



DOCKS AND HARBORS OPERATIONS MEETING MINUTES

October 22, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL: James Becker, Clayton Hamilton, Matt Leither, Nick Orr, Annette Smith, and Shem Sooter.

Absent: Tyler Emerson, Robert Horchover, Mark Ridgway and Nick Orr

Also in Attendance: Carl Uchtyl-Port Director, Leah Narum-Administrative Officer, Matt Creswell-Harbormaster, Matthew Sill-Port Engineer

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES-NONE

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS-NONE

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **August 21, 2025** -Minutes approved unanimously.

F. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

2. US Army Corps of Engineers – Update on Statter Harbor Breakwater Recapitalization

Presentation by Erin Stockdale, Chief Planner for the US Army Corps Alaska District & Michael Rouse, Interim Chief of Civil Works, US Army Corps Alaska District – Ms. Stockdale and Mr. Rouse were here attending the AAHPA Conference, and they also came to report on the Statter Harbor. Ms. Stockdale presented a PowerPoint on the Corps authorization to study the Harbor navigation improvements. The study is cost-shared with Docks and Harbors as well as any construction costs that were found to be of federal interest through the study process. She said Mr. Uchtyl has been advocating for this project since 2016. The Hydraulic Engineering Technical Lead has yet to be determined so they are reaching out to the Army Corps - Seattle District to get that filled. The team has been impacted by the recent federal hiring freeze and overall attrition of the agency.

The project started with the idea of replacing the breakwater. The process of doing that is to come up with a suite of alternatives, so that there is a “no-action” alternative in Juneau if we do nothing. A non-structural alternative, like mariculture, is not feasible but we have to include it to meet Army Corps policy guidelines. Several different kinds of breakwaters, the way they are attached, the size of the basin differs and whether there’s moorage or not is looked at in the whole process. Each Technical Lead in the team looks at the environmental impacts. There are biologists and geotechnicians looking at the cultural resources in the area looking at the costs, how many holes to drill, when can it happen and what does the material down in the Harbor look like. The Army Corps looks at problems, opportunities, objectives and constraints. A planning charrette was completed in Juneau about a year and a half ago to look at the existing problems. Their main objective was the existing protective navigation features, including the floating wave attenuator at Stater Harbor and that is past its design life. When navigation features continue to degrade, they

no longer provide the level of protection required for safe moorage. Insufficient and crowded harbor conditions cause transportation delays and create vessel damages in the harbor. The charrette serves as a guide through the process to check in, address the problems that are within their policies what they are legally allowed to do. Next, the Army Corps looks at their opportunities to address, efficiency of operations, fostering maritime partnerships, improving water quality and long-term community resilience for marine-dependent users and to alleviate large demand areas. Three objectives were given 1) to reduce damages to vessels and harbor infrastructure, 2) reduce transportation and safety delay costs to harbor users, and 3) improve economic conditions for a region. Economists with the Army Corps are looking at how each of the alternatives will address these three objectives. Universal constraints avoid or mitigate for any impacts to historic or cultural resources; avoid or mitigate for any impacts to environmental resources. Study constraints limit the ability to expand existing upland facilities due to natural geography, real estate availability and excessive costs. Planning considerations include the whole navigation system within Auke Bay to avoid negative impacts on other facilities.

The Future Without Project conditions (FWOP) looks at the impact to the region without the project moving forward. The inefficiencies and delays are expected to continue, and costs will continue to accrue. Damage will continue which will affect vessels and infrastructure. Inefficiencies and delays will be driven by harbor congestion and overcrowding. The Army Corps look at, over a period, the costs and how much will be saved and how much value there is in replacing the breakwater to improve the harbor.

The Refined Array of Alternatives looks at: 0) no action 1) non-structural alternative 2) chain-supported floating breakwater and a: with moorage to breakwater b: without moorage to breakwater. The Army Corps doesn't normally permit moorage as this would increase maintenance costs onto the government. A policy exception can be obtained if the Army Corps can prove that the moorage on the outside of the breakwater doesn't contribute to long term, degradation and maintenance costs and it benefits permitting on the outside breakwater. That is why there are the a: with moorage to breakwater and b: without moorage to breakwater to make the case to get a policy exemption and show the incremental changes from moorage and without moorage. 3) pile-supported floating breakwater a: with moorage to breakwater a: with moorage to breakwater b: without moorage to breakwater; b: without moorage at breakwater 4) pile-supported wave barrier and would not provide moorage. It would probably be less costly to construct. 5) chain-supported floating breakwater expansion a: with moorage to breakwater b: without moorage to breakwater 6) pile-supported floating breakwater a: with moorage to breakwater b: without moorage to breakwater 7) pile-supported wave barrier expansion. The Army Corps doesn't know how many vessels a larger basin would accommodate and that is still being determined. Maps were shown of the area. Additional slides showed an overview of each of the disciplines that were being collected to complete the study. This includes teams from economics, engineers, and biologists for environmental resources. Findings included: reduced catch and diversity between summer and fall pot fishing surveys. The ROV survey indicated sediment composition of silt with sand and shell hash which is consistent across all survey areas. For eelgrass, the growth of eelgrass increased. Background sound pressure increased to around 129 decibels over the summer. This is above the 120 decibels harassment threshold which is the acoustic environment for the marine mammals in the area and how the construction phase affects them. The defense strategy would be to shut down zones before marine mammals like harbor seals enter them. Cultural resources: the archaeological team are out doing surveys looking for shipwrecks and other sites of cultural/ historical significance; however, they have had no areas of significant concern.

Schedule, scope and budget were addressed in the slides. Alternative budgets has been approved, and the next tentatively selected plan milestone is set for October 2026. By then they will have figured out which harbor alternative is the best and provides the most benefits for the least amount of money or which is most beneficial to the government and the sponsor, while meeting all the objectives. The Army Corps has the authority to study for the next 4 years and has \$5 million. Alaska is long on cost, short on data that's extremely expensive. The transmittal final report will be coming up in 2027 and the final report in March of 2028. Beyond that, there must be congressional authorization for construction but that is in the study phase. Once this is done, there is a recommended plan to present to Congress for funding.

This Administration is pushing for more certainty and feasibility for design. Traditionally the scope is 10%-15% for design and feasibility, so with the next phase of construction, there's less room for error in terms of estimating the total cost of construction. The new direction is to get 35% design in all the feasibility studies within the constraints of time and money. With this study, the Army Corps had already planned for about 25% design due to the limited project area and the breakwater. This project is designed into the schedule a little bit of a higher level. The next slide showed a potential increase in scope as the team is currently assessing any other information they may need to get to 35% design, which would include additional time or costs. The project is evolving every day, but they are working their hardest.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment:

Ms. Smith asked compared to other Alaskan communities whether the Army Corps thought this project design could accommodate what may happen in the next 20-30 years in Alaska.

Ms. Stockdale answered that the Army Corps builds based on existing waitlists and plans. They must have data to back up the moorage expansion, extra accommodations so then the government won't just come in and build the biggest harbor possible. They plan for the need that is already here, not accommodate the exponential future growth.

Ms. Smith said that there's a lot more interest in the Northern Passage now that it's free of ice, which means there's going to be more of a military interest in Alaska. She asked if an icebreaker might be accommodated here.

Ms. Stockdale replied that that is the job for the Army Corps economics team to justify the military's needs.

Mr. Uchytel added that Docks and Harbors have money in a CIP balance of 2.2 million of our local matched funds, and may add another \$300,000 if it's a \$5 million project for the 50:50 match with the Army Corps. He said next week if all goes well, Docks and Harbors staff will be asking the Board to approve a bid opening for the geotechnical work which would be between \$700,000-\$1.5 million of our local money. That work would be accomplished in the Spring to October 2026.

3. Cruise Ship Underwater Hull Maintenance

Presentation by Mr. Ben Eisenstein (ADEC) – Mr. Uchytel said attached there was a report (page 17 of the packet) from Subsea Global solutions, which is a company that does underwater hull polishing. They remove micro-fouling on ship's hulls. Last year they worked on ships in Juneau. Docks and Harbors had a question from a member of the public asking about underwater cleaning and we answered this information from SUBSEA GLOBAL Solutions. This company uses no chemicals, microfouling organisms, not macrofouling organisms. Docks and Harbors replied that ADEC and EPA Clean Water Act has jurisdiction over this area. A Board Member asked that this information be put on the agenda, and we have Mr. Ben Eisenstein from ADEC to talk with us about this.

Mr. Eisenstein did not give a presentation but wanted to speak to the board about this issue. Mr. Eisenstein said he is the cruise ship Program Manager for the ADEC Water Division. He said Stephanie Montano on the zoom call was from SUBSEA GLOBAL and had given their division a report last April. He said their department doesn't have any authority over this matter. They get their authority from state statutes, or they are called commercial passenger vessel statutes. The state statutes don't say anything about hull cleanings. Vessels, through the EPA, have a general permit for wastewater discharge, specific to wastewater, gray water, and black water. When the State does inspections, they look at hull cleanings, but they have no enforcement over it. The EPA permit came out in 2013 and has a specific section for hull cleaning, and they are responsible for enforcement of this statute.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment:

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Eisenstein to explain the process and asked how other states are handling statutes.

Mr. Eisenstein responded that the vessels are polishing, what they consider microfouling, which is less than 4 millimeters. Polishing with microfouling prevents macrofouling. From the ship's fouling logs they can see macrofouling that was removed during the season. The water that comes out of the process gets filtered and this is discharged. He said essentially it is a kind of slime layer that prevents macrofouling and gives the vessel a better fuel economy.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Uchytel if Docks and Harbors have authority over the kinds of activities that are at our Docks. She said the people of Juneau are concerned about the water and air quality and it does not bode well for the cruise industry.

Mr. Uchytel answered that this question is for the tourism director. This is something that affects the policies with the cruise lines. He said the bigger question would be why we would want to prohibit the cleaning of hulls if this microfouling is done to alleviate macrofouling. The process makes for better operations and less emissions and that will help our docks industry.

Mr. Hamilton said in the packet he read that they could gradually decrease the amount of biocide, does it mean that some steel ships use copper, lead, and zinc?

Ms. Montano spoke saying Carl Lander, their environmental director, was also on the call. Their intention is to add to the Juneau economy and assist the cruise ships. She said they didn't clean vessels in Alaska that have any biocides or toxic ingredients. At the beginning of every season, a list of the ships they are attending to include paint certificates of all the coatings as well as previous reports. Their process is to clean ships thoroughly before they come into Alaska to maintain their micro-filing stage.

Mr. Hamilton asked about the type of brushes used.

Ms. Montano responded that the type of brushes used depends on the type of coating and they do their best to adjust the stiffness of the brush to the coating used. She said that the process does not release any toxicities into the Alaska water or into the environment. The ships that have a self-polishing toxic coating (SPC), they do a prop polish, or inspection, so there's no paint that can be released into the waters.

Ms. Smith said most cruises are 7–10 day cruises and she was wondering how much bottom crud they accrue that must be removed or can it wait until they are in their home port.

Ms. Montano said that ships are regularly maintained. The ships are on a very rigorous cleaning schedule even before they enter Alaska. They are maintaining them once they leave Alaska and before they arrive in New Zealand. The ships are in port for a limited amount of time and during that time they are inspecting sections of the ship.

Mr. Leither asked if the ships were being cleaned before they enter Alaska waters, they're being cleaned.

Ms. Montano said they are cleaned every 2-3 months so that they are cleaned before they enter Alaska waters. She said they are seasonal, every 3 months they get a hull cleaning. Some ships go to Seattle; others go to Vancouver.

Mr. Hamilton asked what the rules are in Seattle and Vancouver for this cleaning.

Ms. Montano responded that they don't do any cleaning in Vancouver except for propeller polishing. In Seattle, they can clean and apply the microfouling on silicone coatings.

Mr. Eisenstein said that in answer to how this is done in other places, like California, they have a marine invasive species department, so it's regulated.

Ms. Smith asked if Mr. Eisenstein was saying Fish and Game was interested in invasive species like the European green crab.

Mr. Eisenstein responded that he's relayed the concern to Fish and Game, however, he has not gotten a response.

Ms. Montano said that every port has different requirements and regulations. She said that reports from the last inspection done before the ship enters the port, showing the

filing condition and the paint certificates. They do due diligence to respect the environment and community and to follow procedures.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Uchytel when he heard about this.

Mr. Uchytel responded probably in July.

Mr. John Melino, of Melino's Marine Services, spoke to the platform of SUBSEA GLOBAL. He asked if they are not allowed to clean the cruise ship bottoms that are silicone-based, what happens to all the other divers and dive companies who are scrubbing boat bottoms and the sluff off from those boats. His company can do this cleaning in Sitka, Ketchikan but not in Juneau and he said that didn't make sense.

Mr. Hamilton said that he was a crabber, and he said he is personally invested in this topic. He said he's been asked about this by members of the public

Mr. Carl Lander, the Environmental Services Director of SUBSEA GLOBAL said the global shipping industry, particularly at the cruise ship level, is heavily regulated on the coatings that they can use. They are prohibited from using any lead-based paints and have been for over 20 years or more. There are still biocidal paints that contain varying degrees of copper and zinc, and they work closely with coating manufacturers and ship owners to ensure that they are using the correct materials. As they review and submit the anti-fouling certificates they look for Tributyltin coatings which are the previous generation of biocides which have significant legacy impacts that are released into the water. Those have been banned for many years, and they watch closely that no residuals are released into the water. They also work closely with the coating manufactures on cleaning technologies, including the life cycle testing of cleaning brushes to ensure that they are not damaging the coating and release of paint, toxic or not, into the water. He said this is a global leadership role they play to stay on front edge of all the technology. Regarding the biology and invasive species concern, cleaning at the microfouling stage alone is critical to the prevention of the spread of invasive species. The microfouling does start reappearing on the ship as a biofilm within hours after cleaning. The biofilm doesn't become visible for a week or two depending on the water quality, water temperature, sunlight etc. but it does return. He said their approach is to ensure that they're clean to begin with and do the macrofouling cleaning in jurisdictions where it is allowed. They maintain the ship by gentle, soft, polishing, so they are not spreading species. It does take some frequency to do this procedure, sometimes once a week. He said Mr. Eisenstein gave an overview of the procedures of other western states' policies and that is the direction that the EPA and Coast Guard are moving towards, as well as internationally. With the support of scientists globally, the cleaning of microfouling through gentle means without damaging the coating is the most environmentally friendly way to ensure ships' performance and minimize invasive species spread.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Melino how he would balance what the anti-cruise ship wants with no impact on the environment and how his business can thrive with these stipulations.

Mr. Melino replied that his company acted at the right time, with the right opportunity. It's important for his small business to do everything that SUBSEA GLOBAL is doing without

polluting and it helps the environment and small businesses like his. He employs six people. He said his question was, if his business can do this with Sitka, Hoonah, Ketchikan, why can't they do it in Juneau? If they are not allowed to do this in the Juneau harbors, then he said he doesn't think any other diving company should be allowed to go underneath any boat in any harbor that does sluff off paint.

Mr. Leither thanked the public for the good discussion and asked that they move on to the next agenda item.

4. CBJ Legislative Priorities List - D&H Board Input

Presentation by Port Director: Mr. Uchytel referred to page 90 of the packet which addresses the FY2027 CBJ Legislative Capital Priority List and the request for feedback needed by Friday October 24, 2025. Included is a list of 20 legislative priorities. This is a process where the city can communicate with our elected officials, both state and federal, and say as a Board, these are our projects which we would like to prioritize. Last year, our priorities were the breakwater and the drive-down float. The drive-down float is off the table because funding has been secured. On page 104 of the packet, Statter Harbor Wave Attenuator remains, as we are keeping that as a priority because we need the federal delegation to keep track of it. Page 105 of the packet indicates the shore power for the 16B cruise ship docks. On page 109 is the Juneau Douglas City Museum which is along the waterfront, so even though it's not a Docks and Harbor project, it is along the Seawalk and provides oversight. On page 111 is the North Douglas boat ramp expansion which the city had added years ago. The question before the Board is, what two projects would you like to say these are our legislative priorities?

Committee Discussion/Public Comment:

Mr. Leither asked whether the two active projects were what the Director and staff felt were most important.

Mr. Uchytel responded that Statter Harbor should still stay on as a priority and it is his recommendation that the North Douglas boat ramp expansion is a good one to add for visibility. Mr. Uchytel stated if the Board wanted to, they could add a new project.

Mr. Sooter, Mr. Becker and Ms. Smith agreed to the need for the North Douglas boat ramp expansion.

Mr. Leither asked for clarification on what Mr. Uchytel would like from the Board.

Mr. Uchytel responded that according to the memo, CBJ Boards and Commissions are invited to provide input on their top two projects they would like to see on the list by Friday, October 24th. He said ideally, they would have had a retreat or a special meeting to explore their priority of projects. If there is consensus to his suggestions, he will send an email to the Public Works & Engineering Director saying the Board would like to keep the breakwater project and add the North Douglas Expansion boat ramp expansion project.

Mr. Hamilton said he wanted to see a drive-down dock for a lightweight truck. He said he wants to see more waterfront access for locals, and water taxis for people who sell fish in the downtown area.

Mr. Leither asked that Mr. Hamilton provide a proposal as he thought that is what they are doing at Aurora with the drive down float. He said that that proposal should come from Mr. Hamilton first before staff devote time and energy to doing it.

Ms. Smith said this is a perfect discussion to have at the retreat where the Board builds a list of priority projects and looks at what they can get funding for. She encouraged Mr. Hamilton to put together a list of his priorities.

Mr. Hamilton said he hasn't given up on this board process yet. He said he saw that we didn't get the anode in Aurora Harbor. He said from attending the AAHPA conference how stressful preventative maintenance of harbors is, but that he wants to see the board work on things that people ask for.

5. Board Planning, Retreat Goals and Organizational Improvements

Presentation by Port Director: Mr. Uchtyl said a doodle poll was sent out to all the Board members for an all-day Saturday retreat. The dates listed for attendance were October 18, or November 15. Seven of the nine Board members responded that the 15th of November said that would be the best date for the retreat. Mr. Uchtyl said that there was a possibility of splitting it into two 3-hour sessions, like on a Tuesday and Thursday so everyone on the Board could attend.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment:

Mr. Leither asked if Board members were open to 3- or 4-hour sessions.

Ms. Smith said she preferred a full day.

Mr. Leither said he could make it work if the rest of the board were to agree to a full Saturday.

Mr. Leither asked that they set the date for the retreat for November 15.

Mr. Uchtyl said that he felt there was fundamental distrust between the board and the staff, but he felt that it could be addressed at the retreat. He said that he felt that the Board needs to share where they are going as Board members and that a frank discussion is necessary.

Mr. Hamilton requested a closed executive session at the beginning of the retreat.

Mr. Uchtyl responded that it was not possible without a reason to have a private meeting with the Board without staff to hear what you want to say to them. An executive session is if there are issues regarding financial or personnel issues that could jeopardize Docks and Harbors.

Mr. Leither asked whether Mr. Uchtyl had someone in mind who may be a facilitator.

Mr. Uchytel said if you bring a facilitator in it could take some time to bring them up to speed as to what the Board is trying to do, what Docks and Harbors mission is and what their goals are.

Mr. Leither said that the facilitator could be beneficial to look at the personality and the teamwork aspect. He said he felt that a facilitator may resolve some of the conflict and that staff are not feeling valued.

Mr. Sooter said that if the Board can talk across the table amicably and everyone respects what he as the Chair says about when you can speak and when you shouldn't. He said he felt he could keep a pretty good rein on the meeting. The Board needs to work together through all the issues out on the table for the good of the community.

Ms. Smith said in the past if there's changes that they would like to see that is what is communicated to staff.

Mr. Becker said that that 2-3 Board members can't get together for an executive session to talk about and issue and try to work out a compromise.

Mr. Leither said that it is not legally allowed under the Open Meetings Act.

Mr. Hamilton pointed out page 8 of the August meeting minutes. He said he was not present at this meeting but quoted "other issues that may lead to an executive session would be judicial matters, appeal decisions, whether the board is considering strategies." He said he doesn't know what the Board is trying to do.

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Uchytel if at the next Board meeting a legal advisor would be available to discuss this issue.

Mr. Sill said Alaska statute offers four reasons for entering executive session. (1) if these matters have an adverse effect on the finances of a public entity. (2) subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation or character of any person with the provision that the person involved may request a public discussion instead. (3) matters that are required to be kept confidential by law, municipal charter or ordinance. (4) matters involving the consideration of government records that are kept confidential.

Mr. Sooter said any Board member can reach out by email or phone call to the Law department at any time.

Mr. Leither said that it sounds like at the retreat Mr. Sooter can run the meeting and lead the discussion within the confines of that discussion and if the Board abides by his leadership. He asked if Mr. Uchytel wanted a facilitator or someone from the Law department, the Board would support that. According to what Mr. Sill said, there was no rationale to enter executive session.

Mr. Uchytel said he would meet with Mr. Sooter and begin planning for Saturday, November 15th with no facilitator. The public would be given notice, and it is welcome to come.

6. Goldbelt Seadrome Property Request

Presentation by Port Director: Mr. Uchytel said he had hoped a representative from Goldbelt would be in attendance. Page 11 shows the existing property lines which would make it tight to put a drive-down float in the area. On page 120, which is if we sold our property to Goldbelt. The purchasing price is \$630,000 based on the March appraisal. Mr. Ridgway asked the Board to look at the appraisal done in 2022 which is on page 158 and 159 of the packets. This was early in the negotiations with Goldbelt. This was a proposed land swap where the values of the property were equivalent, so no money would be transferred. Figure 1.4 on page 158, the yellow piece that looks like Oklahoma about 20 feet, which doesn't have access to Egan. Which is what Docks and Harbors would receive. That land swap equates to \$408,00 of property being transferred between us. In November this will come up at the Ops meeting and a Goldbelt will be there to discuss.

Mr. Hamilton asked if that amount was after the Assessor interjected the swap proposal? The initial and swap appeared to be a lot wider.

Mr. Uchytel had explained that there was never a motion to swap land back when this topic arose in about October of 2022. Goldbelt's Board was never interested in a land swap and backed out. Two years later Goldbelt wanted to strike another deal, but it has never come to fruition.

Mr. Beckers said at that time he recalled the Board took a vote and said you can have the whole thing and we'll take the money. There was no agreement on how much money, but he believed that they were interested in paying the higher amount.

Ms. Smith said she recalled the amount they wanted to pay was not higher than the appraisal.

Mr. Hamilton said this came up because Mr. Ridgway returned to the board and he had a recollection of the square footage for the swap. The original proposal on page 157 is the green and the red zones. He said he would vote against anything unless the whole board was present for the boat.

Mr. Uchytel clarified that on page 156 that green is the square foot per square foot transfer. The discussion led to not all the property is the same, the tideland is of less value. It would be cleaner if one owner managed all the land.

G. STAFF, COMMITTEE, AND MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Sill reported:

- Aurora Harbor Phase IV: Aurora has a big crane barge working on the approach dock. It was completed a couple of days ago. There are new handrails and decking. The approach dock is on the north end down by the Yacht club. Today they floated in the whole head walk in one piece. That piece parallels Egan drive. Western Marine is gearing up all their equipment for drilling the piles. There's bedrock at the location, so they'll be drilling into the bedrock to pin the head walk in place.

- Statter Harbor Phase IIID: Statter parking area was paved by SECON over the weekend. Prior to that, Dawson construction got all the concrete curbs and gutters done before they poured the asphalt. The consultants we hired helped us out with the schedule thinking that it would be done in the Spring of 2026, but Dawson got it done. The remainder of the job is a little plaza area next to the restrooms that need to be paved with concrete, and an area of the sea walk that hangs over the rock wall. There's also an area between the restrooms and the launch/kayak ramp that has yet to pour with concrete. Dawson is making tremendous progress. There will be some landscaping that will be done in the spring.
- Statter Harbor Office Roof: Dawson is in the process of replacing the roof on the Statter Harbor office. There have been some water incursions as they pulled off the roof and put on the new roof, but other than that there are no major issues.
- Drive Down Float Public Meeting: Docks and Harbors had a meeting on their drive down float at Aurora. PND gave a presentation on the 35% of the plans and what work has been done to date. Morris Engineering Group gave a brief presentation on the electrical systems, lighting systems and Docks and Harbors solicited comments from the public. Drawings of the plans were laid out, and they are in the process of taking comments and seeing if they're reasonable to incorporate into the plans.

Mr. Hamilton asked who to put comments in when referring to the plans.

Mr. Sill referred Mr. Hamilton to his email address on the flyer to make comments. He said he could put the comment page on the PDF if Mr. Hamilton thought that would be helpful.

Mr. Uchytel asked what level of review the Board wants going forward with the drive down float. Mr. Uchytel explained that staff could bring the project up every month and review it. He said there was an email where there may be concerns from the board that they don't want the project at all so that should be brought forward as soon as possible. If the project was to be cancelled, it should be cancelled before staff puts much more time into it.

Mr. Sooter asked that at next week's Board meeting they not devote a whole lot of time on it but wanted to keep Board members abreast of what is happening on this topic.

Ms. Smith said that now that they've got the 35% plan for the project that if there are any major changes this is the time to make them. She said she would not like to stop this project from moving forward.

Mr. Sill clarified that they need 35% of the drawing to move on to the environmental process through NEPA. Docks and Harbors is not allowed to proceed until NEPA has concluded the grant requirement and the money comes through. NEPA is primarily concerned with the design and how the pilings are going in before they allow the permit

to go through. Once the permitting comes through, Mr. Sill said that was a plus for getting the project to one hundred percent.

Ms. Smith asked if there was concern that our potential users don't have enough notice or information to make comments and look at the drawing.

Mr. Sooter said no. He said he thought it was well-communicated and that PND and the Port Engineer, Mr. Sill, did a good job of informing the communities through all the available channels and saw many community members there.

Mr. Hamilton said he was an active fisherman. He said that every fisherman he has talked to that they didn't know it was happening and they don't think it's in the right place. He would like to see a more robust outreach regarding an expenditure of this magnitude to every harbor user so that they had the opportunity to comment. He said regarding the yellow cranes, and they would be used in the future. When Mr. Nelson, who attended the public meeting, asked about them at the public meeting, he said he got the sense that that was not actually a priority goal and that it would be a rather major policy shift. He said that his opinion is not a replacement for the pier. The cranes and being able to put crab gear there and being able to get boom trucks in and out easily and quickly, it's not going to be replaced by a drive down float that only has two cranes, that is 200 feet and it's not going to work.

Mr. Uchytel responded that Docks and Harbors has pivoted from our grant projects to go to the crane dock because it is UA property. He said Docks and Harbors still want to build something that supports the commercial fishermen. He said he felt if Docks and Harbors ever receives a long-term lease for the UA property then they could redevelop that area. Currently, Docks and Harbors have a year-to-year lease, and they don't own the land.

Mr. Hamilton said do the yellow cranes cost Docks and Harbors anything? They were paid many years ago and said Docks and Harbor gets \$400,000 a year from fish landings. He asked why Docks and Harbors want to spend more money on things. He apologized for being out of line but wanted to express his sentiment.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Hamilton whether he used the breakwater dock in Douglas Harbor. She asked if it would be more useful if there were a drive down ramp for trucks.

Mr. Hamilton yes it would be beneficial, and he said he felt many of the fishermen would use a drive down.

Mr. Sooter said you would absolutely have to put another breakwater in there to protect the ramp.

Mr. Leither said there was a wide sentiment to halt this project. He said the Board has been discussing this for years and he feels that people in the community have heard

about it. He said he felt it was not fair to say that a project that's already in planning stage would need to move somewhere else.

Ms. Smith said she would like to see the Douglas Harbor improvement go on the CIP list for discussion at the retreat. She suggested the Douglas Advisory Committee pursue support and funding for this project.

Mr. Hamilton asked to speak to Mr. Leither's comment saying that the Board hasn't spent money until they have spent the money. He called it a lost cost fallacy.

Mr. Leither said Docks and Harbors has a grant and many people are putting money into this project, \$15 million, that the staff has done a lot of work on.

Mr. Hamilton responded that he was not trying to contest the merits of this project. He said the Board cannot handcuff to the project. He said there is more conversation that needs to go on.

Ms. Smith said that they have the funding to build this specific project and if the Board decides not to build it, then Docks and Harbors would lose that funding. All the money paid to PND for their design work will be gone. She said she saw the project as not being perfect but it's better than nothing.

Mr. Hamilton said he wished it could be brought back up at the retreat but said he felt it was already moving forward.

MR. CRESWELL REPORTED:

- Aurora Harbor Recycling: There was question about battery and metal recycling in Aurora Harbor about two years ago. During this time the harbor received an insane amount of refrigerators for metal recycling which cost the harbor \$160 per refrigerator to move them to the landfill. The costs were then spread to harbor customers. Signs were put up saying scrap metal only but that didn't stop people from putting in things like refrigerators, bicycles, etc. It became obvious that this was household metal waste. The recycling became too expensive, so Docks and Harbors now take metal recycling and batteries if someone comes to the office with those items. For the batteries, there was a significant battery acid spill that was a result of vandalism to the batteries left overnight at the battery recycling center, so they took that away. They do, however, accept old batteries. Both scrap metal and batteries are accepted. Mr. Creswell said that there would be better signage in the future to indicate they take scrap metal and batteries upon request. Mr. Creswell said they work with hazardous waste and because of work with those city departments they take all the used motor oil for free. The oil is shipped out of Statter Harbor primarily because we don't have a burner out there. Previously, that price was ballooning over \$4 per gallon for used oil. The one caveat is that we must provide our own containers. Mr. Norbryhn has got good deals on 275-gallon refurbished ISO totes. They also work with local repair shops to access good 55-

gallon drums to fill those and take to household hazardous waste. The cost estimate has decreased to \$1.50-\$1.75 a gallon. Mr. Creswell said it would be problem to have this service in every harbor as it takes staff hours to monitor the filling of the ISO totes. He also said that hazardous waste will not take any bilge water.

- Douglas Harbor: In May, a bid process was proposed to have the Douglas Harbor lot completely graded and resurfaced with D1. There was no interest from local contractors. They continued to talk with the city to come in and repave, but they didn't have the capacity to come in and do it. Docks and Harbors continued to talk to contractors. Mr. Sooter and Mr. Creswell looked at the scope of the job and finally got a local contractor to look at the project. The contractor wouldn't give a bid but said it would be more than \$100,000 and he couldn't get to it this season. They asked him to decrease the scope and simply to grade it. They were never able to get a bid, so they reached out to SE Earthmovers, the paving contractor from Statter Harbor, who were finally able to meet with Ms. Thrower last week. Docks and Harbors is hoping to hear from him this week. Mr. Creswell said he was frustrated with the process, but it was not for lack of trying. He said at this point it was pointless with the snow coming. He said he would be working with Mr. Sill to find a more permanent plan to work with a grader, catch basins to ease into a mid-Spring project. Mr. Uchytel added that Mr. Scott Gray, City Streets Superintendent, was invited to attend but was unable to attend tonight's Board meeting. Mr. Uchytel said he would invite him to the next board meeting.
- Statter Harbor: Water on float D at the Breakwater is scheduled to be turned off next Thursday, October 30th. This will go out to the public through posting and Facebook to give everyone heads up. Liveboards are moving into winter hot berths on floats A and B.
- End of Season staff: Nearly all the seasonal staff have taken off for the winter except for two people at the Port Field Office are working on winterization of water and gray water systems. They are working on end of season evaluations and wishing staff a good winter break.

MR. UCHYTIL REPORTED:

- AAHPA Conference: Staff have been engaged in the conference all week.
- Board Meeting on October 30, 2025: Mr. Uchytel was hoping to have active participation in next week's Board Meeting and said he and Mr. Sooter were working on getting some ideas together for the Board retreat. SEAWWA, the Southeast Whale Watching Association, will be presenting next week. Also on the agenda, there will be a showing of the 35% of the Drive Down float at Aurora as an information item.

H. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

- Next Board Meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 30, 2025

I. ADJOURNMENT BY MR. LEITHER AT 1900