



DRAFT DOCKS AND HARBORS BOARD MEETING MINUTES

November 20, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

A. CALL TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM BY MR. SOOTER

B. ROLL CALL: Clayton Hamilton, Matt Leither, Mark Ridgway, Annette Smith, and Shem Sooter.

Absent: James Becker, Tyler Emerson, Robert Horchover and Nick Orr.

Also in attendance: Carl Uchytel-Port Director, Matt Creswell-Harbormaster, Matthew Sill-Port Engineer, Kirby Day of Holland America Lines Juneau (via zoom), Alex Pierce, CBJ Tourism Director, Robin Carr, of USACE, and Maureen Hall-Assembly Liaison.

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES-NONE.

MR. RIDGWAY MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGEDA AS PRESENTED.

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Mr. Day said he wanted to give his thoughts and appreciation as the season wrapped up for 2025. He said Docks and Harbors does a great job and although Princess has their own docks, the Carnival Corporation uses the City docks. As a FSO, Mr. Day works closely with Scott Hinton and Matt Creswell and all the staff that work at the City docks. They work together to facilitate guests going back and forth on the ships and Mr. Norbryhn's team out at Statter Harbor does a fantastic job. Mr. Day said that he knows they have put a lot of pressure on that facility with bus trips and passengers all summer long and it gets a little hectic.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- 1. October 30, 2025** - Ms. Smith name will be corrected.

F. CONSENT AGENDA- APPROVED.

2. Resolution of Support for Full Funding of the FY27 ADOT Harbor Facility Grant

Presentation by Port Director:

RECCOMENDATION: THAT THE ASSEMBLY ADOPT A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU TO URGE FULL FUNDING (\$18,186,535) FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA HARBOR FACILITY GRANT PROGRAM IN THE FY 2027 STATE CAPITAL BUDGET.

- 3. Resolution of Support Raising the Maximum Eligible Annual Grant Award Amount for ADOT Harbor Facilities Grantees**

Presentation by Port Director:

RECOMMENDATION: THAT THE ASSEMBLY ADOPT A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU TO RAISE THE MAXIMUM AVAILABLE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HARBOR FACILITY GRANT TO \$7,500,000 FOR ELIGIBLE PROJECTS ON AN ANNUAL BASIS.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED.

G. ITEMS FOR ACTION

4. FY27 to FY32 Capital Improvement Project List

a. Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytel said on page 20-21 there is a Survey of the list of projects that were discussed at the board retreat. Page 20 is the Board priorities for the harbors. There were 4 Board members that participated in the survey. Page 21 is the staff's priorities and 17 members of the staff participated. On page 22, these are the docs priorities for the Board. Page 23 shows that 14 of the 17 staff members are in answer to the docs. On page 24, the question, "What other projects should be considered?" There are 4 projects that Board members suggested for consideration. Page 25 lists the staff's recommendations. On page 26 there is the CIP list of the 18 projects, 2 may have been tied, those recommendations were averaged. Of those, the Statter Harbor breakwater construction was number one and the Aurora Harbor Office replacement was number two. The Statter zinc anodes were number three and the North Douglas boat ramp expansion was number four. The other tie for four was the UAS property purchase. Mr. Uchytel said he took the projects and organized them in a reasonable order with the goal being to come up with a CIP list from FY27 to FY32. This will provide the engineering department to put it into a form and then it goes to the Assembly. The Assembly will adopt it as part of the budget process. He said just because there is a project there that doesn't mean the money is there, these are aspirational goals. This is input from the Board and staff and what are reasonable goals. If the Board changes its mind, then FY28 will be the next opportunity to apply for a DOT grant, so this is its marker. The Aurora Harbor replacement cost of \$4 million, is a reasonable number to recapitalize the breakwater. The Aurora Harbor shower and bathroom are on the list as number 9, but there may be an opportunity to roll this work into the harbor office replacement. There might be an opportunity to leverage money from the Department of Fish and Game. The North Douglas Boat Extension project, that will be some seed money to start the design. As a reminder, this is one of the two legislative priorities that we provided to the Assembly as saying these are projects that Docks and Harbors wants elevated to our elected officials. Moving on to FY28, the UAS property purchase does not guarantee that the UAS is ready to sell in FY28. He said that he moved the North Douglas Harbor launch ramp extension lighting, because he said it's something that could be worked on outside the CIP, as the staff think it's a small improvement that is

affordable. The Douglas Harbor shower bathroom is high, but it's also ranked high, but it's something that Docks and Harbors may want to leverage with Fish and Game money. The Harbormaster, Mr. Creswell and Mr. Uchytel met with the new Parks and Rec Director. The previous director was looking to replace the bathrooms at Savikko Park, through a grant, and if that happens, Docks and Harbors want to participate. The Douglas Harbor Uplands, marked at \$5 million, would be like the curb, gutter, paving, and landscaping. The area-wide security gates are estimated at \$50,000 per ramp. As an aspiration, \$10 million dollars is marked for the North Douglas boat ramp. Mr. Uchytel said that he's tried to look at the list critically to see what were reasonable projects that can be completed in the next couple of years.

Board Questions:

Mr. Ridgway said he appreciated staff's input in describing projects and it's important to have them facilitated. It's been appreciated as the Board considers Docks and Harbor's plan for facility replacements or upgrading. He asked staff, when a project is identified is there a community workshop, an open house, a design charrette, public outreach, expert facilitator, architects, engineers that meet. He wondered if there was a write-up or narrative that would take place to say that we had begun this process.

Mr. Uchytel said that typically a masterplan begins, for example when a project starts getting traction, like the Aurora Harbor recapitalization. There was Phase 1 of aurora harbor, and Docks and Harbors saw a path forward to finishing the basin and then it was time to look at the uplands portion. That created its own project, and other ideas came from that. The Marine Park to Taku Dock was a 16B project that was facilitated by building on to the rest of that area. The blueprint downtown, that was adopted by the Assembly, was one where they picked items such as the Aurora and Harris sea walk as one of their objectives. These projects are identified through the Board or staff saying we need to work on this.

Mr. Hamilton asked who was asking for the Echo Cove launch ramp.

Mr. Orr said that he thought Fish and Game would be able to assist with funds for that project, but he was waiting to hear back from them.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the Sportsman Association wanted to drive a float out there.

Mr. Orr replied, sure. Mr. Orr asked what Indian Point PFH Facility was.

Mr. Creswell answered that Docks and Harbors own a piece of property over at Indian Point and it's leased at no-cost to the National Park. It's an older, trestle-style dock that goes down to a floating dock, and PFH stands for Passenger For Hire. He guessed that staff suggested that they move some of the load off Statter Harbor to Indian Point.

Mr. Uchytel said he had more to add to Docks and that on page 27, there were 8 projects. He said he added a project, the recapitalization Timber Dock as it has already been funded to do an inspection. He said this year there are marine passenger fees for an inspection. He suspected that Docks and Harbors will need to replace the timber docks between the

Alaska Steamship wharfs. There are 8 other that were identified as staff and Board priorities. Zinc anodes were number one, which needs to be done about every 10 years. Number two is downtown bathrooms, numbers three and four are the emergency vessel lightering float, boating floats to shore power. These numbers for FY27, marine passenger fees will be asked for until there is enough money to add those. The Lone Sailor Memorial, the Board got a request from Pioneers of Alaska to install a Lone Sailor statue along the sea walk. The Board and Assembly approved of the request and the money would facilitate the mounting of the Lone Sailor statue. The downtown deck project and has been held at bay until there was some certainty of what the waterfront plans are. It's well outlined in the Urban Design plan of Marine Park to Taku Dock. That's the plan for dock-type projects.

Mr. Hamilton asked why the Peratrovich bathrooms went from \$2 million to \$3 million dollars.

Mr. Uchytel said he put that number, but it was just a number, nothing is being designed.

Mr. Hamilton asked why it's 4 times as expensive as the Aurora or the Douglas bathroom facility. He said now he wants to know why it's 6 times more.

Mr. Uchytel said the bathrooms that will go downtown will be more than just urinals and toilets. They may have showers. There's no design yet, but in the urban design plan, in the first phase of the deck over project, there were visions for a waiting area with hangar doors and a seating area. That's the plan for a nice facility along the sea walk that can be constructed.

Mr. Hamilton said he wanted to know about the vision so that he could be up to speed on the project.

Mr. Uchytel said he showed the rendering at the retreat during the Board retreat. Docks and Harbors have already plumbed for a restroom, for water, sewer and a lift station. That project was progressing for Phase II. The City Manager has said to hold off until they can see what happens with the general Douglas City Museum and if there's an interest in bringing that to the waterfront. Docks and Harbors have been successful is that they have been nimble and they see opportunities. Next month, Mr. Uchytel said that he will be coming forward with a list of items that can utilize marine passenger fees. The plan for the waterfront has only been solidified in the last few weeks when the archipelago property was sold. Mr. Uchytel said that Docks and Harbors look for opportunities, the cadence of the budget cycle and when money is available for marine passenger fees to be used. He wants to make sure Docks and Harbors can be successful when these requests come up.

Ms. Smith asked if there were any engineering plans made to exclude unwanted material like drug paraphernalia going down the bathroom receptacles.

Mr. Uchytel said no, we haven't done any bathroom designs and they are still in the planning stage.

Ms. Smith said if we moved forward on any of these projects, she would encourage some efforts to prevent expensive destruction of the facilities.

Mr. Leither asked if Mr. Uchytel could review the purpose of the CIP list, he said it was his understanding from previous years that the reason for the list is so the Board can request moving forward on a project in the future. He said the list doesn't bind the board to commit money or efforts but without the list it's much more difficult to start a project in that phase. Correct?

Mr. Uchytel responded, that is correct. The objective is to create CIP projects. It shows the community what's out there. The next fiscal year is important as it affects our fund balance and where we put our efforts.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the zinc anodes was the number one priority. He said he heard Mr. Uchytel say that it may not be needed for 10 years. He asked what would happen if the zinc anodes needed immediate attention. Would Docks and Harbors try to fund it, hold some money for the project or because it may be 10 years out would we go towards the bathroom project?

Mr. Uchytel said, if the Board said, we really want the zinc anodes, then a request would be made marine passenger fees or state passenger fees saying we want \$10 million for zinc anodes. He said the City may say these aren't 8 years old yet and possibly not fund it.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the next step would be to go to number 2 on the list which is the bathroom with use of the marine passenger fees.

Mr. Uchytel explained the process that includes the Board to rank projects. He said Docks and Harbors values the Board's opinion.

Mr. Leither said that the Board was getting hung up on columns 2,3, and 4. He said his understanding was what was important is the actual fiscal year in which something is placed.

Mr. Uchytel said yes, that is correct. The Board wanted a Doodle poll, so this makes sense of what the poll means. He said if you look at the downtown safety railings, the staff rated that as number one. The Board rated that as last, so there's a disconnect there. He said he was trying to provide a big picture document that shows a path forward.

Mr. Leither said what he was hoping the Board can look at the ranking and say, for example, zinc anodes should be in FY32, but that should be in FY28. If someone feels there is a significant issue, then perhaps that is the question the Board should be concentrating on in their discussions.

Ms. Smith added that she would not question the fiscal year because that's unimportant. What is important is having the project listed and being agile enough that if funding becomes available, we have the means to use the funds for completing that project.

Mr. Ridgway said he would appreciate it if there was a narrative about where the project came from for the Board to evaluate whether the bathroom should be at this dock or another dock, or any harbor project. He hoped that it would bridge the gap, for instance, the discrepancy between the Board saying safety railing was our least priority and staff saying it was their number one. A paragraph stating what the project is, where it came

from, rather than just the name of the project, submitted to the Board would be helpful and add more discipline to the Board's decision-making process.

Mr. Sill commented that master plans are available on the projects page of the website and they contain many of the elements that Mr. Ridgway is requesting.

Mr. Hamilton said Mr. Uchytel pointed to the longevity of these things on the list as a reason to move forward with them. He said he felt the Echo Cove project should be cut off the list because of the Cascade point development soon. He said, he shouldn't say this, but who's asking for a direct fish sales facility and what does that mean. He asked whether some projects could be eye washed.

Mr. Orr responded that he didn't think they should be removed. The projects have merit, however some of the projects wouldn't rise to the top as far as a project like the paving of the Douglas parking lot.

Mr. Hamilton said that some of the items are placeholders and they get pushed down the road. He said he'd like the Board to make some amendments.

Mr. Ridgway said that if the Board is voting on a priority, he would like to know here the project came from. If the Board is voting on priority, one scheduled for FY31, then it's \$20 million, he wondered does that mean that Docks and Harbors is prepared to fund it or to prepare the Board for what they see as their number one and number two priority for the staff. He agrees with Mr. Uchytel that the organization is very nimble and very geared towards looking for opportunities. He needs to know that if the Board votes on number one, does that mean that all the money for FY27 money is put into priority number one.

Mr. Uchytel responded that his recommendation would be to cross it off the priority list. As the Port Director, he developed the matrix and asked the Board, does it look reasonable? Is \$20 million in FY 31 reasonable? He assumed that everything was going to advance with the Army Corps of Engineers. He said it's just a marker. It could be the breakwater is going to be \$100 million dollars and Docks and Harbors will need 20%. The project may occur in FY27 and maybe there will be a 1% increase in sales tax or maybe there's money from DOT that can double that or a Fish and Game Grant. At some point, Docks and Harbors will need to recapitalize on the breakwater and that cost will be large. The Board may be feeling sticker shock up front but it will be dealt with in the future.

Mr. Ridgway said he appreciated that staff have managed the Board's expectations in saying they don't know the cost and they don't know when the project will happen. As a Board they come back later to discuss how to go about getting the funding for projects.

Mr. Leither encouraged staff to leave items on the list as staff can go to a legislative meeting and say, for example, this project grant is designed for a fish station.

Mr. Sooter asked if there was any more discussion for the Docks.

MS. SMITH MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FY27 TO FY32 CIP LIST AS PRESENTED AS DETERMINED FROM THE NOVEMBER 15TH BOARD RETREAT.

Mr. Hamilton asked for a rejection for vote. He said the board has got these continuous

pressures to rate raises and that he was happy or content to pushing down huge numbers and getting the sticker shock out of the way initially. The Board points to the rates not being high enough, so he was going to vote no.

Mr. Sooter called for roll.

All in favor: Mr. Leither, Mr. Orr, Mr. Ridgway, Ms. Smith, and Mr. Sooter.

Not in favor: Mr. Hamilton.

Motion passed 5:1.

H. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

5. Juneau Cruise Ship Berth Assignment Update

Presentation by CBJ Tourism Director:

Ms. Pierce said she wanted to give the Board an update on doesn't affect the way Docks and Harbors operate the docks. It doesn't affect the revenue of the docks, but it does affect how the schedule ships onto the docks. The original visitor Industry Task Force recommended the CBJ take a more active role in membership scheduling. Historically, the work in the past has been done by Cruise Line Agencies of Alaska (CLAA), since cruise ships started coming to Alaska and they have scheduled ships in a historical priority berthing format based on a 1980 Juneau ordinance. The practice has strayed quite a way from the initial ordinance. Typically, the city has set the dockage fee and CLAA has scheduled the docks. In recent years, they have negotiated agreements and limits on the number of ships. The schedule gets approved with some negotiation, but the city has been in a passive role. Now, the city is looking at long-term birthing agreements. Part of the reason is based upon having more predictability and stability for our own facilities. The other part of the reason is that there has been some cruise line anxiety as Juneau had some limits and ballot initiative in the region about getting closed out of ports where they don't control dock facilities. She said she personally feels that these anxieties are a little bit unwarranted, but cruise line agencies are sometimes reactive. What the city is looking at is signing long-term agreements with the cruise lines that, for the days when we have a predictable ship at our docks, for example, Carnival has a spot at a CBJ dock on Tuesdays. That's in the historical priority birthing, that would move over into an agreement. It would be between the city and the cruise line. On days where we don't have a predictable ship at our dock, then we'd still be subject to the same scheduling by CLAA. That's because we have ships that are on 10- or 12-day itineraries that rotate through. It's too messy to try to figure out and we want to help cruise line agencies retrain some of that ability of creating some surety around the days in the schedule that we have stability. Most birthing agreements throughout the world are in our own port with the private docks and have minimal passenger guarantees. As a public entity, our guarantees are more like behavioral MOAs, a five-ship day MOA, and a daily passenger cap. What the city is looking for is maintaining stability in our visitor volume over the next 5-10 years and meeting community goals around having a direct relationship with our facilities. She said they are in preliminary talks with the cruise lines and wanted to bring this informational item to the board tonight.

to give them the opportunity to ask questions and make suggestions. She said Docks and Harbors can understand what's going on in the kind of policy and rate-setting side of the facilities and while it doesn't represent any change in the how things work operationally or financially, it still changes the plan and schedule.

Board Discussion/Public Comment:

Mr. Ridgway thanks Ms. Pierce for the presentation. He asked Mr. Uchytel if he saw any downside to this long-term agreement for Docks and Harbors.

Mr. Uchytel said he's never concerned when it comes to finances with the Docks. The money is always there through the head tax or through the new fee structure. He said he's not worried about the financial ramifications of any capital agreement.

Mr. Ridgway asked if he was concerned about any schedule challenges given these long-term agreements or anything that may affect staffing.

Mr. Creswell explained that we get the schedule a year in advance and we don't have the dock assignments or times yet but as Ms. Pierce said historically, we know where the ships are going to be either early, mid-morning or afternoon. Docks and Harbors are starting to solidify times, so we have that well in advance. This makes it easier to count on that schedule for the following year.

Ms. Pierce added that one of the cruise lines engaged in the long-term agreement discussion is Royal Caribbean.

Mr. Hamilton asked Ms. Pierce that when she spoke of surety that meant that was an exclusive right to the berth for that cruise line.

Ms. Pierce said that it was surety for both the city and the cruise line to dock at our facilities based on a schedule and a long-term commitment to provide that facility to them.

Mr. Hamilton asked what long-term means for the cruise lines.

Ms. Pierce said that the city was looking at 5-year agreements with an automatic 5-year renewal.

Mr. Leither asked if the city was at a disadvantage because in the past Docks and Harbors had committed to security staff and the cruise ships changed their mind, and we were left holding the bag on that. He asked if we sign these ships up for 5 years, do we have the mechanism to recoup any changes on their behalf? He said he trusts the city, but he doesn't trust the cruise ship as much.

Mr. Creswell answered that we don't commit to security as Docks and Harbor's has been told by the Coast Guard that we provide for security and that's the same for every ship and it doesn't matter which cruise line. What has changed was there was no technological means to verify dual identification for cruise ship passengers. The cruise lines have developed that technology and now they have given that technology to us when they come to our docks and that makes our job easier to slowly start decreasing staffing.

Ms. Pierce added that Docks and Harbors should be commended for putting fines in place.

That made cruise lines accountable for cancellations and that is something other ports have implemented. Weather cancellations are in the writing and agreement, and we have provisions for that. Cruise lines will be paying significant penalties for breaking the agreement.

Ms. Smith asked for clarification with a recent memo that said that the rates were raised for the city docks but none of that money is going to Docks and Harbors but that it is going to the city.

Ms. Pierce said the city went through the process of raising dockage fees. It was her intention that money would be used for Docks and Harbors. The intent was to treat both the city and private docks the same. The Assembly has had some changes in the city budget process, and it is entirely up to the Assembly as to what happens with that money. She said that she could not advocate either way and that she could only speak to her intent which was to raise the rates. There are still restrictions around how dockage fees are used and she thought that there would be an interesting discussion during budget time with the Assembly. She said she didn't want to throw our Assembly Liaison into the mess but there is a lot of uncertainty.

Mr. Hamilton said Ms. Pierce was comparing our public to private dock situation. It was his understanding that in a private dock situation, a cruise line is paying for that surety and currently, there is no surety.

Ms. Pierce said the cruise line would be paying for that guarantee. The cruise line wants predictability and stability in the city facilities. The city is not passively letting a third-party schedule to schedule our facilities but by signing a long-term agreement the city will know who's going in our docks and will have that revenue stream associated with the docks and if not, the cruise lines will be paying penalties for not following through with the agreement. The Assembly has the right to release a cruise line from an agreement if they have reason to, but it gives the city control over whether to release a cruise line for an agreement.

Mr. Leither said that his understanding of the 5-year lease was guaranteeing themselves the same spot on Juneau city docks. He said it was his understanding that there is going to be more cruise ships on the back side of Douglas and they are not going to be in this moorage agreement. His question is whether the cruise lines that we are leasing with have the right to continue their lease, if nothing has changed. He wondered if there is a way to say there are way too many tourists here. Does the city have the option to get out or are we selling to continue if the terms have not changed significantly.

Ms. Pierce said that she would look at the situation the other way around. If the cruise line has talked with the back side of Douglas regarding a long-term agreement with the city, they get out of their agreement through payment or by being released by the Assembly to move that ship over to the backside of Douglas.

Mr. Leither said that's not what he is asking, he is saying for example instead of having 5 cruise ships downtown, and they put 2 more on the back side of Douglas, that's 7 cruise ships using Juneau's resources. Can the city say those negotiations are not working for us and even though it's a 5-year lease is there a clause in there that gives them the right to

continue the lease under similar terms.

Ms. Pierce asked to add to the discussion since the Board was talking about CIPs and marine passenger fees. She said she had a fair amount of influence over the marine passenger fee budget and would highly support a recommendation for a bathroom and covered waiting facility. She said that she has heard a lot about that from the community over the last few years and she would welcome that submission to have on the docks.

Mr. Ridgway said that Ms. Pierce had mentioned the bathrooms and thought Ms. Pierce had the ability to go in between CBJ and the cruise line organizations. He wondered if managing the bathroom facility by Docks and Harbor staff would be advantageous. Is there any advantage to Docks and Harbors constructing the bathrooms and engineers designing it using the passenger fees and then someone else operating it rather than burdening Docks and Harbors staff.

Ms. Pierce said that she would defer to Mr. Creswell's staff to manage the facility.

Mr. Creswell thanked Mr. Ridgway as anytime we talk about building something, we often forget about the human factor of how we maintain and operate it. He said although he hasn't had any discussions about the facilities, and if the cleaning and maintenance of the restrooms fall to Docks and Harbors, the good news is that 3 years ago they increased the staffing by 4 people. He said after this next year, as we start losing anchoring ships. We can go forward, and work becomes easier. Docks and Harbors still have FTEs available as they are currently staffed to transfer them to where they are needed.

Mr. Uchtyl said they always can outsource cleaning of the bathrooms.

Ms. Pierce said traditionally what they have funded for private docks and public facilities the security and maintenance services have been paid with passenger fees. Assuming that continues, and the Assembly continues to support the maintenance of the restrooms.

Mr. Day said that Holland America Lines supports the idea of berth agreements all over the world so that there are consistency and long-term surety. He said that their corporation has berthed out with the city. Although Princess ships utilize the Franklin Dock in most cases because of the shore power, they do utilize the city docks when they have more than one ship in port. Their sister company, Carnival Corporation, does as well. He said they support the idea and as Ms. Pierce and Mr. Creswell mentioned it gives consistency of what's coming. There's always reason why ships don't call, whether it's weather or mechanical or something else occurs, the intent of the agreement is there will be significant penalties if someone doesn't show. He said they are anxious to see the process move forward as it will also help the cruise line agencies to do their scheduling.

6. US Army Corps of Engineers - Statter Breakwater Update

Presentation by Robin Carr, USACE:

Mr. Carr, lead planner for the Auke Bay Harbor navigation improvements feasibility study, presented a PowerPoint. Updates included the study going forward and the bottom line up

front along with the background, alternative, and future courses of action. Changes that have happened to the study are the general that oversees the use of the program, there's a new 35% design requirements for feasibility studies. Previously, this study was scoped for a 15% design to finish the feasibility, so there's been an increase in the scope from what they had originally had. There's also a strong preference from headquarters to complete studies in three years, for under \$3 million. This conflicts with the prior alignment in June 2025 that was quoted for a 30-and-a-half-year study at \$4.78 million. After getting bids back for the geotechnical analysis, those were higher than originally budgeted for. The USACE has prepared courses of action with two recommendations that they will present to headquarters who are the final decision makers on the project. He asked the board for their input and approval on what their recommendations would be.

Background: The problems they identified with the Statter Harbor are the current wave attenuated had passed its design life and it won't provide the same level of protection going for safe moorage going into the future. A crowded harbor, there's more need for moorage and the wave conditions can create damaging and dangerous conditions. Their objectives for the study are to reduce damages to vessels and harbor infrastructure, reduce transportation and delays and to improve the economic conditions for the region. Their previously agreed schedule and budget was for a total of \$4.78 million was split between the federal government and CBJ with each contributing about 2.39 million with the final report finishing in 2028.

Mr. Carr said that the next slide showed the refined array of alternatives. They identified 7 different alternatives with the first one to have a policy non-structural alternative but that is not technically viable. There are 3 main measures, there's a chain-supported floating breakwater, pile-supported floating breakwater and then there's a pile supported wave barrier. These are 3 different ways to make the harbor safe. With the first two, there would be moorage to the breakwater. Without moorage at the breakwater, that could be the current level of moorage for an expanded harbor with increasing the moorage. The courses of action, USACE has identified 4 different actions. The first one, if they kept the one over the next 3 years at \$3 million would only be able to look at the current harbor and it would be impossible for them to hit a 35% level of design. It would only be 15% of the level of design. Because of the geotechnical analysis, the water depths of 120 feet, it would be too expensive to get to that level of design. They don't think headquarters would be interested in moving forward due to the minimal budget. The next option would be to aim for the 3-year time frame and 35% and a \$4.38 million cost. That's a slight decrease from what they currently have. He said that they would lose if they did this and they would only evaluate the current floating breakwater. The pile-supported measures are structures that are buried into the earth, and they have the potential depending on the type, the geotechnical conditions and are much cheaper, and USACE cannot evaluate that. They would be able to evaluate the expanded harbor rather than both options. The recommended option keeps the time and budget that was previously approved in June. This would also enable them to look at all three types of wave barriers. This would only be for an expanded harbor. Looking at the study for both the difference between the current and expanded harbor, they identified that it would cost \$5.5 million and that is the total

study cost. That would be equally split between the federal government and CBJ. Their current recommendation is to get what had been previously approved under the budget and schedule from June 2025 but to also show that headquarters this is what you would get going into the next 3 years and 3 million which is the bare minimum for the 35% design.

Board Discussion:

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Carr to explain the difference between choice number 3 and choice number 4.

Mr. Carr responded said there are a couple of different components. Normally they look at what keeping the current harbor would do and that would give more options down the line. An expanded harbor would have much higher costs than the current harbor. What happens under some project conditions is that the final costs of a larger project are too much money for a community. If we don't evaluate through these studies, there's two main pieces the technical and economic feasibility of the harbor offers a lot of benefits. With that expansion also comes the higher costs. Maybe that is not economically viable but a replacement that protects the current harbor, maybe that's economically viable. If both are eliminated you increase the risk that you've eliminated or you're only looking at possibilities that are not economically viable at all. This could risk funding of not having a feasible project.

Mr. Ridgway said the second or third slide discussed the original problem statement and the work inefficient was used. Is that what was taken into consideration when looking at either expanded or current harbor situations. What are the inefficiencies of the moorage out at Statter Harbor?

Mr. Carr said that inefficiencies refer to the demand for more vessels in the harbor that by expanding the harbor, efficiencies are gained.

Mr. Carr laid out the risk for each of the courses of action. There's a risk across the board of the schedule being longer than anticipated due to staffing shortages. There's been major public sector disruption across the federal government that has impacted the USACE. As staff leave, it's hard to find new staff members to cover their duties. For action numbers 1 and 2 that only look at the anchor chain floating breakwater, there's a risk that they don't meet standards. If they don't meet those standards, then they would not be on a project to build them. There's a risk that even though there is floating breakwater protecting Statter Harbor the preliminary analysis seems to be undersized and needs to be adequately protected. We may be able to, if it's technically feasible, to build an anchor chain floating breakwater big enough to meet the necessary protection. That may increase costs by number one, exceeding the budget. That is USACE most unrealistic course of action. For option number 2, by not evaluating all the measures or all the locations, adds additional risk to not selecting the optimized solution to the problem. That could be acceptable, but it could mean more costs to the project. Construction is more expensive than investigation. The final risks are in action 3 and 4, due to the nature of the geotechnical analysis. No matter how many boreholes are laid out there's always a risk that it's not enough to satisfy

the 35% design requirement. He was not sure that headquarters would accept a lower than 35% design and that may require more geotechnical analysis. The recommended plan 3 keeps some of the milestones, which are moved around slightly. In the final report, finishing the project would be the same date and the funding stream was the total cost would be the same as the previous budget so it wouldn't need any approval from CBJ Assembly as was previously approved. However, what would be delivered would be different, meaning that they'd only look at the expanded harbor and there's a risk of not hitting the 35% design requirement. With the changes, the USACE is making recommendations to headquarters, and they felt it was necessary to keep the Board informed at every step of the way. He felt it was important to have the Board's input, and if there were different ideas, then they would need to change things in the (Course of Actions) COAs and finalize them before they got to headquarters.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Carr if the economic analysis is included during the study. He said Docks and Harbors doesn't want to eliminate options for a 35% design for an expanded harbor or the current design but wanted to know whether the board was buying an economic analysis that helps them decide to move forward.

Mr. Carr answered that they always include an economic analysis as a major component of the final number which is a benefit-cost ratio. That means that if the benefits are above one, then the benefits exceed the costs of the project. The benefits are calculated from the perspective of the federal government and not necessarily from the prospective of Juneau but the benefits to the local community are included separately through not as a single number. There are some unique situations for harbors in Alaska, for those harbors that are eligible for report and subsistence Harbor Authority, which has a separate type of analysis. The USACE is only able to conduct that analysis if they have a course of action for number 4, because it requires more comparison. There would need to be some justification, if the benefit-cost ratio is below one and the project is still possible.

Mr. Leither said he wanted to make sure he understood that and that essentially his question was let's say the federal government says this project was not financially feasible, but Docks and Harbor felt like it was in their financial best interest to move forward. Would this project still move forward even though the federal government says that it is not financially feasible, or is it a dead project?

Mr. Carr said the federal interest in this project was expanded compared to other projects because it's in a remote location and all harbors in Alaska are designated as remote locations. There are specific categories that look at the economic benefit of the region. By demonstrating that this harbor is a driver as a economic benefit for the region, on a national level, are below one, there would still be a federal interest. The only caveat is that the determination that they will present in the findings to the Alaska District, the final determination is not made at a local level, and it is made at the very top by the Assistant Secretary to the Army who makes that final determination.

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Carr if he could help him to understand what he asked earlier regarding what the current study would look at Statter Harbor, that would make it a viable alternative. Are we replacing it as is or what are the possible options using the current

study which are financially feasible?

Mr. Carr said that the current harbor means keeping the current level of moorage safe, and the floating breakwater that's currently there. There are a lot of maintenance issues as it deteriorates. The alternative is looking at just the current harbor, building a floating breakwater or other sort of breakwater in front of the one that's currently there. The breakwater that is currently there was essentially a float that would be there and wouldn't have the stress that it's currently undergoing because it would no longer be the wave barrier that it's acting as. It would deteriorate much more slowly and as it needs to be replaced it could just be replaced by normal floats behind it.

Mr. Carr said mainly the USACE would like to know if there were any questions, concerns, especially about changing the main recommendation to COA number 3.

Mr. Sooter said that the Board agrees with COA 3.

Mr. Ridgway asked if in other districts, are there similar projects out there that have been under way that the Board could look at, say on the East Coast?

Mr. Carr said floating breakwater projects for the USACE are very rare and there are a few mostly in Alaska. He could not recall the names of the other projects, but he could send them over later.

Ms. Smith wondered about the comment about building a new breakwater outside of the current one and using the current one for moorage. The current break water has big yacht tied up to it in the summer months and she is wondering whether the current breakwater for moorage would deteriorate much slower or would it still be able to handle those huge boats. Or would it be able to handle the smaller boats of between 25-40 feet.

Mr. Carr said he could not accurately answer that question at this time but could confirm it with their team engineers.

Mr. Leither asked for clarification about COA number 4. He said the Board and USACE would only be going forward with the recommended number 3 not number 4.

Mr. Carr said that would be correct.

Public Comment: None

I. STAFF, COMMITTEE, AND MEMBER REPORTS

7. a. Port Engineer Report

Mr. Sill reported:

- Aurora Harbor – Aurora Harbor is down to two pilings that need to be driven. Western Marine is working to build the harbor faster than we have seen it built in the past. Our electricians have started this week to pull wire. The completion for this project is April 2026 and barring some unforeseen incident, they are looking at finishing the project this year. Western Marine is looking at getting the barge out of there by next week

and they have done a walkthrough with Mr. Sill and the Engineer contractor and are the floats in, all but the two pilings are in and the anodes, cable, wires, life rings and fire extinguishers are on site.

Mr. Ridgway asked how they managed to finish months ahead of schedule. Did they bring in more employees, more equipment?

Mr. Sill said they really didn't want to be here in January.

Mr. Ridgway said he had a follow-up question from the USACE COA number 3. He asked if the breakwater breaks away what kind of risk is that and is there an associated risk in choosing one of the COAs over another.

Mr. Sill responded that the advantage of COA 4 was that it's too expensive for us. The breakwater at the location of the existing project is yes, going to be expensive with a breakwater 100-300 feet out. It's the same water depth and didn't think the cost would be any more. He said the risk would be to say that we're going to expand but we can't afford it. Docks and Harbors have already wanted to recapitalize their floats, and what needs to be looked at is replacing the 1984 floats which is going to be expensive. Regarding the breakwater, it's down to survival and not surviving. The way the concrete and the post-tension structure may fail would not be a maintenance issue. Docks and Harbors' biggest concern are thin concrete shells over some foam that's tightened to tens of thousands of pounds of tension from cables failing. It's expensive and very difficult to repair.

Mr. Leither asked how many attachments we have with chains and if that breakwater is under tension, it would not be that the breakwater's floating into the boats immediately, but we would not be sinking boats with the breakwater either.

Mr. Sill said there are 36. He said when they did the passengers for hire floats, Docks and Harbors did an inventory of chains and they were down 3 chains that were sitting on the bottom. Looking at the breakwater, you can see the missing chains, and you can see that floats are not aligned and that there could be a missing chain. Mr. Sill said he was not concerned with breaking chains, but he was more concerned with the structure collapsing. When a piece of the structure collapses from four modules. Any one of those four pieces could collapse. A few years ago, Docks and Harbors had a couple of modules that collapsed on D-float and then there's a tremendous amount of force.

Mr. Leiter asked if we needed to be concerned about our liability if a pedestrian would be injured during that situation.

Mr. Sill said he wouldn't say no, but it would be relative.

Mr. Creswell said that what they have seen in the past at Statter harbor has occurred during extreme weather events. If there were extreme weather events that would cause

that type of weather on the breakwater, he felt it would be extreme enough that no one could safely walk on the breakwater.

Mr. Orr asked about the status of the anodes being installed in Aurora.

Mr. Sill responded that Global Diving would come in December and weld those on.

Mr. Ridgway commented that he was proud to be a member of the Board as staff no exactly how many connections there are and he appreciated that.

b. Harbormaster

Mr. Creswell reported:

- All Hands Meetings: During the winter they try to meet with all staff. They had their first meeting to discuss asbestos training, winter driving, cold weather safety, CBJ severe weather policy, plus projects updates. It also was a good opportunity for Mr. Uchytel to be in front of staff and give an update on what's going on and to talk about the retreat.
- New Volvo Loader: The new Volvo Loader for the downtown crew is in Alaska and should be in Juneau soon. It is being driven down on a trailer to Haines as they initially sent it to Fairbanks.
- Taku Harbor: Mr. Creswell and Mr. Sill went to Taku Harbor last Thursday to check the stockade point float and take some measurements to finalize the design for the repair of that float. The float hasn't gotten any worse and Mr. Sill is working on a straightforward plan for that. The other reason was, to check on the boat the Haida Lady which was sold out of Sitka and had a new owner. It had been tied up at Taku. The derelict boat is now tied up at Limestone Harbor which is no longer within Docks and Harbors purview.
- Fish On: The Fish On boat sank last week in Aurora. The hospital liability trust fund was opened and the Coast Guard paid for the raising and removing of the hydrocarbons and hazmat from the vessel. It was towed to Trucano, and they disposed of the boat. Docks and Harbors paid for the disposal but not the diving, the raising and hazmat removal.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the State of Alaska derelict vessel registration fee is paying for that?

Mr. Creswell said that was a one-time reimbursement program. Docks and Harbors do not expect to ever receive that reimbursement again from the state. Juneau was the most successful harbor in the state to receive reimbursement. They received \$86,000 was received and every application, except for one, got funded. The money dispersed had nothing to do with the money collected from titling fees. The money had to do with the settlement of a lawsuit that the state was the beneficiary of and that was put into the

derelict vessel fund.

Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Creswell could recall when the extended fees for non-inured vessels went into effect.

Mr. Creswell replied that they went into effect over a year ago and that this is our first full year of operations under those fees. Docks and Harbors has spent the last 2-3 weeks because we know we're coming up at the end of the calendar year pulling reports. In January he will come before the board to notify them of the disposal costs for 2025, which he thought would be 20% lower. Mr. Creswell said that in the case of Fish On, he was able to go through the impound process and hold the boat. The owner was without the means to dispose of the boat. He signed a letter of "no objections" which showed that he is not objecting to Docks and Harbors taking possession and disposing of the boat. He was given notice that he was responsible for all charges incurred while disposing of the vessel and he must go through our normal collections process for that. Docks and Harbors were able to move on the process.

Mr. Leither said he didn't remember what the Board ended up on when they passed the insurance. Is it a variable?

Mr. Creswell said that the Board settled on \$1.50. He said the language says each year it will be evaluated and presented to the board and the fee will be adjusted to no more than \$3 and no less than \$1 to come within the 20% of the actual previous year's disposable costs.

- Review of regulations: Mr. Creswell will have a document in the future to fix some of the language in the regulations, which will come before the Board.
- Household Hazardous Waste: Mr. Creswell will get in touch with Mr. Hamilton about information regarding bilge water disposal. Capital Disposal does take it if it's brought to them, but they don't pick it up.

Mr. Hamilton asked about recycling metal and batteries at the harbors.

Mr. Creswell said he had met with staff and asked them to think about signage and would make sure it is arranged adequately.

- Christmas party: Docks and Harbors will have their Christmas party at DIPAC, December 20th from 6-9 pm. Everyone is formally invited. Mike's Airport Express is sponsoring prime rib and attendees are asked to bring a side dish. There will be an ugly sweater contest and a white elephant gift exchange. There will be a bartender for a BYOB, but it must be served by someone who has a TAPS card, so Keri Antsen, a city employee, will serve you your own booze.

c. Assembly Liaison

Ms. Hall reported that she'd give a brief recap of Monday's Assembly meeting. Telephone Hill dominated the conversation. Items on the agenda that had to do with Docks and Harbors was the Statter Harbor breakwater geotechnical investigation. Ordinances that were set for public hearing and acted upon included the ranked choice voting, which was table, one for Eaglecrest, entering into a franchise and permit agreement with the Zipline Adventure Endeavors. There were a couple with regards to the airport, wetlands rescue vehicle and motor grader vacuum truck. The Assembly has their retreat on December 6th, and Mr. Uchytel will be there. They have been ranking the CIPs that they have to turn in by Monday. Ms. Hall explained that the way the Assembly does their ranking of projects is online and a paper copy and they are considered as they have moved along with staff input. They delve into the list by trying to fully understand what it is that they are making. She said being able to listen to the Board, the process has helped but there are a lot of competing projects. Everyone has their own priorities, but we also look at how the city overall ranks our priorities.

d. Port Director

Mr. Uchytel reported:

- Bonds: At the retreat there was a question about the original bonds that Docks and Harbors is paying off. The Finance Department reported that originally, we were issued \$10.6 Million in bonds in 2007. The bonds were refunded in 2015 and again in 2025. Over the life of the three various bond issuance, Docks and Harbors has made debt service payments totaling \$16.8 million, \$9 million in principal and \$7.8 in interest.
- Geotech Drilling: The Assembly approved the bid award to Discovery Drilling. Docks and Harbors will be meeting with them at the site in late April or early May to do that work. They will be working with the USACE on how many soil bore samples they need done. It could be 3-6. Since Discovery Drilling is coming down from Anchorage, we'll be looking at mobilization costs. We may want them to drill at the North Douglas Launch Ramp to get some Geotech work done there. It could be expensive, but they will look at that to see if Docks and Harbors can afford that.
- Marine Services Center update: An update was asked for by the Board, but too much was already on tonight's agenda. Mr. Sill will be ready to present that at the next Ops Meeting.

Mr. Hamilton asked that during the presentation about marine services, there is a distinction between marine services center and the boatyard.

Mr. Uchytel said that marine services are a loose term for studies. It's a cogent, what the city needs or what the community needs between a boatyard and what is the need moving forward.

Mr. Hamilton asked when additional boring is needed out at North Douglas boat harbor, will that come out of the harbor fund?

Mr. Uchytel answered yes. He said at the last meeting he had said we need to establish the calendar year for 2026. Page 30 of the packet refers to the input from the Board. The one exception in October, the week of the 19th of October, when the AAHPA Conference will be held in Valdez. Other than that, the Ops meeting is held on Wednesdays and the Board meetings on the following Thursday.

Mr. Sooter said now would be the time if anyone needed to make a change to the calendar to do so.

J. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

NEXT OPS MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR DECEMBER 10TH AT 5 PM

NEXT BOARD MEETING WILL BE DECEMBER 18TH AT 5PM

CHRISTMAS PARTY WILL BE HELD AT DIPAC ON DECEMBER 20TH FROM 6-9 PM

K. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:31 PM