer the shelter for sale to the general public. If the owner sells the shelter without informing the Port Director and allowing the Docks and Harbors Board its first right of refusal, the reserved moorage within the shelter will not transfer to the buyer. This subsection does not allow an inappropriately sized vessel to be assigned reserved moorage space within a boat shelter.

3. The Docks & Harbors Board is waiving its right of first refusal to purchase Boat Shelter AE-26. You may proceed with the sale of Boat Shelter AE-26.

#

2024 Docks & Harbors Board Retreat

November 12th & 13th

Goals:

1. Board members' background, philosophy and strategic vision
2. Prioritization of Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) and Docks & Harbors "needs"

Tuesday, November 12th
30,000 Foot View

1700 Call to Order – Opening Remarks by Chair Etheridge/Port Director/Assembly Liaison

1710 Introduction of each Board Member (4 minutes) each
- a. Background
- b. Motivation to serve on Board
- c. Desired course for Board (the good, the bad and otherwise)

1800 Port Director – Fund balances, fee increases, resources & execution

1815 Commercial Fisheries Brainstorming
- a. Port Director on past accomplishment
- b. Fishermen's Perspective: Board members Becker/Hamilton/Emerson
- c. SWOT analysis (Strength, Weakness/Opportunity/Threats)

1845 Commercial Property Policy Position – Port Director

1915 2018 Strategic Retreat Project List and Board guidance for November 13th

1930 Law 101

Wednesday, November 13th
Sea Level View ($\pm$ 20 foot tidal range)

1700 Call to Order – Opening Remarks by Chair Etheridge/Port Director/Assembly Liaison

1710 Docks & Harbors – Project Efforts – Port Engineer

1800 Docks & Harbors – Internal/public improvements - Harbormaster

1830 Priorization
- a. CIP
- b. Legislative Priorities
- c. MPF
- d. Projects (maintenance/legislative/other)

2000 Adjournment

Docks & Harbors Board Strategic Retreat

Total Duration: 6 Hours

Purpose:

1. Build trust and alignment;
2. Strengthen leadership communication; and,
3. Prioritize strategic waterfront projects.

Session 1 — Welcome, Intent, and Ground Rules (30 min)

Objective: Set a tone of collaboration and respect.

Welcome from Chair Sooter

- Review purpose of the retreat: strengthen trust and communication; establish unified direction for harbor and port infrastructure
- Ground rules: respect, active listening, no interruptions, focus on mission
- Icebreaker: "motivation – why are you here, desired course & purpose of the Board"

Leadership principle: Clarity and connection start with shared purpose.

Session 2 — Building Trust and Team Cohesion (45 min)

Objective: Acknowledge and begin to address relationship strains.

Facilitated discussion by Port Director:

- What helps build trust among us? Where have we lost trust, and how can we rebuild it?
- Identify shared values and behaviors for respectful collaboration
- Agree on Board–Staff communication guidelines

Leadership principle: Trust and empathy strengthen resilience and collaboration.

Session 3 — Establishing a Unified Vision (45 min)

Objective: Reconnect to mission and define collective direction.

- Review Board's mission and mandates (harbors, cruise docks, waterfront facilities)
- Visioning exercise: "What will success look like in 2035?"
- Identify three to five strategic focus areas (e.g., safety, sustainability, capacity, community relations)

Leadership principle: Keep the main thing the main thing.

Session 4 — Evaluating Projects and Setting Priorities (3 hours)

Part A — Current Project & Budget Review (60 min)

Objective: Build shared understanding of active projects.
Presentation by Staff on current projects, funding, and timelines

- Q&A and clarifying discussion
- Identify key performance indicators for success

Leadership principle: Clarity reduces ambiguity and improves decision quality.

Part B — Strategic Prioritization Workshop (75 min)

Objective: Develop a ranked list of priorities based on shared criteria.

- Use criteria: safety, economic/community impact, reducing operational costs, environmental sustainability, funding feasibility
- Small group breakout: score or rank projects
- Combine results into draft Board-wide priority matrix

Leadership principle: Shared decision-making increases team ownership.

Part C — Aligning Resources and Accountability (45 min)

Objective: Connect priorities to capacity and leadership responsibility.

- Discuss alignment between project list, funding, and staff capacity
- Define top 3 strategic priorities for next decade
- Identify CIP FY2027-2032 priority list
- Identify achievable 2026 projects with operational funds
- Assign Board or committee leads for follow-up

Leadership principle: Balance accountability with support.

Session 5 — Wrap-Up and Commitments (1 hr)

Objective: End with clarity, accountability, and unity.

- Review key outcomes: agreed values, shared vision, top priorities
- Reflection round: "One thing I'll do differently after today"
- Define next steps: follow-up meeting, written summary, progress tracking

Leadership principle: Leaders model integrity and consistency.

LEADING TO SUCCESS

5 practices for cultivating high-performing teams in the military and beyond

By former Lt. Cmdr. Kimberly M. Mitchell, USN, Ed.D.

In today's rapidly evolving environment — whether on the battlefield or in the boardroom — the ability to build and sustain high-performing teams can be the decisive factor between success and failure. Senior military general officers and flag officers understand this well.

In a recent study I conducted, nine retired three- and four-star officers from the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard shared their insights and experiences, highlighting universal leadership lessons that extend well beyond the military and apply equally to the corporate, nonprofit, and government sectors. They identified the following practices, which go beyond strategy, for leadership success:

ESTABLISH A UNIFIED VISION

Clarity is the foundation upon which high-performing teams are built. Senior military leaders consistently emphasize the need to remove ambiguity and ensure every team member understands their role and the broader mission.

A retired U.S. Coast Guard admiral said: "Leaders must strive for clarity and remove ambiguity — two goals that are not necessarily the same." In high-pressure, fast-changing environments, team cohesion relies on a shared understanding of intent, direction, and purpose.

A Marine Corps lieutenant general added: "Leaders need to keep the main thing, the main thing." Eliminating competing priorities and streamlining communication helps reduce confusion and increases focus on what matters most.

Providing clear expectations, setting performance benchmarks, and supplying the right tools are essential steps in reinforcing clarity. A retired Air Force lieutenant general also stressed the importance of "high-caliber feedback," which not only identifies areas for improvement but also offers actionable guidance to elevate performance.

'Leaders need to keep the main thing, the main thing.'

— A Marine Corps lieutenant general

'Leaders must find opportunities to let the team express their opinions and show them respect — even if they disagree.'

— A retired Navy vice admiral

BUILD TRUST AND COHESION

While strategic direction is essential, the human dimension of leadership remains central to team success. Strong interpersonal connections — rooted in trust, respect, and empathy — foster resilient teams.

Leaders who take time to understand their team members' professional goals and personal backgrounds build loyalty and morale. Trust grows when people feel valued and heard.

This trust is further strengthened by promoting psychological safety — the ability to speak openly, take risks, and admit mistakes without fear of reprisal.

"Leaders must find opportunities to let the team express their opinions and show them respect — even if they disagree," said a retired Navy vice admiral.

This environment, where mutual respect and dialogue are encouraged, fosters creativity, enhances problem-solving, and builds cohesion.

COMMUNICATE, COMMUNICATE, COMMUNICATE

Clarity and connection come to life through communication. Successful leaders use candid, consistent, and adaptive communication strategies.

Structured communication tools — like standardized reporting, regular briefings, and open forums — are essential. However, just as important is a leader's willingness to listen, adjust their approach, and engage meaningfully with all levels of the team.

One retired Marine Corps lieutenant general described fostering "verbal sparring" with junior Marines.

"I wanted them to challenge my thinking — if they thought I was wrong, I wanted to know why," he said.

His goal was to create an atmosphere where all voices could be heard and where constructive debate sharpened decision-making.

He referred to this approach as "walking around the fighting hole" — taking time to gather multiple perspectives before taking action. This practice not only improves situational awareness but also builds mutual respect and confidence.

'I wanted them to challenge my thinking — if they thought I was wrong, I wanted to know why.'

— A retired Marine Corps lieutenant general

Shared leadership involves more than delegation. It's about recognizing and using each member's expertise, encouraging initiative, and fostering collaboration.

EMPOWER THE TEAM

Modern military challenges require adaptive, agile teams. That need has driven a shift away from rigid hierarchies and toward shared leadership models — where influence, decision-making, and responsibility are distributed across the team.

A retired Army lieutenant general emphasized that when team members are empowered to contribute and take ownership, performance improves and teams become more responsive to rapidly changing conditions.

"Shared decision-making in dynamic environments increases team performance," he said.

Shared leadership involves more than delegation. It's about recognizing and using each member's expertise, encouraging initiative, and fostering collaboration. It builds stronger, more committed teams capable of independent, critical thinking — traits that are vital in both military and civilian organizations.

IMAGES: MASTERSERGEANT/GETTY IMAGES; NATALIIA/GETTY IMAGES

Leaders must clearly define roles and responsibilities, conduct regular evaluations, and provide structured feedback.

BALANCE ACCOUNTABILITY AND SUPPORT

While inclusivity and trust are vital, accountability remains a cornerstone of operational effectiveness. Research reinforces that leaders must maintain high standards while offering support and empathy.

This requires balance. Leaders must clearly define roles and responsibilities, conduct regular evaluations, and provide structured feedback. At the same time, they must model the behaviors they expect from their teams: resilience, integrity, and professionalism.

By consistently demonstrating commitment and excellence, leaders inspire their teams to follow suit. The standard is not simply stated — it's lived.

The leadership practices identified by the nine senior military general officers and flag officers are actionable, interdependent competencies that drive team excellence. As organizations across sectors face increasing uncertainty and complexity, these proven practices provide a path forward. Whether in military operations, corporate strategy, or public service, the ability to lead with purpose, precision, and humility will define the teams and leaders who succeed.

Former Lt. Cmdr. Kimberly M. Mitchell, USN, Ed.D., is a 1996 U.S. Naval Academy graduate and spent 17 years as a surface warfare officer. She recently completed her doctorate in education focusing on organizational leadership. Her 2025 study, "Leadership Practices for High-Performing Teams: Insights From Senior Military General Officers and Flag Officers," captures leadership principles through the voices of nine senior military general officers and flag officers. In the last 13 years she has led nonprofit organizations and served as a senior advisor at the VA.