DOCKS AND HARBORS BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

December 18, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL: Clayton Hamilton (at 5:05 pm), Matt Leither, Nick Orr, Mark Ridgway, Annette Smith, and Shem Sooter.

Absent: James Becker, Tyler Emerson and Robert Horchover.

Also in attendance: Carl Uchytil-Port Director, Leah Narum-Administrative Officer, Matt Creswell-Harbormaster, Matthew Sill-Port Engineer, Emily Wright- City Attorney, Steve Sahlender-VP of Alaska Operations – Goldbelt, Inc, and Maureen Hall- Assembly Liaison.

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES

Mr. Uchytil asked to pull item 4 under the consent agenda, which is the FY27 Marine Passenger Fees Request

MR. RIDGWAY MADE AN MOTION TO ACCEPT THE AGENDA AS AMENDED AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS- None

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. **November 14, 2025, Board Retreat** – Minutes approved unanimously.
b. **November 19, 2025, Regular Meeting** – Minutes approved unanimously.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

Marine Exchange of Alaska - Channel Drive Lease & Development Approval

Recommendation: To approve Marine Exchange of Alaska Request for New Development at 2601 Channel Drive and to Amend the Lease to include use which is appropriate for the intended operations by the Marine Exchange.

MS. SMITH MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AS AMENDED
Motion passed unanimously.

G. NEW BUSINESS

FY27 Marine Passenger Fee (MPF) Request

Port Engineer – Mr. Sill presented on page 45, the Taku Dock Seawalk Replacement was added to the FY27 Marine Passenger Fee Request. He asked the Board to recall the area down by the Fisherman's Memorial between the Taku Smokeries or Twisted Fish Building. That area has settled and there was a project in 2023 to raise the deck up and put fill underneath. Efforts that were put into that have now failed and settlement has continued. Docks and Harbors maintain that portion of the timber deck and it is a constant tripping hazard. We are recommending that we pull up the timber deck that it is sitting on and install a pile-supported sea walk structure, which should solve the settlement issues. We've estimated it to be a $3 million dollar project. This summer there was a cruise ship passenger that tripped and injured themselves and there's a claim before the city so it's an ongoing issue that we need to address.

a. Board Questions:

Mr. Ridgway asked how high of a priority this was.

Mr. Sill said that port projects are different than prioritizing harbor projects because there's a reliable funding stream for it from the Marine Passenger Fees. It's a high maintenance issue for the port.

Mr. Sooter asked if we have had any discussion with the Tourism Director, Ms. Pierce.

Mr. Sill said he met with Ms. Pierce about 2 hours ago and discussed the project. We have been talking about this project for several years and it's understood to be an important project and there is money coming in for these types of maintenance projects.

Mr. Hamilton joined the Board and was briefed on the discussion.

Ms. Smith asked where Docks and Harbors at placing this on the list of priorities.

Mr. Sill said that is a high maintenance priority and it is likely to be funded.

b. Public Comment- None

c. Board Discussion/Action-None

MR. RIDGWAY MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE FY27 MARINE PASSENGER FEE REQUEST FEE REQUEST AS PRESENTED IN THE AGENDA AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed unanimously.

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Property Conveyance of CBJ owned land at Seadrome

a. Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil said last week at the Operations and the Planning Committee Meeting there was a motion to consult with the Law Department to whether the Board could go into executive session. City Attorney Emily Wright, via Zoom, answered that question that it is not appropriate for the Board to go into executive session for the purpose of discussing the appropriate value of the CBJ owned land.

Mr. Sooter said he was comfortable with that, and no other Board members wished to speak with Ms. Wright.

Mr. Uchytil said representatives from Goldbelt are here to ask the Board for the sale of CBJ land.

Mr. Sahlender presented that last week they talked about the fair market value for the CBJ land to build a better facility and enhance the waterfront property. They are still willing to pay the appraised value of the land.

b. Board Questions

Mr. Uchytil said that in the package we have the original 2022 Goldbelt there's the document, page 59, that discussed the square foot per square foot conveyance. A Board member had asked him was there another iteration where the Board was talking about a conveyance of properties and a dollar amount. He was wondering if Mr. Sahlender knew if there was a proposal for a land swap plus a dollar amount for not the entire 15,000 square feet.

Mr. Sahlender asked if he was addressing property on West Douglas or Echo Cove in a land swap with the Seadrome property.

Mr. Uchytil said that he meant the iteration between square foot for square foot swap or to sell everything to Seadrome.

Mr. Sahlender responded that Goldbelt had moved from the swap to the purchase some time ago, but he didn't have a date. The land swap was for the property that is abutting the NOAA facility, now the Coast Guard facility and then allowing Goldbelt the property we call the volcano because of land setbacks or building setbacks. He said that if they were to extend the building, they would still have setbacks based off the CBJ property that is dead center of their property which is a horseshoe around that property. It wasn't beneficial to them to not acquire CX3A and CX3B. They would have to see what those setbacks are plus the parking requirements and 10% of green space. Because of the setbacks it doesn't mean Goldbelt won't need to have additional requirements to build. It makes the most sense for Goldbelt to buy the property at the higher value of $630,000, opposed to the $590,000 on the second appraisal. He reiterated that without ample ownership of the property it inhibits them and their ability to build.

Mr. Ridgway said that there was the 2022 land swap that Goldbelt had presented on page 90 of the packet at the Ops Planning Meeting. The impression he got was that if we looked at the right side for a land swap, that Goldbelt could still move forward with their plans. He asked if Goldbelt and CBJ did the land swap and consolidated their lots, so that Docks and Harbors had their waterfront and road access that they had the land to pursue their project.

Mr. Sahlender believed so, however, there would be a few things that they would have to look at like long-term leasing, to meet CBJ requirements like the 35-year lease set up at the Tram. He said yes, though they would have to make sure the lease would be a priority. He would have to present this old option to his Board as well. He said he preferred this option to not having an option at all. It allows for Goldbelt's building setbacks, green space and parking which is like what's here now.

Mr. Sooter asked if Goldbelt would need to lease that CBJ property from Docks and Harbors to satisfy all the building requirements.

Mr. Sahlender said he believed yes due to the parking requirements and the size and occupancy of the building but that would be a conversation with the planning department as that was not his area of expertise.

Mr. Leither said that he believed the reason why this proposed exchange had failed in the past was because to make the finances work, Goldbelt owned more uplands and CBJ owned more tidelands that we are responsible for. CBJ would have had to make the difference out of our own funds for the land swap and that was not palatable to the Board at the time.

Mr. Sahlender said as he remembered it, he thought that Goldbelt and CBJ were doing a price per price exchange and the price was something like $63 dollars per square foot. He thought neither side would balk at that.

Mr. Leither said that he thought it was in the range of $100,000 to $200,000. For purposes of discussion, he wondered whether Goldbelt might be considered on page 90.

Mr. Sahlender said to look at the Horan appraisal, the Board and Goldbelt didn't want each entity to pay. He said he thought the Board had expressed that they didn't want anything to come out of Docks and Harbor's pocket unless the payment came from Goldbelt.

Mr. Ridgway said that he thought that idea had been pitched to Goldbelt and that they felt that that was an impossible selling point. He said he did not want to give Mr. Sahlender a proposal that would be impossible to sell to the Goldbelt Board.

Mr. Sahlender said he believed it would be amenable to the Board. He thought their biggest concern would be the setbacks and it would not be economical to build a smaller building than they currently have planned. He said their first choice is to purchase, as it would be a cleaner deal and they would end up paying property taxes for the property anyway and there is some revenue generated from that sale, but not in the form of a lease. He said it's more comfortable for them to building owning outright the property than going through and redoing a 35-year lease like they do with the Tram property.

Mr. Sooter said Goldbelt pays sale tax. He asked if they got a better interest rate if they owned than versus leasing the land.

Mr. Sahlender said that it would be a smoother transaction. He said it's easier to invest in a better parking lot than the dirt, and gravel.

Mr. Orr said that he was looking at page 89, to meet CBJ requirements, then you would need to have a bigger parking lot.

Mr. Uchytil said he wanted to make sure that he understood that on page 89, the green part looks like it's a lot of property under Docks and Harbor's control. He thought we would end up with more like what was on page 91 where Docks and Harbors would get the yellow portion.

Mr. Leither said that it was his question that what was defined on page 90 would have generated a payment to Goldbelt. The Board didn't like that option so that option so then it was suggested that we would get the land defined on page 91 which looks like a corner, Lot 2, has been cut off.

Mr. Sill said that the drawing on page 90 is a square foot for square foot swap, whereas the drawing on page 91 is a value-for-value swap and an equal land trade. On page 106 it may be a bit clearer and is an equal land swap.

Mr. Sill said what is shown on page 90 is a pre-appraisal concept and after an appraiser was engaged, they pointed out the submerged lands were assessed at 40% the value of drylands. The appraiser came up with the drawings on page 91 and he came up with the drawings on page 106.

c. Public Comment-None

d. Board Discussion/Action-

MS. SMITH MADE A MOTION THAT THE BOARD ACCEPT THE STRAIGHT SQUARE-FOOT FOR SQUARE-FOOT AS LAID OUT ON PAGE 90 LAND EXCHANGE CONFIGURATION WITH NEGOTIATION RIGHTS TO LEASE THE DOCKS AND HARBOR SPACE AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Mr. Uchytil cautioned the Board that the proposed values were based on an appraisal done in 2022.

Mr. Leither asked if he was suggesting we do another appraisal.

Mr. Uchytil said that it would be his recommendation and Department of Law is online if the Board wishes to hear from someone else.

Mr. Hamilton asked if Ms. Smith was proposing that this is no longer a discussion that we're moving forward with the values of the square footage.

Ms. Smith said that she is proposing that they move forward with the land swap.

Mr. Ridgway said that he wanted to follow up with Mr. Leither's question to Mr. Uchytil. He asked if the motion was to offer the land swap on page 89 to Goldbelt and that was the offer.

Mr. Uchytil said that you could offer that proposal to Goldbelt but he's not sure they are going to accept it. It's appropriate in open meetings to say this is our offer, Mr. Sahlender can send it to Goldbelt, he can respond on behalf of Goldbelt or he could take it back to his Board for a future Board meeting. The proposal is favorable to Docks and Harbors so he thought they would need an appraisal within 90 days of a land action. February 2025 was not sufficient for acting and thought the Horan appraisal that was from 2022 would require an update to move the proposal forward. He said it would not be improper to make that offer to Goldbelt today and he would work with Goldbelt to revise the plan at future Board meetings.

Mr. Ridgway said that if he heard Mr. Uchytil correctly, for the potential purchase the Horan appraisal does work if the Board would like to move forward, but it does not work if we want to do a land swap.

Mr. Uchytil said that the CBJ code says that for lease, purchase or sale, has got to be at fair market value, and within 90 days. We never meet that code as it's such a stringent requirement and by the time it goes through all the bodies for approval. He thought we should not be relying on an appraisal that was 3 ½ years old.

Mr. Orr said that he would be uncomfortable voting on the motion, with the Board not knowing what their lease revenue would be based on what CBJ is making now.

Ms. Smith said we would need to get an appraisal anyway for negotiating the lease and asked if something could be added to the motion to make it move forward. She said it sounds redundant but if someone wanted to make an amendment, she would be happy with that.

Mr. Ridgway said the amount of revenue that he heard from Goldbelt was high compared to what Mr. Uchytil had mentioned. He asked what amount of revenue we get off the property.

Mr. Uchytil said that the revenue we get is based on page 73 of 129. The blue portion is leased to Goldbelt and most of the square footage is the Seadrome float. He asked Ms. Narum to look up the amount.

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Sill to speak about the land swap design on page 106 versus the one on page 90, and why he felt it would be more advantageous from a Harbor perspective. He asked why CBJ retained some of the tidelands.

Mr. Sill responded that what is on page 90 is a drawing prepared by Goldbelt, which shows the square foot per square foot trade. After the Board met with the appraiser, the Board was told that that's not equal value. What's on page 106 is an equal value swap. CBJ would retain the piece where the oil tank is sitting. In one discussion with Goldbelt at the time it was, what if we wanted to build something in this area. It was important for us to have shoreline access.

That was the genesis behind CBJ retaining this area with shore access and allowing Goldbelt to build their proposed building.

Mr. Sahlender said we went through 3 options. One was the drawing of Mr. Sill's on page 106, another is the drawing on page 90, if Docks and Harbors didn't require a shoreline. The last option was that Docks and Harbors wanted a shoreline, which is page 90 which would allow Goldbelt to build on offsets. On page 106, it doesn't allow those offsets to build a bigger building and go out to the tidelands. Though page 90 is not 100% accurate it would allow for what Goldbelt originally proposed which was building to property line based off tidelands. On page 106, there is a light blue area that CBJ would retain. That area swaps a portion of the tideland property, but CBJ maintains the same values of square footage since it's upland and therefore the same value.

Ms. Smith said on page 106, one of the issues in the past the little thin piece coming down into the lot was small. On the equal land square foot-per-square foot swap, the Board was clear that Goldbelt understood that the land they purchased would be merged would be substantially greater than the financial piece of it. She said that the Board wanted more of a dollar value and by doing the square foot-by-square-foot swap they are getting that.

Mr. Uchytil referred to page 73, which indicates the blue portion that CBJ leases to Goldbelt. He asked if the lease agreement totaled about $61,000 a year.

Ms. Narum said that it is correct, a lease with CP Marine, which is Goldbelt.

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Orr if he could help the Board understand whether a trade like this has less potential in a lease agreement.

Mr. Orr said looking at page 107, if CBJ still retains the blue portion, it will probably increase our revenue, especially if we retain access to the waterfront. If Horan comes back with an appraisal and we sell the land, then the land and revenue will be gone forever. He said we can't develop as it is. He said if Goldbelt comes up with a lease agreement allowing them access to parking then CBJ will have present value based on the current interest rates.

Mr. Hamilton said his concern was losing waterfront access and Goldbelt's proven to be a decent partner and they are ready to build. He thought that this may be a responsible compromise where we might gain a little value with the ongoing revenue from a lease for parking, but he has some reservations.

Mr. Ridgway said his understanding of the motion is that the Board offer a land swap, as shown on page 89, to Goldbelt and then we see what will happen next. He said he would like to leave tonight to give Goldbelt something to move forward with as they have shown CBJ a lot of patience. He said he would like to know what kind of income it would be from the lease, but we don't know that amount.

Mr. Orr said that he doesn't have any problem selling land, but he heard other Board members were hesitant to agree to sell waterfront property. He said his objection was not the project, but it was the price. He said if we sell, we will probably get more lease income, but it will be based on Horan and what we are getting now. His objective was, are we getting more value for the property.

Mr. Leither said that if the option sells for $630,000 versus making potentially $61,000 a year, then we would make that amount back in 10 years. He thought that was a reasonable option to keep the lease.

Mr. Orr said that his understanding was we keep the lease on the dock which would continue to be $60,000 but they got to build their building. He wanted to know what was in it for CBJ.

Mr. Ridgway said the issues that he has heard of and he wanted to summarize them. The lots we currently own don't have road access. The proposed land swap would allow for a consolidated lot and road access. The other issue is that we don't have plans for the existing property, but we don't need plans for it because we make $60,000 by leasing it. That is the way CBJ generally uses most of the property that we manage, and he sees the value in that. He does see the land swap as something that Goldbelt can move forward with and that is not going to affect us too much.

Ms. Smith said that she wanted to understand his concern. She referred to page 88, the blue area that is leased to Goldbelt. His concern is that if we do the land swap, we will lose the area in blue.

Mr. Orr said that we would retain some of the land that is part of the tideline lease. He said he thought we would come out ahead or about the same.

Mr. Sooter said he hoped the Board could come with something to direct staff to negotiate with Goldbelt and they could leave to go back to their Board with a proposal. Goldbelt could then come back some numbers and drawings.

Ms. Smith said that she would willing to accept amendments to the motion.

Mr. Ridgway said what he thought, Mr. Orr was saying was he wanted to make sure the motion talked about a lease agreement or losing the property. The motion made is to make us an offer to split the properties.

Mr. Leither said he agreed but he also doesn't want Goldbelt to come back without a decision. There must be some weight behind the Board's decision, otherwise what's the point in negotiating this. He didn't want Goldbelt to come out the meeting and say they're negotiating this when it comes back to the board and they might have completely changed their minds. He felt that they should have some sort of agreement in place with Goldbelt.

Mr. Hamilton said Boards don't work very well.

Ms. Smith said there were, in the motion, negotiation rights to lease.

Mr. Uchytil offered suggestions for a motion to direct staff to negotiate with leadership of Goldbelt a square-foot-per-square-foot land swap.

MR. RIDGWAY ASKED FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION THAT THE BOARD DIRECT STAFF TO NEGOTIATE WITH GOLDBELT LEADERSHIP TO NEGOTIATE THE STRAIGHT SQUARE-FOOT FOR SQUARE-FOOT AS LAID OUT ON PAGE 89 OF THE PACKAGE AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

2. **Re-solicitation: Application for Aurora Harbor Boat Shelter Space AG22/23**

    a. Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil presented, the last two pages of the packet, page 128-129, that in January of 2023 we had a lot of snow and lost a boat shelter at Aurora Harbor (AG22/23). The boat shelter owner walked away from that shelter. Docks and Harbors went through the process of looking for a fair public process for finding a new patron to build a boat shelter. The application on page 128 was what staff came up with last February. A few days ago, the successful bidder, bid $1,225 to rebuild it by January of 2026. He has notified Docks and Harbors that due to some health concerns, he's unable to meet that requirement and his original bid stays in our bank. As of Monday, we will be starting the bid process over again. He asked the Board to keep the boat shelter space open and whether they want to have the same process as a year ago or are there other ideas the Board would like to see.

b. Board Questions:

Ms. Smith asked whether there was any second bidder.

Mr. Uchytil said there was just one bidder.

Mr. Orr asked about paragraph f, on the application process, the "Boat Shelter applicant must retain ownership of the shelter at least half the Boat Sheter through January 2031." He wanted to know why that is in the process.

Mr. Uchytil said that it was set up so someone couldn't build it and sell it.
He said the Board approved the items last year now that he thought about it, there was nothing wrong with having a commercial operation come in and build the shelter and then selling it on the open market. The application process was written so that whoever built it could use it or at least half of the boat shelter.

Mr. Orr said that he appreciated that but since there was only one bidder, and we want to get a boat house built, we should look at some of the language.

Mr. Uchytil said within the last couple of days they have had somebody say that they're interested.

Ms. Smith asked if there was a commercial area where fishermen can sell their products.

Mr. Uchytil said that there is a commercial area between the approach docks at Harris Harbor, which is as close as possible to foot traffic use.

Mr. Leither asked if the trimaran or catamaran that used to live in the harbor used there? Also, could Mr. Uchytil tell the Board about the differences in revenue between a stall and a boat shelter.

Mr. Uchytil said that people in the boat shelter pay for a linear foot, like a square foot surcharge to Docks and Harbors. He said he thought it was 15 cents a square foot surcharge and then they pay property tax as well.
Mr. Creswell added that they are charged for the moorage is either the length of the boat shelter or length of the boat whichever is greater. In addition, there is an overwater property tax and the surcharge for square footage. There are 3 different fees people pay for a boot shelter.
Mr. Leither asked for a 40-foot boat, would they pay for the same linear foot for a normal slip as a boat shelter.
Mr. Uchytil said that they would pay the same linear foot fee whether they were at a boat shelter or on a normal slip. On top of that they're paying the 15-cent surcharge for however long the boat shelter is. Following up with Mr. Leither he said that the catamaran is still there and it's a good place for the catamaran however, Docks and Harbors is losing revenue on it. They will probably move along the head walk because that's the only place that they will fit.
Ms. Smith asked if it would be appropriate to ask the person who has expressed interest whether they would be interested in taking it over building the boat shelter.

Mr. Uchytil said that he wanted to make sure it was a fair process. When bids were requested in the past, there was a $500 minimum bid. He said they were looking for direction on how the Board wants to proceed.

Ms. Smith asked if the interested party could go directly to the person who had it.

Mr. Uchytil said that he would have to amend the original agreement because it said that the boat shelter had to be in place by February 2026. He said it was unlikely that the interested party could have a boat shelter built by next February.

Mr. Ridgway said he did own a boat house, and he said it was about $180 a month for his boat, which is about a fifth to a quarter more than what he'd pay for a slip. He said it was a reasonable fee, and he would like to move forward to give Mr. Uchytil some directions.

c. Public Comment-None

d. Board Discussion/Action

MR. RIDGEWAY MADE THE MOTION TO RE-SOLICIT APPLICATIONS FOR RIGHT TO MAINTAIN BOAT SHELTER AG22/23 AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed unanimously.

I. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

3. Community Development Department (CDD) Invitation for Board Participation in the Comprehensive Plan

a. Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil said that the Community Development Department is looking to redo the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan was last adopted in 2013 and drives all land decisions. It's an important document that the Assembly would like a Board member to participate in the future development of our community. The 2013 comprehensive plan didn't advance Docks and Harbor's vision, but the Assembly would like someone who would participate and create a vision for what areas of town would be developed first. He said he would send out a link to the Board so that they can look at it and urged members to participate if they could.

a. Board Discussion/Public Comment

Ms. Smith said she was interested in attending the Douglas planning meeting if Mr. Uchytil would resend the time and date to her.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the comprehensive plan would move Docks and Harbors plans forward.

Mr. Uchytil said that it doesn't hurt to attend. The comprehensive plan is usually a huge document. It's a visionary document that advances all the communities' needs, so they are looking for good participation.

Mr. Hamilton asked if this was an open process and that Board members could participate or was this a formal request for participation.

Mr. Uchytil said they were not looking for a liaison, rather they are looking for a Board member to be involved.

b. Board Discussion/Public Comment-

Ms. Hall said that she pulled up the web page and said that there is registration for the next round of Juneau Futures Public Workshops and it was described as an interactive workshop where participants step in to the role of a city planner. There will be one at the Valley Public Library, January 8, 2026, at the Douglas Library on the 12th and on January 22nd at the Generation Southeast Family Learning Center. It says on the website that space is limited so for people to register.

Mr. Uchytil said that it is a multi-year plan so that it's to bring people together to reinvest in different areas of Juneau. They do control who's participating in these types of plans and the workshops are one phase of a multi-phase process to update the comprehensive plan.

4. **Review of Docks & Harbors Previous Marine Services Planning Efforts**

a. Presentation by Port Engineer

Mr. Sill said that there was a request for a Marine Services facilities presentation. He pulled many studies on the topic to present. He broke these up into formal studies which produce documents that can generate informal discussions and talked to owners to see if they had any plans for the future of that property. In 1988, the fisherman's terminal was built in collaboration between CBJ and was at the time, University of Alaska Juneau. In 2006, Trick-Nyman-Hayes consultant was working on some designs for Aurora Harbor, and they presented a master plan for the fisheries terminal area which included some expansion. There was an RFP put out for a formal analysis of different marine services facilities. The two main concepts that were presented in 2007. These were the University of Alaska boatyard expansion and a Norway Point boat yard. Trick-Nyman-Hayes was purchased by URS and there was a second phase of the project in 2011 which looked at two additional sites for marine facilities, one at the Auke Bay loading facility and another at Statter Harbor Boatyard. Auke Bay loading facility would go on to what it is today. We had built the facility, but it was essentially an empty parking lot, so it became a working loading facility. The Statter Boat Harbor was an attempt to replace the old, but that plan didn't go anywhere and so we expanded the Passenger for Hire facility in space instead. In 2017, we asked PND to look at the possibility of putting together a Marine Service Center at the Little Rock Dump and to put together the Downtown Harbor Upland Master Plan which showed a polished boatyard at Norway Point. Essentially the plan took out the boatyard at the University which expanded the crane dock and then there were additional services for the fishing industry, but it removed the boatyard aspect of it. Docks and Harbors also have some property down by the Thane Ore House which is flat and somewhat close to the ocean. The Smith Brothers property, which is a barge landing near DIPAC was also discussed but most of that is owned outright and they have plans for that. Each of the slides, in the Marine Services background, were reviewed in the presentation and can be found here: https://juneau.org/harbors/projects

b. Board Discussion/Public Comment:

Discussion generated by what type of business entity was the Yacht Club.

Mr. Uchytil responded that the Yacht club has a long-term (35 or 55 year) lease from us as the building is on our land. The land lease will expire in 2035. He was not sure if they were a 501c (3) and wasn't sure what their incorporation was. They have an agreement with the city as they meet a community need. There is a connection between the Yacht Club and the Youth Sailing Club.

Discussion focused on the Thane Ore House and the lease with Tlingit and Haida for a cultural immersion center.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the AGT Properties sub-lease through Tlingit and Haida went through the Board.

Mr. Uchytil said he didn't know for certain. He didn't know if sub-leasing the property had to come to the Board for action.

Mr. Sooter asked if we required a permit to sub-lease.

Mr. Uchytil said he would have to look at the lease agreement and said he didn't know.

Mr. Ridgway said he remembered the RFP process for selecting a leaser as they were looking for the best entity to provide a benefit to Juneau. Tlingit and Haida came before the Board with some architectural drawings and after much debate amongst the Board members, then they allowed CCFR to do a practice burn. In the interim they found an oil leak and had to clean that up. He said they spent more money on the property than they have recouped. He said there's a clause in the lease that if the leaser doesn't do anything with the property after a few years, then Docks and Harbors could cancel the lease. The place sits underutilized and he thought it was time for the Board to reconsider the lease with this property.

Mr. Leither asked whether there was waterfront access there at the Thane Ore House Property.

Mr. Sill said the land around it is DNR (Department of Natural Resources) and thought that the city could make an argument for DNR land and request it.

Mr. Ridgway said that he thought the former Board Chair of Docks and Harbors was very interested in the idea of the land and access to the waterfront.

Ms. Smith asked if this property lease and the ability to acquire the rest of the land from DNR should be put on the Ops and Planning Committees Agenda.

Board members thought that should be addressed at the next Board meeting.

Ms. Smith asked if she could get a copy of the power point for future reference.

Mr. Hamilton asked staff to speak about their relationship with the UAS.

Mr. Uchytil said that they have a great relationship with the Chancellor at UAS and the lease goes until 2027. He suspected that the UAS will say that they want to consolidate all their facilities at the Auke Bay campus. They don't have money to move, and they don't like their programs spread out. He didn't think their Anchorage lands division of the University would be able to engage in any decisions regarding their property as they are tasked with generating money on the real estate and investments that the University owns.

Mr. Hamilton asked if Docks and Harbors would be able to get the university to engage in a property discussion to house the new Aurora office with the use of some of the Marine Passenger Fees.

Mr. Sooter said that he thought they could go through the Assembly to get back on Board with a discussion to delegate money for that purpose.

Ms. Smith said there was a lack of trust in dealings in the past with the university.

Mr. Orr asked if the staff had any idea of how much money they would want for the property and whether we could buy it.

Mr. Uchytil said that Horan and Associates appraised the land 5 years ago at $8.8M for about 8 acres about 5 years back.   He said that the independent body, University of Alaska Lands, thinks that the land is valuable and that is their main objective. He said the only suitable purchaser for that land is the city.

Mr. Leither asked he'd like to see the City buy the land but reminded the Board that Goldbelt was just asking to buy our land and the Board wanted the right price. He felt that the Board as well as the University may be doing this out of financial responsibility.

Ms. Smith asked the amount that we are leasing from the university.

Mr. Uchytil responded that for the first 33 years of the lease, starting in 1988, Docks and Harbors paid about $10,000 a year, and that was because the city fronted $500,00 for the Egan Library. That was a sweetheart deal that has now expired. We now pay about 9% of $3 million dollars which is $240,000 a year, which is the fair market value for the land, but we were able to negotiate that amount to $100,00 with all the internships and deals with Eaglecrest and extras such as snow removal. The $100,000 is 4-year extension to the lease.

Ms. Smith said we don't know when the lease was up or what amount the University would be looking to charge for that property. She reminded the Board that this will come up in the next year or two and they should be thinking about that.

Mr. Ridgway said he remembered in 2007 the Board offering to buy the land for $8 million dollars to the UAS Board of Regents but asked staff what the consequences would be if the city walked away from the lease. He said we need to plan and start talking about the 2027 lease agreement and what the Board can do. He gave compliments to the staff for negotiating the price to $100,000.

Mr. Hamilton had a follow-up comment that the Board doesn't always address the marine services yard in Juneau. He wanted to know where the Board's values were.

Mr. Uchytil responded that Docks and Harbors has always talked about a marine services yard, but it doesn't seem to be a funding priority.

Mr. Leither asked if they wanted to do a feasibility study on the Thane Ore House property, what would that look like?

Mr. Sill responded he thought it would cost about $50,000.

Mr. Ridgway asked whether a conversation has taken place with City Land Managers about what other land is available.

Mr. Sill said that we control most of CBJ's water-adjacent lands and there has not been a direct conversation with CBJ lands.

Mr. Sooter said that more discussion would be needed on this in the future.

Ms. Hall said that the University is expanding their programs that they're offering to the high school. They're bringing back the CAN course so she thought that it would be to their advantage with the workforce shortages to have more programs targeted for high school students. She said there was a community-wide need for having it adjacent to a high school, so she asked the Board to keep that in mind.

J. STAFF, COMMITTEE, AND MEMBER REPORTS

Ms. Hall's report:

- Board Retreat was held December 5th, and they are grappling with the new fiscal reality. They're going to be starting a public outreach for input on where they should adjust.
- The Alaska Municipal League Annual Winter Conference was held after their retreat in Anchorage and they had some workshops and met people from around the state.
- Last Monday they had a regular meeting that covered many agenda items.
- December 17th, the Assembly met with the Human Resource Committee and filled 3 new seats on the Planning Commission and had 3 incumbents at Bartlett Hospital and with 2 seats being filled. They have had some good candidates for those forums and there was a good turnaround with Bartlett from one year ago.

Ms. Smith asked about fiscal cuts in the City budget and how they would affect Docks and Harbors projects. Mr. Uchytil said that they are fiscally responsible and are not in the same category as departments in the general fund. Docks and Harbors use an enterprise funding source. Ms. Hall said that they don't know what the loss of food sales particularly will do as they begin to develop the budget. The City has some investments that did well and that helps to cushion the blow in the first year of the budgetary process. The Assembly is taking a moderate approach, and they are hoping to get public input as cuts are made.

Mr. Creswell's report:

- Cold temperatures have dictated the staff's jobs for the past 12 days. The wind had blown much of the snow away and Douglas had been dealing with the heaviest winds. They have had a couple of boats break loose. Staff made constant rounds every 2 hours to keep boats secure. A boat on a trailer in storage in Douglas was whipped by the wind and pushed into two other boats on trailers. Out the road, the snow's too deep and staff are working diligently to keep areas clear. Staff have been working to keep heat traces running so that there is water on the docks for all customers, and primarily those who are liveaboards. There's also been some issues with power receptacles when people are using all their power cords for heat. Downtown is getting windier than Auke Bay and a high wind adviser will be ongoing through next Tuesday.
- Regulation changes – more information will follow by January or February 2026. A lot of it is updating language.
- New Loader in the downtown harbors – the new Volvo arrived. Staff love it as they have got chains on the wheels and they can push. The old loader will go on to public surplus site.

- Public Surplus – there are 4 boats up for auction and those close on January 2nd. These boats are supposed to do a sea trial within 3 days or 72 hours of the sale.
- All Hand Meeting – our monthly meeting was held today and the CBJ culture survey was covered. They also covered lockout tagout training.
- Power cords – 20 & 30- amp marine power cords were ordered. They will be sold at 10% above the cost at Harbor offices. If a transient boat needs power, it's cheaper to get them from the Harbor office than for them to go out and buy one at $135.
- Christmas party – Saturday, December 21, 2025, at DIPAC.

Discussion focused on whether the Docks and Harbors needed a new boat. Mr. Creswell said that Docks and Harbors have a 32-foot Munson landing craft that is suitable for their needs. That is the boat that they use for going on longer trips like down to Taku Harbor. Staff take it down there 3 times a year to pressure wash and clean and weed whack that area.

Ms. Smith asked if Docks and Harbors do anything to keep boats from sinking. Mr. Creswell said that she perhaps was referring to a Facebook post. The boat referred to has been derelict and requires staff to pump out water and need a lot of work. He said that when a boat is in danger of sinking, the staff go in and do whatever it takes to keep a vessel from sinking. In their regulations, they have the authority to do so. Ms. Smith asked if we charged to take care of boats at risk of sinking. Mr. Creswell said that boat owners are given one grace period and on the second and third, they are charged for staff labor. The fourth time, according to regulations, they declare that the vessel is a nuisance. That gives the customer an opportunity to come forward and say why it's not a nuisance.

Mr. Sill's report:

- Aurora Harbor – all the light poles are up, and the electricians are working hard to get power up. Harri plumbing, the mechanical contractor, will be in after the new year to install the water and fire system.
- Statter Harbor, Phase 3 - the uplands improvement project is shut down for the moment due to weather. There's still a bit of concrete left to pour. There's a small patch job that they have heaters on but if the weather warms up, they will continue poring and do some railing work.
- Statter Roof Project – is done except for a small punch list. They will need to install a gutter around the outside and there's a few cometic things needed to complete that project.
- Taku Harbor, the new gangways are in town and most of the materials for the project are here. That project will be worked on in the spring. There will be some repair details for the Stockade Point Float for replacing the bull rails, which are the main structural components of the floats. There's a beam that runs underneath the tip of the deck and then there's the bull rails and a joint at both locations. That's where the failure is at that pinned joint. Our solution was to replace the bull rails and remove the joint. The contractor will give us a price on the that detail to patch the float.
- Seawalk - met with Tourism Director and PND Engineers today to discuss the sea walk from the Franklin Dock to the Rock Dump. There are some complicated property issues in that area, but the project is moving forward.

- Deputy Engineer – Docks and Harbors has been trying to hire a Deputy Engineer for some time and are in the process of offering that part-time position to an interested engineer. It's a .0.25 position which means they can only work 500 hours.
- Statter Breakwater Drilling – a draft contract was turned over to the Law Department yesterday to do geotechnical work for the drilling project in front of the Statter Harbor Breakwater. This is work that they do to work in kind with the Corp of Army Engineers for $1.4 million. The project includes drilling 6 holes and collecting all the samples. The Army Corp of Engineers is probably not going to want all 6 holes so it may be less than that, but they already designated the money and Docks and Harbors has the money to match that amount. An RFP has gone out and been awarded. They would like to have the term contractor collect the geotechnical data and have the drillers do the drilling for us.
- Port camera project – internet and power are being investigated for new cameras throughout the port including the Franklin Dock. One million dollars has been designated for that from head taxes.
- Alaska Steamship Dock Inspection – a consultant will be hired to look at the old timber dock and that could be a costly project.
- Fisheries Terminal – working with the university to build ladders as some of them predate 1988 and are in rough shape. The new ladders will go on the dock where there's a knuckle-boom crane.
- Little Rock Dump – secure storage projects are getting underway. A slide showed the plan of a flattened area, a fenced area and putting in some lights. They will be advertising the project, and it will be awarded in early February.

Mr. Uchytil reported:

- Last week he presented a letter and he got some feedback. He sent a letter out to the Board today and asked members to email him with comments and then he will forward that on to the city manager and then to the Assembly.
- North Douglas launch ramp expansion – he's begun the process of working on the launch ramp and drafted a letter to DOT for a right of way, saying that we would like to meet with them to discuss. We would like their cooperation as we discussed from the retreat, and we have this ability to get soil samples done this spring.
- AAHPA – we are working with the Alaska Association of Harbormasters and Port Administrators to raise the cap of future harbor grants so that it's raised to $7.5 million.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the current North Douglas included any commercial expansion.

Mr. Uchytil said that moving forward, he would like to present a full package for 100 trucks and trailer parking spots. Docks and Harbors would like to have a seasonal float for charter operators. The biggest footprint could possibly have a commercial aspect. The head tax can be leveraged so that the project will appeal to all user groups.

K. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Next Docks and Harbors Operations and Planning meeting will be held – Wednesday, January 21, 2026

L. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Ridgway to adjourn.

Motion passed unanimously.