DOCKS AND HARBORS OPERATIONS MEETING MINUTES

November 12, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

A. CALL TO ORDER – MEETING BEGAN AT 5:04 PM

B. ROLL CALL: Tyler Emerson, Nick Orr, Mark Ridgway, Robert Horchover, Jame Becker (at 5:20pm), Annette Smith, Shem Sooter, and Clayton Hamilton (at approximately 5:45 pm).

Absent: Matt Leither.

Also in attendance: Carl Uchytil-Port Director, Leah Narum-Administrative Officer, John Hollingsworth-Marine Exchange of Alaska, Jordan Boghosian-Marine Exchange of Alaska, Zane Smith-MRV Architects

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES - NONE

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - NONE

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **October 22. 2025** Minutes approved unanimously.

F. ITEMS FOR ACTION

2. **Resolution of Support for full funding of the FY27 ADOT Harbor Facility Grant**

Presentation by Port Director:

Mr. Uchytil presented on page 17 of the packet a draft resolution urging full funding of the ADOT Harbor Facility grant in fiscal year 2027 within the State Capital Budget. The resolution if passed by the Board will go to the Assembly for approval. The resolution is drafted annually and is sponsored by the Alaska Association of Harbormasters and Port Administrators (AAHPA). All Alaska city councils or assemblies are encouraged to approve a similar resolution, which says that the Alaska municipal harbor program is a good program and they want the legislature to fully fund the requested $18,200,000. This allows the AAHPA to lobby with elected officials in support of this program. CBJ Docks and Harbors has been successful in this program over the years. Although we don't have a project this year, it's important for the many harbor communities who have projects, Anchorage, Kake, Kodiak, Petersburg, Wrangell, to request support the program. He said the $18,200,000 was the biggest application request that he has seen and thought there is no chance of getting any of that money this year into the budget. It's still important for the association to lobby every February and tell elected officials they want funding in the future.

Board Questions:

Mr. Ridgway asked whether the majority of the public boat harbors in Alaska were constructed by the State during the 1960s.

Mr. Uchytil answered most of the harbors were built by the State of Alaska. When the State had money, they built harbors. Both the Aurora and Harris harbor were built by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Public Comment: -NONE

Board Discussion/Action:

MR. RIDGEWAY MADE THE MOTION: TO RECOMMEND THAT THE ASSEMBLY ADOPT A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU URGING FULL FUNDING ($18,186,535) FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA MUNICIPAL HARBOR FACILITY GRANT PROGRAM IN THE FY 2027 STATE CAPITAL BUDGET. - Motion passed unanimously.

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

Presentation by Port Director:

Mr. Uchytil said that this was a resolution that the AAHPA has been urging for the past 3 years. The ADOT Municipal Harbor grant has a cap of $5 million per harbor per year. Like his last presentation, Juneau has been the most active harbor system in getting those monies. The program was set up in 2006 to encourage municipalities to take over State harbor facilities. At that time the maximum amount was set at $5 million dollars. The association is asking for an increase based on inflation to $7.5 million. The Alaska Association of Harbormasters and Port Administrators is asking that communities approve this resolution that was drafted by the association. . If it is approved, it will be sent to the Assembly for consideration. He said this resolution would help with future projects such as the Statter breakwater project, which is a DOT municipal harbor grant eligible project as it is a floating breakwater. By increasing the funds to $7.5 million then the legislature is encouraged to allocate the money at a higher amount.

Board Questions:

Mr. Ridgway asked if on page 19 of the packet whether it should read, “Now therefore be it resolved the City and Borough of Juneau urges the Governor and the Alaska Legislature to amend AS29.60.800 raising the maximum Harbor facility grant fund award to $7,500,00 per eligible project.”

Mr. Uchytil agreed that it should say CBJ rather than Alaska Association of Harbormasters.

Mr. Ridgway asked where it says, “Senate Bill 291 established the Municipal Harbor Facility Grant Program” envision that the cap funds and that everybody would become an enterprise fund," could Mr. Uchytil tell him whether the Senate bill speaks to communities running enterprise funds versus other types of Harbor funds?

Mr. Uchytil responded that the AAHPA drafted that language in Bill 291 with the idea that primarily the State and Army Corps built harbors through the State in the 60s and 70s. The State managed all these harbors. Around 2000, the harbors needed to be recapitalized, and the State didn't have money to do so. The State encouraged municipalities to take over the maintenance and running of the public harbors. There are still 25 State Harbors that ADOT controls. This resolution was a way for the State to transfer these facilities and give you this opportunity for funding.

Public Comment: None

Board Discussion/Action: None

MR. RIDGWAY MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY ADOPT A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU OF RAISING THE MAXIMUM AVAILABLE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HARBOR FACILITY GRANT TO $7,500,000 FOR ELIGIBLE PROJECTS ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. - Motion passed unanimously.

G. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

4. Marine Exchange of Alaska – Channel Drive Lease & Development Update

Mr. Uchytil explained that on Channel Drive there is a blue building that was leased by Angoon Trading Company. This property, tidelands area, was transferred from the State to CBJ and Docks and Harbors manages this property. The tenant pays about $6500 a year. The original lease was with Angoon Trading Company and then about 3 years ago, Angoon transferred or assigned the lease to Marine Exchange of Alaska. Marine Exchange of Alaska has plans to redevelop that property. The interest of the board is within the lease. Paragraph 5 of the lease says that "use of premises, the lessee is authorized to use the lease premises for a warehouse, product distribution facility and barge vessel landing. Should the lessee wish to further develop the lease premises, lessee shall be required to obtain approval of its development plans from the CBJ Docks and Harbor Board, prior to any further development of the lease premises or improvements less, he shall be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and approvals for lessees' development of the lease premises." Mr. Hollingsworth contacted Mr. Uchytil who made sure he understood the terms of the lease. He's here not to get permission from the Board, but rather to give the Board information for when they do come forward to amend the lease to meet their needs.

Presentation by John Hollingsworth (MXAK): Mr. Hollingsworth introduced Jordan Boghosian, the CFO and Zane Smith of MRV Architects. He said they were looking for a new home for their field operations crew, of which they have five people that currently work out of a boat condominium off Industrial Boulevard. He said their current space is inadequate for their purposes as they don't have any indoor plumbing, so they have an outhouse. He said they purchased the Marine Exchange building on Channel Drive two years ago and have been looking at improving it. They hired PND Engineering to do a structural analysis of it after consulting with them they said it's probably more economically advantageous to tear it down and build a new building instead. He said now they are working with MRV to scope the project and provide plans for a new structure. The work that they do is build Marine Safety sites to build in other parts of Alaska. They have about 150 sites along shoreline of Alaska and they bring back data for Automatic Identification Systems, building out a comprehensive system for distress communications, and helping the Coast Guard and the CBJ improve services on their current sensors throughout town. They have a boat that they have parked down at their existing office down by Harris Harbor. He said in the future they would like to develop this property, since they used to have a dock so they could put a landing craft there

Board Discussion/Public Comment:

Mr. Ridgway asked how many employees might be working there.

Mr. Hollingworth answered that currently they have 5 but thought that they would be hiring more people once they obtain additional contracts.

Mr. Ridgway asked if the new structure would have the same footprint as the current building. He asked whether they foresee any subleases or other types of commercial activities and does the Marine Exchange see this as being specifically for the Marine Exchange.

Mr. Hollingsworth responded it would be a 100% Marine Exchange facility for the foreseeable future. He said they don't plan to have any plans to sublease it out and the current plan was to keep the same footprint as the current building. He said, they could go a little bit bigger, but the main attraction was space to store their boat and a place to maintain it when it was out of the water. They would like a pathway to pull through the building and in one of the drawings there is a markup showing a big boat sized door. The idea would be to pull the boat all the way through the building from the dock for winter maintenance, provided that a dock is built there.

Ms. Smith asked Mr. Uchytil whether we sold this property to Marine Exchange. If we did, why do they need our permission to build there?

Mr. Uchytil said that she was confusing this with the sale of the Juneau Electronic building. This has always been a lease with the Angoon Training Company, and they assigned the lease to the Marine Exchange.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytil when Horan and Associates come back to reassess this lease, and within five years do they reevaluate the value of the property?

Mr. Uchytil said they don't do that as they only evaluate the raw land. They don't evaluate any improvements. Docks and Harbors won't get any more money if they put a new building on it. The City benefits from improvements as the assessor will assess the value for the improvements.

Mr. Ridgway asked how many square feet all three tracks are together.

Mr. Uchytil explained that Track B and C are not part of the Marine Exchange. They only have Track A. Track B and C are leased to Chum Fun, and another is either Trucano or Grant's.

Mr. Ridgway asked if Mr. Hollingsworth could foresee anything they needed from the Board in the future.

Mr. Hollingsworth said they have a proposal from MRV to put together plans for development to move. He said they are looking for is an approval from the Board in a timely manner, when it's time to get the project off the ground.

Mr. Sooter asked for a rough timeline for the construction.

Mr. Hollingsworth said there was some abatement that needed to take place, including some lead paint in a couple of the spaces before demolition can begin. The site prep would take place shortly after that and then they would begin construction by next summer.

Mr. Uchytil reiterated that according to the lease, Marine Exchange as the "lessee wish to further develop the lease premises. they shall be required to obtain approval of its development plans from the Docks and Harbors Board prior to any further development." Whenever the Marine Exchange feels they have a development plan, they can bring it back to the board for approval.

Mr. Hollingsworth asked what would look like for the board. Would they have to have a full set of plans for the Board to approve it before they would it out to contractors for bids? What would the Board require for their approval?

Mr. Orr requested that Mr. Uchytil assist with answering that question.

Mr. Uchytil responded that a concept drawing would be sufficient for staff to say demolish the existing building and put up a 3500 square foot building with a dock.

Mr. Boghosian asked if there would need to be modified language from paragraph five of the original lease to include expanded use of the boat haul out.

Mr. Uchytil said he thought that the lease could just be amended because currently the lease says "it's authorized for warehouse, product distribution, facility and barge vessel landing".

Mr. Sooter asked when the Marine Exchange made the purchase from Angoon Trading, whether the lease was assigned or was a new one drafted. He asked how many years they have on the lease.

Mr. Uchytil said it was initial lease signed in 2016 or 2017 and was a 35-year lease from that initial lease date.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytil if the lease restricts activities to warehouse product storage and a barge. He thought if the Board wanted to expand the use to a manufacturing facility, boat haul out facility to include a boat haul out facility, they would need to document it in an amendment to the lease.

Mr. Uchytil said that that would make sense.

Mr. Sooter said any amendments would need to go through the City Law Department and they would add them.

5. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP) PROCESS

Presentation by Port Engineer:

Mr. Sill pointed out that what was in the packet (starts on page 22) was last year's Capital Improvement Project process. Every year the city goes through all departments and all the enterprises submit the projects for the next year. There's also a six-year window, so they look at projects they have funding for in the coming years and projects that are a little more aspirational sit out at the end of the six-year window. On page 23, there is an overview of the legal background behind the idea of the CIP and why the city does it. Page 26 is the breakdown of the different departments and where the money comes from. On page 27 you'll see that Docks and Harbors have a project under the 1% sales tax and these are last year's priorities. On page 56, is Docks and Harbors six-year projects, listed in priority order. Listed are the funding sources and how much each one is. The reason this is relevant is to complete this document. The Board's job at the upcoming retreat is to assist with projects they want to work on in the future and rank them and create a table like the one page 56 and 57.

Board Discussion/ Public Comment:

Mr. Ridgway asked whether the city differentiates between creating a new project and an old project.

Mr. Sill answered that the city manager recommends capital improvements projects according to the following criteria on page 24. The staff and board make a list and then it goes to the city manager, then to the Assembly. Docks and Harbors recommendations can get tampered with through the process. The recommended projects must support the community and be consistent with other plans for the health and safety of the community. It looks at is it maintenance and repair of existing property. He said he didn't know if the Assembly looks better than a new facility but it's one of their considerations.

Mr. Uchytil added that you need Congresses approval to buy anything new such as, a new building, a new airplane, a new ship. Once something's built, there are approximations that 2% a year is needed to maintain that thing. At the city level, we are not that sophisticated to build a lot of new things, like a second crossing to Douglas. The city does not differentiate between maintaining projects and building new projects.
Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Sill if Docks and Harbors have a statement saying why we need projects and what type of impact we have on not having it.

Mr. Sill said that many statements exist although they are not in the packet.

Mr. Uchytil said that what he needs from the Board is a CIP prioritization list that's due to Engineering by the 15th of December. Docks and Harbors will need to have a clear direction on the Little Rock Dock Dump property. The following projects are on autopilot to be completed: 1) drive down float 2) Statter Breakwater, 3) Statter Harbor office. Zinc anodes, Docks and Harbors applied for funds with ADOT but didn't get the harbor match grant, so that can be pushed out another year. We'd like to see secure storage at the Little Rock Dump and that is something the Board has seen final plans and specs to move the project forward. The question is, should we? The Echo Cove Launch ramp and float that is a grant funded project. Shore power, 16B – that's always been an assembly priority downtown. Downtown piling inspection and sea walk cameras have been awarded with marine passenger fees so those are moving forward this fiscal year. Statter Harbor Phase II curb, gutter and paving are underway. Basically, the Aurora rebuild, that is $400,000 from a 1% sales tax which was transferred into this current fiscal year. The FY 2026 listed projects are either done or on autopilot. As we move into FY 27, the Board will need to look at the UAS property purchase, Aurora Harbor office, Douglas launch ramp, and Douglas Harbor shower bathrooms. The Douglas Harbor bathrooms could potentially be a Fish and Game grant. The emergency vessel loading floats, that's one board member's priority. As we look at future projects, there's the Statter breakwater construction, Douglas Harbor uplands, zinc anodes for 16B in the future, harbor-wide security gates and Statter Harbor garage and storage. In FY 29, it's aspirational, and includes: Aurora Harbor dredging or tug slip marine service facility at $30 million.

Board Discussion/Public Comment:

Ms. Smith asked, at the last Ops meeting, about some projects led by Mr. Hamilton was wanting. She asked if anyone followed up with him. Any changes will be made at this year's Board retreat on November 15, 2025. Mr Uchytil stated that Mr. Hamilton had not brought any new projects forward with exception of the drive down float at the Seadrome building.

Mr. Uchytil informed the board that this was last year's Board Retreat goals.

(Mr. Hamilton joined at approximately 5:45 p.m.)

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

Presentation by Port Director: Mr. Uchytil said on page 71, the Board will see last year, 2024 Docks and Harbors Retreat goals. On pages 72-73, the agenda is presented so the Board can think about the Retreat. What Docks and Harbors staff needs is the CIP prioritization list and whether to execute a project or secure storage at the Little Rock Dump. The schedule includes: the Chair having opening remarks, each member will be asked to talk about their motivations and direction and why they are here as Board Members. That will probably take more than 30 minutes. The next section will focus on clearing the air about certain issues that Docks and Harbors staff and the board have regarding communication and establishing a unified vision about the next 10 years ahead. The Board is a representative of the waterfront community, and we like to see where we're going in the next 10 years from now. It will be important for the board to consider our goals and whether we should be securing more property. For example, the master plan for Statter Harbor was started in 2004. In the afternoon, the Board will be talking about the active projects that they've got going and the funding balance. Part B – looks at a matrix of ideas that Mr. Uchytil has and how we will be evaluating our projects similarly to the CIP projects, such as, support, consistency, health and safety maintenance, repair of existing property, local match for state federal grants, maintenance impact, sustainability elements, economic development, stimulus, anticipated need, recreation funding, and alternatives. He said he would like to measure with staff, expanded moorage capacity, expanded waterfront capacity, economic drivers, reducing maintenance, improving marine services, reducing tourism impact, support commercial fisheries, expand storage for commercial maritime users, reduce costs to patrons, and improve staff efficiency. This is an idea he's had and will need to discuss with Mr. Sooter, that the Board will break out into groups of 3 or 4 to have discussions and to have them back with priorities that the Board could have a vote on projects. Part C – is coming up with a list and developing those strategic priorities. Session 5 is wrap-up and commitments. Mr. Uchytil said he developed the agenda to integrate the concepts for a strategic plan.

Board Discussion/Public Comment:

Ms. Smith said she would like to add to the evaluation process how we have denied people's access to water.

Mr. Uchytil asked for clarification as to whether she was speaking of the lightering float.

Ms. Smith said it was the lightering float and the safety rails and that we can't have kids jumping off the docks in the summer. She said people like to fish and we're doing all kinds of things to prevent those types of activities in an area that has been a recreation area for 400 years.

Mr. Ridgway asked if there's a possibility of putting on the agenda items that may come up as there are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of construction on the waterfront near Juneau in the future. He used for example, the Huna Totem construction on the backside of Douglas, and the collaboration with the Coast Guard. Is there room for those topics to go on the agenda?

Mr. Uchytil responded that the list he provided is staff needs. He asked what the Board wants to see on the agenda.
Ms. Smith said the work that is going on with Huna Totem is going to affect the North Douglas launch ramp and wanted to add that future for that area.

Mr. Ridgway said past retreats were helpful with staff input. He said secondly, regarding the CIP list, 80% of it is, we must have the roof repair at Statter Harbor office. He said the discussion helped him to evaluate what is critical to our Docks and Harbors infrastructure and that it is going to cost more money than the maintenance money will cost. He said a good idea is to consider what the cost is of not doing the repairs.

Mr. Uchytil asked Mr. Ridgway if there was some direction for staff to prepare.

Mr. Ridgway responded that evaluating the importance and the criticality of the project is helpful. He's said from the staff's perspective it's helpful to understand what's the risk if the repair is not done. He said he was looking at ta list of $100 million for projects and he'd like a narrative to the projects instead of a list.

Mr. Orr said some of the projects were self-explanatory and others need more descriptions.

Mr. Ridgway said that if he ran into some on the assembly, for example, he wanted to be able to defend his decision to not do anodes in 2027, for example, is it going to make a sheet pile wall fail? He wants to be able to have a discussion and be informed if something is not done.

H. STAFF, COMMITTEE, AND MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Creswell's report:

- Aurora Harbor- Last night, a vessel, M/V Fish On, sank. It is a liveaboard vessel, no one was on board, and it was uninsured. The vessel was 36-foot troller on the inside of the main harbor. The vessel rolled over and initially there was no sheen but this morning a sheen was reported. They have been working with the Coast Guard, and they have agreed to open a trust fund which will pay for the raising and removal of all the hydrocarbons from the vessel. The plan is to mov raise and dispose of the vessel under the terms of contract with Trucano. Mr. Creswell is working with the owner to get a signed letter of no objection to disposing of his boat. This will keep us out of the 30-day Impound process.
- Taku Harbor - Mr. Creswell, Mr. Sill, the Port Engineer, will be headed to Taku Harbor to assess Stockade Point float damage. There is a 58-foot seiner tied up to the dock.
- Auke Bay Harbor – the water is currently turned off at the facility and parts are on order. There should be divers in the water by next Wednesday to have the water re-energized and up and running.

Mr. Sill's report:

- Aurora Harbor – Western Marine is making great progress on the pile driving. Every float except for the T-float is in place. They have a week or two of drilling on the northernmost float to drill in the last six piling structures will be done then the electricians and plumbers will show up. Mr. Sill the project is running at about slightly over $8 million and because they have a matching grant, Docks and Harbors is paying 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. Uchytil's report:

- Law Department – Mr. Uchytil said that the Law Department provided handouts 74-77 in the packet which indicates a guide for Robert's Rules of Order. This procedure of Robert's Rules is provided for the Board if there is a question the Board can refer to them. The Rules explain when things are needed for motion and that there's no such thing as a friendly amendment. The motion can be amended, modified, withdrawn or voted on. The Bylaws are set up for how the board is organized as a body. The next section is on assembly rule procedures. The Law Department is onboarded with an assigned municipal Attorney, Nicole Lynch. At the Board meeting, if more than three of the members are present, it's a meeting. The packet also discusses executive sessions. If a question comes up as a Board, then the Board can go into executive session and reference in the handout. There's information that if there are conflicts, the Board Chair can facilitate that. If more time is needed the Board can ask for a brief at ease. The Board doesn't need to get hung up on parliamentary procedures, a member can state what they want it to be and let the Board Chair figure it out. The Open Meetings Act section talks about what can be discussed in private and not communicating with more than three members at a time during executive session. There are three reasons for executive sessions, and the packet indicates when there may be a conflict of interest. If Board members take the handout, Mr. Uchytil asked that the Board members bring it back or they could leave it at the Port Directors Board meeting office. The handout will also be made available electronically.

Mr. Ridgway commented that he'd like Mr. Uchytil to pass along that this a handy reference and if the Law Department can budget it to make more of them, he'd appreciate it. He asked if the Board retreat was an open meeting.

Mr. Uchytil said it is an open public meeting and the community is invited. He said that writing the minutes is tedious and that the minutes will be generated by AI and the board member can adjust the minutes as they see fit.

Mr. Hamilton said there seems like there should money to print off the packet to do the Volunteer jobs the Board does. He asked if the packet is available online, electronically?

Mr. Uchytil said it would be made available electronically.

Mr. Hamilton added a word of caution about some of the AI summaries that had been presented to the Board. He said the summary is a bare bone to only say the speaker spoke about a topic. He said without the content that it's not helpful at all.

Mr. Uchytil asked Mr. Clayton whether there were any must haves to the retreat minutes.

Mr. Clayton said, no, but that he would have a very concise message that he' hoped to convey to the rest of the board about what the Board is doing going forward.

Mr. Uchytil said that he would like to bring to the attention the fact that there is nothing magic about scheduling the calendar year board meetings for the last Thursday of the month and the second Wednesday in the month at five o'clock. According to the Bylaws the only stipulation is that the annual board meeting should be held on the last Thursday of July. Other than that, the Board can modify the dates and times. Mr. Uchytil said that he wanted to provide some guidance on what days past years during June, July, August, when the Ops meeting and the Board Meeting were held on Thursdays. He said he is open to ideas.

Mr. Sooter asked if that could be discussed at the retreat.

Mr. Uchytil responded that it could be discussed at the retreat.

Ms. Smith said her preference was to say with the Wednesdays for the Ops Meeting and the Thursdays for the Board Meetings.

Mr. Orr said a poll could be done at the retreat.

Mr. Ridgway said in past retreats there was a comparison between the CIP list of board member priorities and staff priorities. He said he felt that that was productive in the past.

Ms. Smith said she remembered the Board's priorities were very different from the staff priorities.

Mr. Uchytil asked if the priorities list from staff was needed ahead of Saturday's retreat.

Mr. Sooter said once we start talking about the CIP list that it will start to take on its own life. He felt that once their ball got rolling it would take off, and the Board will break up into a couple of groups and come up with something to compare. He said that's the beauty of the retreat to deliver that list of priorities.

Mr. Ridgway said once that list is started it's good to also look at staff's list and then begin to prioritize and that's what engendered a good discussion in the past.

I. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

Mr. Uchytil introduced Ms. Maureen Hall. Ms. Hall is Docks and Harbor's Assembly Liaison. Mr. Sooter and Mr. Uchytil met with Ms. Hall early in the week and talked about the Douglas Harbor needs and she'd asked about what meetings she should attend. We gave a format for board meetings and informed her that our liaisons in the past have only showed up for board meetings. She has been encouraged to attend the ops meetings, because more discussion and debate happens here and we thought it would give her a better idea of what's going on. He said in the future, he was recommending that she come to a meeting and make her liaison report.

J. ADJOURNMENT BY MS. SMITH AT 6:22 PM