DOCKS AND HARBORS MEETING MINUTES

January 29, 2026, at 5:00 PM

Port Office Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

A. CALL TO ORDER by Chair Shooter at 5:00 pm.

B. ROLL CALL: James Becker (left at 7:00 pm), Tyler Emerson (via zoom, left at approximately 5:30 pm), Clayton Hamilton, Robert Horchover, Matthew Leither, Nick Orr, Mark Ridgway (via phone), and Shem Sooter,

Absent: Annette Smith

Also in Attendance: Carl Uchytil - Port Director, Matt Creswell - Harbormaster, Matthew Sill - Port Engineer, Paul Kelly – CBJ Assembly Member, Kirby Day - Port Manager for Princess Cruises, Jeremiah Cryts - Docks and Harbors Harbor Officer, Nicole Lynch – CBJ Law, Steve Sahlender - VP of Alaska Operations -Goldbelt, Inc., Elias Hastings - Operations Manager – Alaska Division of Goldbelt.

C. PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES

Mr. Uchytil recommended that Item 11 be deleted. Agenda passed with changes.

D. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Mr. Day offered kudos to Docks and Harbors staff regarding the snow removal of the Seawalk, which allowed the public to walk their dogs despite the weather.

E. SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS: Employee of the Quarter Recognition

Mr. Uchytil presented to Jim Collins, Harbor Security Officer, a citation dated the last day of December. Mr. Uchytil said that Mr. Collins was named Employee of the Quarter in recognition of his exceptional reliability, professionalism and independent work ethic during the fourth quarter of 2025. In his role, Jim primarily works from 3:30 pm to midnight, often operating solo and without direct support during after-hour operations. Mr. Collins has demonstrated sound judgment, accountability, and trustworthiness, providing the department with a dependable presence during some of the most challenging hours of operation. During the quarter, Mr. Collins took on the role of managing and categorizing impound vehicles which required persistence. His attention to detail and physical efforts, particularly during this harsh winter, Mr. Collins has shown remarkable dedication to Docks and Harbors. He has gone above and beyond to ensure the safety of harbor facilities and patrons. His proactive approach has reduced slip hazards, minimized complaints and helped ensure the harbor facilities remain as safe place despite the weather. In 2025, Mr. Collins issued an impressive 639 citations, noteworthy is the number of citations that he did not issue. Mr. Collins consistently prioritized education, compliance and customer service over punitive enforcement. He's helped patrons to comply without the need for formal citations whenever possible. This approach strongly aligns with the Department's customer service focus, philosophy and speaks volumes about his patience, professionalism and character.

Mr. Collins accepted the citation saying he worked with a great group of people.

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **December 18th, 2025, Minutes** – Minutes approved unanimously.

G. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Public Requests for Consent Agenda Changes - None
B. Board Member Requests for Consent Agenda Changes - None
C. Items for Action

MR. ORR MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed.
The four items on the consent agenda were:

3. CY2025 Urban Alaska Consumer Price Index (CPI) – Application to Docks Enterprise Fees

TO ACCEPT THE CY2025 URBAN ALASKA CPI OF 2.1% AND APPLY IT TO ALL APPLICABLE DOCKS ENTERPRISE FEES.

4. CY2025 Urban Alaska Consumer Price Index (CPI) – Application to Harbors Enterprise Fees

TO ACCEPT THE CY2025 URBAN ALASKA CPI OF 2.1% AND APPLY IT TO ALL APPLICABLE HARBOR ENTERPRISE FEES.

5. Transfer of Remaining Funds from Statter Harbor Office Roof Project to Secure Storage - Little Rock Dump Project

THAT THE ASSEMBLY TRANSFER REMAINING FUNDS IN STATTER HARBOR ROOF (CIP H51-133) TO SECURE STORAGE – LITTLE ROCK DUMP (CIP H51-136).

6. Dock Enterprise Personnel Change Request

TO CONVERT A PART-TIME LIMITED HARBOR OFFICER POSITION INTO A BENEFITTED HARBOR OFFICER AS PRESENTED.

H. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

7. Property Conveyance of CBJ Owned Land at Seadrome

Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil said that on page 42 of the packet there is a letter from Goldbelt addressing the Seadrome Land Swap Discussion. Currently, Goldbelt is only willing to pursue a purchase of the uplands and tidelands on page 45. Goldbelt is requesting the purchase of 15,000 square feet for the purpose of building a tourist-related building where the existing Seadrome building is. Mr. Uchytil's memo on page 43 outlines the discussions that they've had with Goldbelt over the years regarding the property.

a. Board Questions

Mr. Leither said it was his understanding that at the Operations Committee last week the offer was $700,000.

Mr. Uchytil said that that was not clear to him and that they are here tonight so that discussion could be made with Goldbelt present tonight.

Mr. Horchover said that before he made a motion, he asked how recent that price was.

Mr. Uchytil pointed out that he thought it was February of 2025 that Horan and Company appraised the value of the land to $630,000. There was a language by the CEO of Goldbelt that they could go up to $700,000 but that was not offered and was an aside.

b. Public Comment - None

c. Board Discussion/Action

Mr. Hamilton said he was interested to hear what Mr. Orr said about this value comparison.

Mr. Orr said that basically $700,000 is about $50 a square foot to evaluate. He said that the area was along the water and felt that the value was the least rate on the waterfront. He thought Horan's appraisal of $50 was low. Compared to other operations on the sea walk prices were much higher accessed than the Docks and Harbor property.

Mr. Ridgway asked how much Docks and Harbors got off the lease agreement on the land.

Mr. Uchytil replied approximately $35k-$50K.

Mr. Ridgway said that he was not in favor of selling the land.

Mr. Orr added that he would be in favor if the amount suggested was more than $50,- per square foot. He said he was speaking as it was a risk-free bond.

Mr. Ridgway said that Docks and Harbors is sort of a landholding agency and gets over a million dollars a year from revenues. The property owned was valuable and will continue to grow. If Docks and Harbors decide to keep the land, he felt that they would not be getting into Goldbelt's way.

Mr. Orr said that the Board had three options to make a motion 1) to ask for $700,000, or 2) he was in favor of asking for $1.5 million or 3) say no, that they are not open to a sale of the property.

Mr. Ridgway said that the Board should come up with something that satisfies Goldbelt's needs.

Mr. Sooter said that Goldbelt had said they were not interested in any property exchanges, leases or anything of that nature.

MR. ORR MADE THE MOTION THAT GOLDBELT ACCCEPT A $1.5 MILLION PRICE FOR THE SEADROME PROPERTY AND ASKED FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Mr. Ridgway objected with the purpose of discussion.

He asked to amend the original motion to include an asset of $1.5 million from Goldbelt which would offer potential financial consideration and asked for unanimous consent.

MR. RIDGWAY ASKED TO AMEND THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO INCLUDE AN ASSET OF $1.5 MILLION FROM GOLDBELT OR AN OFFER WHICH WOULD INCLUDE A LAND EXCHANGE.

Mr. Uchytil read from the document on page 44 from Mr. Sahlender that "This document serves as notice of Goldbelt's continued interest in purchasing the parcels owned by CBJ Docks and Harbors and the Seadrome Marina. This process, which officially began on July 20, 2022, has passed through several iterations and several different Boards. While we appreciate the current Board's interest and motion to re-examine a land swap or property exchange, Goldbelt is only willing to pursue a purchase of the uplands and tidelands currently. We are happy to address this position at the January 21st Operations and Planning Committee meeting, and we appreciate your attention to this matter." He said that it's within the Boards purview to make whatever motion they want, he wanted to be clear that the Goldbelt would only consider a sale of the property.

Mr. Sooter asked Mr. Sahlender if this was what Goldbelt was expecting.

Mr. Salhlender said that it has been Goldbelt's position since 2022. He said they entertained every kind of land swap imaginable and arrived at the land swap not happening. The do not want to spend the next 3 ½ years of negotiating a land swap. The second position is to purchase the land because they feel like this conversation could go on indefinitely and that's not a position that they want to be in. Goldbelt felt that their waterfront plan is amenable to the City Docks and Harbors and the plan that they have for the waterfront would be nice. He said then there was an amendment for $700,000. Goldbelt had a second appraisal because the Board wasn't comfortable with the first appraisal.

Mr. Ridgway asked Mr. Uchytil whether initially the Board had approved of a land swap.

Mr. Uchytil replied he did not remember and there were no signatures that said this is what Docks and Harbors are doing.

Mr. Ridgway said that according to his recollection there was a motion after many months of trying to come up with a solution that was to both parties' likings. Once that was completed, the thought Goldbelt hand said that they'd changed their mind. He realized that the process had been challenging, he said he didn't want Docks and Harbors to be seen as ineffectual in performing their duties.

Mr. Hamilton said he wanted it to be clear that the Board never made an amendment for $700,000.

Mr. Sooter said that they had a motion on the table for $1.5 million and that Goldbelt has no interest in a land swap deal.

Ms. Lynch said that once a motion is made and there is an amendment to that motion, as Mr. Ridgway introduced the idea of a land swap, then the Board would vote on the amendment first and then on the original motion.

Mr. Leither said that with Mr. Ridgway's offer of the land swap then Goldbelt has the information that that was what the Board was intending to do and they were giving them an option.

MR. ORR MADE A MOTION TO VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT PUT FORTH BY MR. RIDGWAY.

MR. RIDGWAY ASKED TO AMEND THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO INCLUDE AN ASSET OF $1.5 MILLION FROM GOLDBELT OR AN OFFER WHICH WOULD INCLUDE A LAND EXCHANGE.

All those in favor: James Becker, Clayton Hamilton, Robert Horchover, Matthew Leither, Nick Orr, Shem Sooter and Mark Ridgway.

Mr. Tyler Emerson was having technical difficulties and was not included in the vote.

Mr. Sooter said that they would put forward the motion made by Mr. Orr.

MR. ORR MADE THE MOTION THAT GOLDBELT ACCCEPT A $1.5 MILLION PRICE FOR THE SEADROME PROPERTY AND ASKED FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE.

Mr. Ridgway removed his previous objection.

All those in favor: James Becker, Clayton Hamilton, Robert Horchover, Matthew Leither, Nick Orr, Shem Sooter and Mark Ridgway.

Motion passed as amended.

8. New 35-year Lease to Petro Marine for ATS 857

Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil said that on page 46 is a draft of the Lase Agreement for ATS857 for .88 acres, which is about 3,800 square feet of tidelands near the National Guard dock. The lease is approaching the final year of the current 55-year lease. The existing lease that they received from the state allows the lease for a one-time renewal. Petro 49 would like to start the lease early so that they can secure financing for a project. The last appraisal was for $1,800 for the property. The property is important to Petro 49 for their operation. The Law Department for CBJ has drafted the language. This lease has come before two committee meetings and both times they failed to receive the 5 votes to move it forward. It was introduced to the Assembly on January 12, and the Assembly will take it for action at the public hearing at the February 9 meeting. The reason it didn't receive 5 votes was because the committee board members were concerned with the CPI adjustments. He requested that the Board act tonight. If it fails to pass tonight, then it will be pulled out from the February 9th meeting, and the lease won't go forward.

a. Board Questions

Mr. Hamilton asked if the land leases were about one fifth of the Docks and Harbor's revenue.

Mr. Uchytil said that was correct.

Mr. Orr asked if there were about 40 leases that were held.

Mr. Uchytil said that they have about 43 leases that they manage.

b. Public Comment-None

c. Board Discussion/Action

Mr. Orr said that he remembered Mr. Hamilton bringing up the matter of fairness and that if they are charging for other things that had been CPI-adjusted that they should also be adjusting leases as such. He said this was an opportunity to put all leases on a CPI adjustment basis for fairness. Although it may be an administrative burden, he thought that they could be put into a spreadsheet and that they could be done annually when they come up. He said that it should be done all at one time. He was inclined to move all leases to an annual basis.

Mr. Uchytil said he wanted to understand the question that what Mr. Orr was asking was making everyone with a lease on the same schedule.

Mr. Orr said that what he was asking is that the leases would have language in them that would include a CPI adjustment at the beginning of the year so that the amount would be x times whatever the CPI rate is.

Mr. Uchytil said that no other leases with CBJ have a CPI adjustment for property. He thought what Mr. Orr was suggesting was that in January all leases would be adjusted by the CPI from the previous year. The lease is a legal contract so it's different than a rate or a fee schedule. He said he would be cautious.

Mr. Orr said that when an agreement is up for negotiation they should apply to CPI as a matter of fairness for fees.

Mr. Sooter said that some of these leases are re-negotiated every 35 years.

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Orr if he knew of other leases that run on a yearly CPI adjustment schedule.

Mr. Orr said that in real estate there is a CPI or step increase, whichever is greater and that as they are negotiated. Every time there was not a CPI adjustment then the entity with the lease would lose money. If there is a CPI or a step increase, there would be appraisal and then the negotiations would begin again. He said that it would take a long time to implement but it would be a reasonable policy to pursue.

Mr. Hamilton said that he would like to make this a policy.

Mr. Leither said that Mr. Emerson said last week, as someone who has worked on City leases, that it would be a difficult requirement to change to a yearly CPI adjustment. He said it makes sense to put a clause in the agreement, but the process sounded cumbersome.

Mr. Sooter said that if there's a requirement to adjust the CPI then it must be done annually for each individual lease.

Ms. Hall said that she had talked to some one in the Lands Management Department, and he said it was highly unusual. There is a mechanism when a lease comes up, say every 5 years to look up the value of the property and adjust the lease accordingly to make the adjustment.

Mr. Orr said he wanted to make the point that the Goldbelt Tram was appraised in 2012 for $272,000 and 13 years later it was appraised again and it's still $272,000. He said he does not have a lot of confidence in the appraisal that they have received on their leases. He felt that this was an administrative burden that Docks and Harbors could handle.

Mr. Hamilton said that if the Board was not consistent with CPI it could lead to problems later.

Mr. Leither said he didn't feel he had the whole picture as this lease is quite small. He said his inclination was to let this one continue but moving forward he would like to look at a policy.

Mr. Sooter said he agreed and that CPI adjustment in the private world was common, but as far as the City goes, it's not as common.

MR. HAMILTON MOTION TO APPROVE THE NEW 35-YEAR LEASE WITH PETRO MARINE FOR TIDELAND PROPERTY ATS 857, PENDING APPRAISAL WITH A CPI ADJUSTMENT.

Mr. Leither objected and asked for a vote.

All those in favor: James Becker, Clayton Hamilton, Robert Horshover, Nick Orr, Mark Ridgway

Not in favor: Matt Leither and Shem Sooter.

Motion passed.

Mr. Leither requested that this be part of a policy discussion at the next Operations and Planning Committee meeting.

I. NEW BUSINESS

9. FY2027 Docks & Harbors Budget

Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil gave an overview of the budget and talked broadly about the listed expenditures, funding sources and fund balances and then there was a list of questions that he said he would answer. There were two budgets presented, one for Docks and one for Harbors.

On the Docks budget, notable was that there was a proposal to move over $2.4 million out of the Docks enterprise fund into the CBJ general funds. They will be collecting about twice as much money from the cruise ship operations. FY27 shows that $2.4 million transfer. The Docks enterprise shows that there are more costs of 20% for salaries than they have in payments because they have part-time limited positions that are vacant. Therefore, their budget was typically higher than their actual. The proposed budget includes all the part-time limited and FTE staff for a total of 19.73 FTE, but they only pay about 80% of that, not because of turnover but because they have vacancies of part-time limited staff. They anticipate spending less than they have budgeted for. The assembly will not be taking up any funds from FY26 so to look at cost of the proposed budget they looked at FY25. It's different in the Harbors budget as the staff there are year-round employed versus the (15) part-time limited staff who are employed seasonally.

For funding sources, fees are doubling because we are charging $7.15 per lower berth which will be a bigger windfall. Interdepartmental charges, he said, are what we charge CBJ for the counting of cruise ship passengers. Investment is how the Finance department tracks and invests our fund balance. That is account is not touched. They don't change many of their personnel, so they have 19.73 FTEs. In the consent agenda, the Board agreed to delete a part-time limited position and create a FTE Harbor Officer. That doesn't change the FTE but would change the personnel cost.

Mr. Horchover asked if the $2.4 million was going to be regular pay out to the Assembly.

Mr. Uchytil said yes.

Mr. Orr asked if $2.4 million is roughly the fee increase or is it more than the fee increase.

Mr. Uchytil said that it's less of the fee increase and that they also won't get marine passenger fees either into perpetuity. Every January, Docks and Harbors ask for monies; to help with maintenance of the buildings, extra costs associated with cruise ships. It's been $770,000 typically but they will not be getting that amount anymore.

Mr. Hamilton asked whether they were paying $2.4 million out to the city but they were also seeing a 24% increase in their total funding sources (page 69) so that Docks will be making more money.

Mr. Uchytil said that they are trying to keep it status quo by saying this was where they were in 2025 and this is where you will be at the end of FY27. Docks will never be in the deficit, and the Finance Director is looking to reduce the CBJ general fund deficit by taking that $2.4 million.

Ms. Hall added that the Assembly's intent was that they were not charging as much as the private docks were charging so there was an ability to increase the revenue by making that equal. That was the initiative the Assembly wanted when they raised the docking fees so that everyone could benefit, including Docks and Harbors.

For Harbors budget, Mr. Uchytil explained that their staffing doesn't change. The biggest change for the Harbor's budget is the state shared revenue which is about $450,000 which is the fish tax. In FY27, they won't be receiving that amount. Mr. Uchytil went line-by-line over the Harbors budget. Their goal in the budget was not to overspend. $2.6M was what they were recommending for expenditures and for the support of capital projects, so they built up whatever profit was revenue over expenditures. Within their fund balance they'll pull from the fund balance for projects for this fiscal year. That's $2.8 million for the 20% local match for the drive-down float. That's $600,000 of their commitment for the breakwater feasibility cost analysis and $300,000 for the Little Rock Dump, secure storage. They're proposing for 2027, $2.225 million as money that's being transferred to the CIP list for the current fiscal year. They're recommending $2 million to go towards the new Aurora Harbor office and $225,000 for efforts to get the design going for the North Douglas launch ramp. After 2025, they had $4 million and moved $3.7 million out and are projecting $2 million again at the end of 2026 due to revenues. At the end of 2026 he was anticipating that they would have $1.2 million in their fund balance. The Finance Department has said that they should have at least 3 months of operating costs in their fund balance. Funding sources included: charges for services, such as moorage fees, licenses and permits, loading zones, passengers for hire floats, rentals and leases, etc. The Huna Totem lease is currently being handled at the City Manager's office and has not been included. There's language in the lease agreement that may allow Huna Totem to defray the cost for their first year. Eventually, they are expecting all the leasing cost for Huna Totem to come to Docks and Harbors.

a. **Board Questions**

Mr. Leither asked about the loss of the fish tax and wondered when and how that happened.

Mr. Uchytil said that was not statutory, rather it was a way for the Finance Department to say that it was a way to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Leither commented that it was a curious process that was done without elected representatives.

Mr. Uchytil said the Assembly approves their budget but that they approve every department budget, so they go through every line item.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Uchytil to speak about the variability of the Harbor budget vs. the Dock budget.

Mr. Uchytil referred to a list of questions sent earlier by Mr. Hamilton. Question (1) asked: What was the anticipated increase in electrical use in the Harbor? He said in harbors the electrical cost was 20% higher whereas on the Docks side it has stayed the same. Mr. Uchytil said that in 2025, electricity was $145,000. In the current year and 2027 they are projecting $172,000. Staff has looked at this number and doesn't want to underestimate their usage. It's a good faith effort to estimate what they will be using in the future and those costs.

Mr. Hamilton said that he was looking at the past arguments for the 9% rate increase and looking at the fund balance that is under $2 million projected loss. There was no benefit to coming in under the budget, there is a cost coming in over. He said $30,000 was a lot of wiggle room.

Mr. Uchytil said that if you look at the previous year's fund balance there's $4 million or $2 million and those are actual numbers. They're projecting forward for the budget so that they can feel confident about their revenues exceeding the expenditures.

Mr. Leither said that with the 9% rate study they weren't just looking at their budget number for future projections, they were looking at past actual expenditures that are going into capital improvements.

Mr. Creswell asked to speak at Docks vs. Harbors electricity. At the Docks side, he observed that the Port Field Office float has two power pedestals and on the IVF float there are 8 power pedestals. There's also some various basic lighting down on the docks. At the Harbors, there are 1,200 slips, some of those are transient and all the extra offices and extra facilities include the Auck Bay Marine station and Auke Bay loading facility. The power needs in the harbors were greater than the power needs at the docks.

Mr. Hamilton said he understood why the harbor's budget was a lot bigger, but he didn't understand why it has changed some much. He said it was helpful to go back to the information that they got a few months ago that shows 2020-2026.

Mr. Creswell said that 90% of the harbor's electricity is versus 10% at docks. If they have a cold winter, with extreme power use that 90% would be at a greater magnitude than the 10% at the Docks. There would be more variability potentially for higher power bulls in the Harbors than at the Docks.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Uchytil why Docks doesn't see the need for extensive repairs like Harbors does.

Mr. Uchytil responded that's because they are different. When staff look at repairs for the Port, the supervisor doesn't have any major repair projects. For Harbors, they look at the need for grading Douglas Harbor, recovery of a sunken vessel, lights needed for Douglas Harbor, repairs to the North Douglas launch ramp, etc. The big numbers they have in the budget are for contractual services, materials, commodities and repairs. Mr. Creswell was correct in saying that there's not a lot of repairs that the supervisor needs at the Port. That's why there's a difference between the two enterprises.

Mr. Hamilton asked if there was a large repair needed in the Harbor.

Mr. Uchytil explained, yes, they need to re-grade Douglas Harbor that's about $100,000, they need stairs at the grid. There are projects that they have lumped into the contracts, commodities and repairs.

Mr. Uchytil referred to question (2) "why [our] fleet replacement went up dramatically" with both budgets. In item 5362 of the budget, they have a complete reserve that was a lockbox. They can choose how much money goes into the fleet reserve that was both in the Docks and Harbors budget. This year has gone up due to the Conolift at the Auke Bay Loading Facility. They had money that they got from a grant and then used another portion from expenditures. They also have a need for a new front-end loader in FY2028 so that their plan was built into the budget for these expenditures.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the fleet fund was like a replacement reserve fund for materials that they would get to move as they please. He thought in past years the fleet replacement reserve was for harbor trucks specifically.

Mr. Uchytil said yes, that's correct. There is a spreadsheet of about 20 or more items that include snowplows, trucks, front-end loaders, and there's a schedule for boats or skiffs. The Finance Department requires us to have money for our fleet reserve.

Mr. Hamilton asked if Mr. Uchytil was saying that in 2028, they could expect that his spreadsheet would drop back down to the $20,00-$30,000 range. Looking at the range, he said it was low at $20,000 and then it jumped up to $107,000. He said he didn't understand the cost unless it was a one-time expenditure.

Mr. Creswell said it was a one-time expenditure because they had to purchase a boat trailer and that had not been budgeted for. Also, a loader was a cost that they split between docks and harbors.

Mr. Hamilton said that these costs have made some big jumps. Costs appeared steady for the last 5 years and then they don't.

Mr. Uchytil said for the question (3) the current year for repairs, they have only spent $15,000. In 2024, they budgeted $200,000 but only spent $81,000. They put $190K as a marker so that if they need to, they have those funds available to spend. If it's not spent, it goes back into their fund balance.

Mr. Creswell said that if they were to look at Docks vs. Harbors for repairs, the Docks have newer equipment whereas Harbors has older equipment.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the re-decking project was going to come out of other money.

Mr. Creswell said that he could not speak to where the funds would come from for that project, but they have the money budgeted.

Mr. Hamilton said none of these figures are accurate. He asked Mr. Uchytil if he could tell him what the real expectation of revenue and expenditure would be.

Mr. Uchytil responded and said that he has come before the Board in the past and said that 90% was baked in. 10% was where adjustments were made such as repairs, commodities, and contracts. Those are the three big areas that the Board has influence.

Mr. Uchytil said the fourth (4) question was a request to speak about the significant increase in bank card fees within the Harbor budget. The bank card fees are what they incur for accepting credit cards. Staff have about 15 credit cards and amounts spent are allocated to whatever was purchased. The fees are a processing fee.

Mr. Hamilton said he misunderstood and thought Docks and Harbors were paying the fee to have cards.

Mr. Uchytil said the next question had to do with why the category of programs and equipment went up to $5000 for harbors but it went down $5000 for docks. He said that was for safety material.

Mr. Creswell said that that's for uniforms and safety equipment (item 5480). Mr. Hinton went through and made a big purchase as they had a lot of new staff.

Mr. Hamilton said that he was speaking to item 5491 Safety Programs & Equipment.

Mr. Creswell said that those are for purchase and upkeep of fire extinguisher purchases, services, any non-personal safety equipment, and the on-the-shelf safety gear.

Mr. Hamilton said that his question was about discrepancies and that he didn't understand why Docks went down $5000 and Harbors went up. He didn't understand how they draw the lines between the two budgets.

Mr. Creswell said that it was probably because they had a decrease in actuals and that he would need to have a closer look at the budget with Mr. Hinton to see what their projected needs were.

Mr. Uchytil said that the next question was regarding office supplies and why they look smaller on the dock's budget. He said that this office was 50% Docks and 50% Harbors. The Port Field Office is 100% and then their two harbors are 100% of the Harbor's budget.

Mr. Uchytil responded to the next question (5) of what does advertising entails for the harbors. He said that it is mostly the Juneau Empire that they are required to advertise for any type of contract, all the vessels that go to impound. The Assembly was looking at changing that requirement for general circulation, for advertising for Docks, it's a small amount.

Mr. Uchytil answered (6) that the difference between business travel and training was that the Finance Department is removing business travel so that it won't show up on the budget. It will just be called travel and training. Seeing as how most of the associations business effects the Docks area that will be moved to the Docks budget. Currently they have three major memberships, the American Association of Port Authorities, the Alaska Association of Harbormasters and Port Administrators, and the Pacific Coast Congress of Harbormasters and Port Managers. Of those three organizations they have $24,000 in annual costs. Right now, those costs are split 50/50. The American Association of Port Authorities strongly supports topics that support harbors, such as the PIDP grant which is lobbied by the AAPA and is not lobbied by the AAHPA which is the Harbormasters Association. The WRDA which is the Army Corps of Engineers funding and the AAPA also benefits our harbors. He said that was why they treated these as a 50/50 split.

Regarding a question about the specialty and property, Mr. Uchytil said that it had to do with their insurance and that the amount jumped up from 2023 and then in 2024 it went down. This year it spiked up and then next year he anticipated that it would go back down. Those are numbers that Risk Management gives to the Finance Department that indicate that this is the Docks or Harbors Enterprise number.

Mr. Hamilton asked him to explain that 90% amount.

Mr. Uchytil said that, for example, they buy into an insurance premium that takes care of a sunken vessel that damaged their infrastructure. That is a payment that they would make through the insurance that they're paying and that's what Risk Management cost. They manage all the insurance for the City. It may appear that they pay more into it than they get out. Docks and Harbors have been asking them if they would consider the salvage and disposal of the 58-ft seiner as an insurance claim.

Mr. Horschover asked if it was like a co-op and whether it was like a commercial insurer that they are paying a premium.

Mr. Uchytil said that the city does self-insure certain things, like the marine surveyor who came down during the snow was employed by Hartford Insurance. He said he doesn't know specifically how it works but he would be happy to invite the Risk Manager to come in and they could ask them questions.

Mr. Sooter said that Docks and Harbors have assets of $250 million and that the insurance cost is $300,000 a year. He felt that there was not much to pay.

Mr. Uchytil said the next question was who assesses their liability with the City and could the Board get some input on how they are assessed. Mr. Uchytil said that they could again ask the Risk Manager in to answer some of their questions. He said he didn't think there was an avenue to protest insurance costs.

Mr. Uchytil read the next question (8), saying, "Could you provide a review of the proposal increasing for contractual services?" In the past 5 years they have been at or below the $300,000 value and the closing amount of $350,000. The contractual amount is based on what the insurance people say, for example for damage to floats, they will pay. They are asking them to pay for a vessel that is uninsured which will be more than $200,000. If items are approved from the CIP, they have the flexibility to operate nimbly and address some of their projects, like the Rock Dump storage, the repairs needed at the North Douglas Boat Harbor and the grading needed at Douglas Boat Harbor.

Mr. Uchytil read the next question (9), "Could you please review the heading "full cost allocation?" He replied that it was paid to City Hall, which includes services received from the Finance Department, help with the budget, services they get from HR, etc. That amount is treated 50/50 for line 5394 on the Docks budget.

Question (10) asked to "review the line items in the Docks budget, "all other workforces?" Mr. Uchytil said they run reports through a system called Questica and this was the report that was published today. What Mr. Hamilton is asking about is last week at the Ops meeting there was a line item that was for the Docks Enterprise called "all other workforce" and it was on the expenses for $370,000. It didn't show up in this week's report, because it's a credit to Docks Enterprise coming out of the CIP budget. Mr. Uchytil asked Ms. Narum to explain.

Ms. Narum said that Stevie, who works on budget analysis, was much more versed on the program navigation so she may have been capturing a few different line items. This report captured transfers out of the general fund and out of the Dock's CIP's budget. She said that she thought it was capturing their main operational expenses.

Mr. Uchytil read question (10) "These [There are] huge increases in the budget associated with staff salary and benefits; Are these reflective of a one-time renegotiation or do we need to plan for continued increases of this magnitude?" He answered that Docks Enterprise amounts are a full account of every FTE, every part-time limited person coming in for every shift. There's a 20% over budget amount reflected at the end of the fiscal year in the Docks budget. For the Harbors budget, there was a 5% increase to all wages last year and so from the actuals for Harbors should be closer to the amount reflected in the budget. Last week, the Board approved one FTE be changed to bring on a benefited full-time or seasonal Harbor Officer in lieu of a part-time limited staff with the new cost of about $~~35,000~~25,000.

Mr. Orr asked, looking at page 61 of 68, if it was accurate that personnel service was down -2.5%. on the variance analysis and 3.1% on Harbors.

Mr. Uchytil responded that it was a decrease of 3%. Looking at personnel services, last year it said it was $1.789 million and it's been updated to $1.66.

Mr. Orr said so this is proposed for FY27 vs. FY26 amended.

Mr. Uchytil said that the 3% increase sounded accurate.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the amount included bonuses.

Mr. Uchytil said nobody at Docks and Harbors gets performance bonuses. The bonus is based on the MEBA negotiations for a 5.21% increase for this upcoming year. He had never seen the term "bonus" before. It was $2000 for this past year.

Mr. Orr requested to follow up on his question that Harbor's personnel costs went down 2.5%. He was more concerned about the variance analysis.

Mr. Uchytil said that he couldn't say for sure what the 2.5% was but could get back to Mr. Orr.

Mr. Creswell said that they had a tenured employee that left so there was a vacancy.

The final question (12) was, "What equipment are we renting for an additional $10,000 a year. Why isn't this increase similarly reflected on the Docks budget?"

Mr. Creswell said some of the rental equipment that they rent includes boom lifts, scissor lifts, and loaders for projects. Recently they spent $13,000 on loaders that were needed during the snow season. They try to foresee their usage and that way they can use rental equipment.

Mr. Uchytil said that they are finally at a point where they have recapitalized all our Harbor floats. He said they were conservative in the budget and that didn't increase the revenue. He didn't plan on every slip on the north end of Aurora to provide income because it's not available. Eventually they will see more revenue for moorage and thought they were in a good place. They will lose part of that revenue that they got from the fish tax, but they'll always have money but not to the extent they have had in the past. They know they will need to recapitalize the timber dock along the Seawalk. They know they'll have other major expenditures but that they can maintain the facilities they have. They have sufficient budgetary authority to make the repairs that they need.

b. Public Comment-None

c. Board Discussion/Action for the Dock's Budget

Mr. Hamilton asked the Board if there was any appetite to move some of the small shared expenses to Docks. He said that Docks make money and that Harbors was in the business of providing a service. Docks were safer now that they were sending money to the City so that justifies their role in the community.

Mr. Leither asked Mr. Hamilton if he had specific examples. He said he heard from Mr. Uchytil that the budget passes the test, and he didn't they the Board could go beyond that.

Mr. Hamilton said he had staff positions that are split 50/50 that the Board could review. He thought there were some staff that could be moved to Docks. Docks make money and they will have over $5 million in the next fund reserve, and Harbors has paid out for some projects. He said he likes to see some of the shared expenses moved to docks to make a safer operating environment for their harbors.

Mr. Orr said that the Board could explore making it one fund versus moving $10,000 from here or there. If the Board makes it one entity that's something that they could talk about later.

Mr. Leither said that it's an interesting question to combine the two, and in the past, he has been opposed to that. He said that he said the staff has done a good job on the budget and he trusted their judgement.

Mr. Ridgway said that he agreed with everything he's heard from Mr. Orr and that combining the two budgets should be at a later meeting.

Mr. Sooter said his opinion that he liked that the two budgets were firewalled but if he were asked to put everything into the Docks budget, he would want a valid reason to do it. He said he would be willing to explore the idea later.

MR. ORR MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE BUDGET AS PRESENTED FOR DOCKS AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed unanimously.

a. **Board Discussion/Action for Harbor's Budget**

Mr. Leither said that there was a lot of talk that involved both Harbors and Docks, and how some people are frustrated about the City taking the marine passenger fees or the dockage fees. He said it makes sense to him as tourism hits most of Juneau and those costs will support everyone's efforts. The Harbor Enterprise has made a huge effort to be fiscally responsible and to have a budget that makes sense. He wondered about other departments that have enterprise accounts and asked Ms. Hall, do they also give money to the city. He was concerned that Harbors will not be getting the fish tax this year because the Board and staff work hard to make themselves fiscally responsible. He hoped that that was not hurting us in the end.

Ms. Hall said that she would be willing to take another look at that with finance and get back to them. She wondered why the fish tax didn't come before the Assembly and will bring that back to the Board.

Mr. Leither said that the tourism industry affects the whole City. He felt that the people who use the harbors are paying the fish tax and they depend on it to make their living so that was a different situation.

MR. LEITHER MADE THE MOTION THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE HARBOR BUDGET AS PRESENTED AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSTENT.

Motion passed unanimously.

J. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION:

10. 2026 CBJ Launch Ramp Permit Donation to American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE)

Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil said that the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) asked for a donation of their engineer's week banquet. They asked for a launch ramp permit donation.

a. Board Questions

Mr. Leither said that he said in the past that a permit was given to the Territorial Sportsman as they had played an intricate part in their functioning harbors.

Mr. Uchytil said that is true and that they have also given a permit to Backcountry Hunters & Anglers. He said that on behalf of the ASCE they have received awards from them for projects on our harbors projects.

Mr. Orr said that he felt that the Territorial Sportsmen permit was dumped back into the community, but it seems like with the ASCE they don't put any money back into the community. He understood that the relationship was important to Docks and Harbors, but he'd like to see it go into the Juneau community. He would like to see that they demonstrate that they spend money locally or in the State of Alaska.

Mr. Hamilton said if he brought a Boy Scout Troop he could get a launch permit. Do they give them to certain nonprofits.

Mr. Uchytil said that they could have a policy that the Board adhered to.

Mr. Orr said that the discussion got side-lined at the retreat and that he would like to see these cooperations demonstrate how they spend their money in the community or was the money going to the national organization.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Orr if he would feel good about donating to a local organization.

Mr. Orr said yes, if they could demonstrate some kind of connection to the harbor. He said it would be a good conversation to have later.

b. Public Comment

c. Board Discussion/Action

Mr. Hamilton said why not make the motion be that he would support a launch ramp permit and all other launch ramp permit applications for local nonprofits.

Mr. Leither and Mr. Sooter both said they would not support that motion.

Mr. Orr asked that they put this on the agenda for the next Ops Committee meeting.

MR. ORR MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE A DONATION OF A CBJ LAUNCH RAMP PERMIT TO THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS FOR THEIR ANNUAL ENGINEERS WEEK BANQUET AND ASKED FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

J. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION:

12. North Douglas Launch Ramp Improvements - Update

Presentation by Port Director

Mr. Uchytil said that page 67 of 68 was a letter he had sent to Mr. Gregory Weinert with DOT right away from the aerial view of North Douglas. At the Board retreat, the Board made this a priority. There are 4.6 acres of tidelands and 30,000 square feet of Docks and Harbors property where the launch ramp is located. Everything else is DOT right away. They had a meeting held with ADOT and the CBJ Engineer and they are willing to convey all the property that is needed for this project. On the last page there a conceptual drawing shows the design for a 100 truck and trailers, 313,000 cubic yards of fill. ADOT was willing to work with them to convey the property that is needed to move the project forward. The only request that ADOT has is that they want the property underneath the Juneau Douglas Bridge. He said that this was good news and that he would bring something forward next month as a resolution to start acquiring the tidelands from and, who is also very supportive of the project.

a. Board Questions

Mr. Horchover asked about whether ADOT wanted to do a land swap for the property underneath the bridge.

Mr. Uchytil said they want the land directly underneath the bridge that CBJ owns. They would like to have the official authority to manage what is placed underneath the bridge.

Mr. Hamilton asked how this project would work and whether they are laying the groundwork for a project.

Mr. Uchytil said he didn’t have the CIP list in front of him, but the Board prioritized this project and it’s in the Assembly legislative priorities. They could move forward as quickly as the Board wants, subject to funding.

Mr. Leither said that he realized they are going forward with projects that have funding and asked what the cost would be for this project.

Mr. Uchytil said an estimate for the 100 trailers pre-covid was probably $10 million for half that but thought that now it would be about $20 million. He said he has met with the Kensington Mine General Manager over the years and that they have discussed an excess of waste rock so there are opportunities to become partners to provide some of the fill.

Mr. Horchover asked whether the rock filling from Kensington was included in the $20 million estimate.

Mr. Uchytil responded that in the 2020 budget, pre-covid, those numbers are a rough amount with filling coming from a quarry. He said that since covid, things have doubled in cost. It would not be the size of Statter Harbor, but it could reduce the amount of whale watching traffic in Auke Bay. We’re also looking at working with the Alaska Association of Harbor Masters to increase the amount that DOT can provide for any harbor grants from $5million to $7.5 million.

b. Public Comment-None

c. Board Discussion-None

13. Harbors Enterprise Snow Response – December 2025/January

Harbormaster Presentation

Mr. Creswell said there were some questions emailed by a Board member about snow removal and a SOP. Question (1) What is the order of priority for cleaning the entrances of the ramps? What is the priority of cleaning the main fingers of the harbor? He answered number 1 was the parking lot entrances, 2 was the parking lots, 3 dock ramps and floats. Number 4 all ramps and associated parking lots. The order of priority was structured to create accessibility from largest to smallest to limit the areas from blockage.

Question (2) How much did the big snowstorm cost? Mr. Creswell told the Harbormaster Conference that he could track how much a snowstorm costs down to the inch and the Board member would like to know how much the snowstorm costs. Mr. Creswell said this would take extensive work with the National Weather Service to get every day's snowfall. That amount would need to be calculated based on what was received at the airport for each day and then extrapolated for all his work orders for every day and applying it to that. He said it could be done but not something he's had time to do.

Question (3) The Board member would like to see the tracking information for time plowing versus time spent clearing snow on the dock. They track time and total equipment usage but do not track snow removal costs by location.

Question (4) What is the order of priority for clearing the entrance to the ramp? What is the priority for clearing the main fingers of the harbors? While the big snowstorm was admittedly unusual, this last storm similarly resulted in a nearly impassable entrance to Douglas ramp. This state of affairs lasted at least through the next day and as a former EMT, I do not think it was passable to a stretcher. Mr. Creswell asked if that would be for the snowstorm Sunay night, Monday morning or this week.

Mr. Hamilton said yes.

Mr. Creswell said that Ms. Thrower said the response over this last round of snow, January 25-26, needed improvement for snow accumulations estimated over a few inches. The crew should have been in at 6 am to start on snow removal prior to the morning traffic and essential access on all floats done by noon. Their crew fell short and the snow removal was not completed until the end of the day. They were 4 hours behind schedule. Their standard for passable walkways is that it would be passable for a stretcher via a snowblower. Ms. Thrower was on leave, and her crew had somebody who was on call, went to bed at 9 pm and the winter weather advisory did not go out until 9:55 pm and then there was an upgraded winter storm that went out at 5:16 am. The person downtown went to bed before the weather was forecast and they were late for the snow removal that happened on Monday night.

Mr. Hamilton asked if that was an anomaly and whether that would ever happen again.

Mr. Creswell would never say it won't happen again because things happen, things change but normally the downtown crew begin work at 6 am on snowy days.

Question (5), Not to be too blunt, but are the other harbors better cared for than Douglas? Because Douglas is mostly ignored. The restrooms (generous term) are simply never cleared, and the main float takes over a day to clear, last big storm the main finger was almost under water, pulling an adjacent house boat down at the corner, this lasted for over a day until I called the on-duty officer.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Creswell to read the question again, saying he wanted to have it read correctly.

Mr. Sooter asked Mr. Hamilton if he could have some decorum and wait his turn.

Mr. Hamilton said he would like to correct Mr. Creswell.

Mr. Creswell read the question and said that Douglas has been and will always be a priority. The float referred to was 75% cleared of snow at the time that the request was made. It was not fully cleared because the houseboat patron left lines under the snow that kept getting caught up in the snow blower. He had conversations with the patron about the issue with the lines and the completion of the snow removal was already on the project list prior to the phone call.

Question (6) What is the amount of time within which we can expect snow removal to occur on the main fingers? Mr. Creswell asked if Mr. Hamilton meant the fingers between boats because those are the responsibility of the boat owners. Mr. Hamilton said no, he meant head walks. Mr. Creswell said depending on the rate of snowfall, this begins around 9 am and completion should occur between 12 and 3:00 pm. This would depend on the snowfall rates and additional demands on time from sinking vessels.

Question (7) What is the amount of time within which we can expect the entrance to the harbor to be cleared? Mr. Creswell said that it depends on the amount of snow and he could not give an exact time.

Mr. Hamilton said he was curious about the entrance to the pedestrian entrance to the ramp.

Mr. Creswell asked if he was talking about the gangways. For snowfall rates under 4", the entrances should be cleared by 7:30 a.m. For snowfall rates over 4" they should be cleared by 9:30 am.

Question (8) Finally I'd [the Board member] like to ask if we have gotten any feedback and guidance from the City regarding our responsibility to keep the entrance and walkways clear. Am I correct in presuming that the harbor is just as liable as any condo association for keeping its entrance ice clear and passable? Mr. Creswell said that would be question for the Law Department and he did not have that answer.

Question (9) In light of the nearly $30,000 increase in equipment costs and the $70, 000 increase in our fleet maintenance costs, does the Harbormaster's Office have any opinions regarding hiring a contractor to do the snow removal? In terms of cost? In terms of timelines? Mr. Creswell said not at this time, but it is something they could explore.

Question (10) Is there any reason we could not try alternate strategies at different harbors? Mr.

Creswell said no there isn't.

Mr. Hamilton said that he would like to make a motion to direct the harbor to prioritize gangway entrances because there's a lot of older pedestrians down at Douglas Harbor.

Mr. Leither asked what staff priority he is proposing that he would like to take staff away from.

Mr. Hamilton said he thinks staff spend too much time on loaders and plows when they really need access for emergencies. He said that the gangway entrance should be the priority.

Mr. Orr said they do the parking lot, then the gangway and then they do the head walk then the fingers to the floats. He said that made sense to him for emergency personnel. It didn't make sense to do the gangways then the parking lots.

Mr. Creswell said they would be getting heating mats for the top of the gateway column to keep the snow from building up and the weight off. The parking lots doesn't mean completely clearing the parking lots. They make the parking lots passable and as accessible as possible. Each of the parking lots is different. They have a SOP for snow and it's very general as every storm is different.

Mr. Leither asked whether Mr. Hamilton was looking for what to expect at different times. Mr. Hamilton's questions about the process feel accusatory to him. He said that he thought Harbors had done a great job.

Mr. Horchover said he had sympathy for Mr. Hamilton as this snowstorm caught a lot of people by surprise and it was chaotic. He said that he noticed people at Aurora and Harris of people dumping snow from their boats onto the docks and the docks almost sunk. He would like to suggest cleaning off the ramps as one foot doesn't do the job that the two by two and making all the ramps uniform. He also said that the non-skid gratings are great and that should also be standard in all the harbors. With security gates, he would like to see a 3-foot awning to help protect the entrance gate and access despite what the weather was doing.

Mr. Sooter said that he will sometimes leave sidewalks to get the parking lot done first that way he can't get to his snowplow as traffic moves in. He then will do the sidewalks.

Mr. Hamilton said that he wasn't saying that anyone did anything poorly, he was saying it's a poor situation. He was concerned and not embarrassed to bring it up. He wanted to hear about their liability for impassable entrances to the docks. He would like the priority to be a pedestrian area not just a parking lot. He asked the chair to bring the Douglas snow removal and parking lot maintenance to the next Ops. Meeting to discuss.

Mr. Creswell said that if they wanted, they could make changes immediately.

Mr. Hamilton asked if they could hire Carver construction to run their loaders to remove snow.

Mr. Sooter said that they would have to put it out to bid.

Mr. Uchytil said that Carver Construction is a term contractor of theirs and they didn't respond.

Mr. Leither said that everyone was overwhelmed during the last snowstorm. He said those companies were working 16 hours a day and none of them could come to their aid.

Mr. Sooter said the topic would be moved to the next Ops meeting.

a. Public Comment-None

b. Board Discussion-None

14. STAFF, COMMITTEE, AND MEMBER REPORTS

15. Assembly Liaison Report

Ms. Hall presented:

- The Assembly had a regular meeting on January 12 and work session with Juneau Legislative Delegation on the 22nd. They had updates from the CBJ DC lobbyists, mainly on the flood response. They also had updates from Senator Sullivan and Senator Murkowski's office, Senator Kiehl, Representative Story and Hannon. They heard from CBJ State lobbyist, Kevin Jardell, which provided an opportunity to ask questions.
- The Committee as a Whole meeting was held on January 26th and was dominated by an Eaglecrest discussion. There will be a joint meeting between Eaglecrest and the Assembly on March 4th to delve into the proposed switch-up in their Board structure. She had a tour of the Mendenhall Wastewater Treatment Plant this week and saw the aging infrastructure and with their fiscal reality, everyone is looking at whatever they can do.
- There is also a citywide survey out responding to fiscal priorities that she had hoped that everyone had an opportunity to complete.
- Ms. Hall thanked Docks and Harbors and said that the snowstorm was phenomenal and that staff were working incredibly long hours as boats were sinking. It made national news and she said that it was a heroic effort that they put forth.

Mr. Horchover said that what he understood was that they estimated $100 million was the cheapest option for flood control.

Ms. Hall said that she wasn't 100% sure and that they would be looking for an appropriate solution for that and getting funds to address the flood zone.

16. Visitor Industry Task Force Liaison Report

Mr. Sooter presented:

- They got the Juneau Tourism Survey report back which was 54 pages of information about the sentiments of the community. 31% said tourism had a positive impact and 10% said negative. 39% said that it was both positive and negative and 18% said that tourism had no impact at all.

17. Harbormaster Report

Mr. Creswell presented:

- Abandoned vehicles have been collected after the snow melted.

- Special Douglas Harbor parking lot: They are working through as quick as they can.
- National Guard Dock has two gangways that must go through the gate. One goes down to the float, and the other one was a straight transfer gangway. These are pile supported structures. The 70-foot gangway going down to the floating dock pulled away and broke away from its moorings on the upland side. They assumed that that was from snow but will go down and investigate further. Mr. Sill and Mr. Creswell had a meeting before the Board Meeting to figure out a plan to get the 70-foot aluminum gangway salvaged. It wasn't serving any purpose.
- There was a complaint from a patron about pigeons being fed on a boat and they have been working to remedy that situation.
- North Douglas Launch Ramp has a sinkhole due to a failed culvert. It started on the other side of the highway and came under the highway and drained out towards Fritz Cove. They have shut down the North Douglas Launch Ramp for the time being and are working with DOT next week to assess the issue. They will be coming up with a short- and long-term repair plan.
- They brought a few seasonal workers back to help with snow removal, and they have since let them go. They brought one seasonal back because they realized they needed them for derelict and sunken vessel disposal. They brought back Mr. Sean McKeown.

Mr. Hamilton asked if they got any bids for the disposal of the FV Julie Ann.

Mr. Creswell said the FV Julie Ann, which was on a seiner on the H-Float, slip 20, was supposed to open on Wednesday, but they extended it for a weekbecause of questions from the contractors/bidders. It has been extended through February 4th.

18. Port Engineer Report

Mr. Sill presented:

- Aurora Harbor, Phase 4 - The electricians worked through the worst weather. Now that the storm has melted, the plumbers have showed up and begun their job. Harri's Plumbing is fusing up the water and fire lines. The electricians are working on all the pedestals and they've got wires pulled. Western Marine Construction is largely done, and they have a little item for refurbishing the gangway. The H-Float that the FV Jullie Ann was hanging off was inspected and there was damage to that finger that the seiner was on. It's got a split waler, but the damage is not that bad. They are working on that area before they get hit with the minus tides in the next couple of days because they don't want the finger to come back and sit down on the seiner again. When the seiner came up underneath and that's when the floats were damaged. They have a plan to stitch those floats back together, so they are trying to get that repair done quickly.
- Taku Harbor - Trucano has most of the gangways and most of the aluminum and steel components in Juneau or on their way. They'll be mobilizing in the spring. They have asked them to make repairs to the Stockade Point float, and they have come back with a $40,000 quote. They will try to make those repairs in-house as they think that is a lot of money. They thought what was driving the costs up was the use of their crane with a barge, but that wasn't a necessary expense. They will buy the timber and make the repairs themselves and if they can't do it themselves, they will find someone with a landing craft who can make the repairs.
- The Statter Harbor parking lot has calmed down, and they are putting up railing during the winter months. The roof is done on the Harbor Office.
- Secure storage project at the Rock Dump was advertised today for 3 weeks.
- Salvage of the FV Julie Ann was supposed to open later this week however, they have received a lot of questions about insurance requirements, and they are still working through some of those

questions. They have pushed the bid process out until the following week.

- They are in their second week of having a part-time limited Engineer in the office so that has been helpful and they are working on a RFP for the Steamship Dock inspection which they have funding for.
- They are working on a port camera project which also has been funded and the power needed for cameras on the intermediate vessel float.
- They have executed an agreement with a driller for the Statter Harbor Breakwater for the Geotechnical study. The Army Corp of Engineers are doing the study to rebuild the breakwater there in front of the Stater Harbor. Docks and Harbors put out the proposal to bid, and they have an agreement to begin in the spring to drill some holes and find out what was down there.

19. Port Director Report

Mr. Uchytil presented:

- Mr. Uchytil added that the geotechnical drilling company at Statter Harbor is planning to mobilize in May and will do some soil sampling for North Douglas.
- They received notice from CDD that the Planning Commission is going to consider a conditional use permit for Fly and Dive. This is the new facility that's being built on what we used to call Archipelago property. On the 24th of February, there is conditional use permit with the Planning Commission. They are adjacent landowners and have got a question asking the Board if they want to make a formal statement or stay silent as they will need a variance. It's a large building, 35,000 square feet. The zone there is 35 feet in height. The plan shows that the building goes right up to Franklin Street. The question before the Board was do they want to or want him to make any comments to the Planning Commission. They have one more meeting between now and the February meeting.

Mr. Orr asked if they were going to do bathrooms somewhere in that space.

Mr. Uchytil said we have a marine passenger fee request for bathrooms. There's a sketch for food carts in the Archipelago area with zero setbacks.

Mr. Horchover asked if there were any issues structurally or any reason why they can have those variances. He thought that 38-foot was the height requirement downtown. He said it sounded like they were making reasonable efforts to build what they want in the place where there are.

Mr. Leither said that he was picturing a wall-sized advertisement on the building and that may cause him enough reason to oppose the zero-set back. He said it was overwhelming to him.

Mr. Sooter commented that the hard thing about zero setbacks was that if maintenance was needed, they would need to burden their neighbor. He realized it's public property.

Mr. Leither said that it would make it more complicated if Docks and Harbors must repair the boardwalk.

Mr. Sill said that there was always the potential for development there. This plan is larger than what Archipelago had envisioned but it is a private parcel of property that wanted tourism development.

The Docks and Harbor has always accommodated others in that space so he couldn't currently see any harm that would have from this facility being built.

Mr. Sooter asked if they could think about it as they have one more Ops meeting before February 24th.

Mr. Leither said that by his count there were 4 items added to the Ops meeting and that 4-hour meetings were tough.

Mr. Uchytil said that they postponed the bid opening for FV Julie Ann until Wednesday February 4th at 2:00 pm. He asked the board if either next Thursday or Friday they could meet to have a quick noon meeting to approve the award so that allows them to weigh in before the Assembly has their meeting on February 9th. They think the bid will be more than $200,000 dollars. Members said those days would work for them.

Mr. Uchytil said he had one more item to present. The joint meeting with the Assembly had been moved to Wednesday, March 18th. They will be presenting the budget for their approval. He wanted to put that on everyone's schedule and said that it should be on everyone's schedule as that is a normal Ops Meeting Day to meet. They will probably cancel the Ops meeting so that they can all attend.

Mr. Sooter said that Breckan Hendricks, the CBJ Municipal Clerk/Election Official, was looking for confirmation from Board members.

Mr. Leither said for the record he would be available on the 18th.

20. COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS-None

21. ADJOURNMENT at 8:45 pm