

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

**I. Call to Order**

Mr. Eiler called the meeting to order at 5:04pm in CBJ Room 224.

**II. Roll Call**

The following members were present: Don Etheridge, Bob Janes (Via Telephone 5:18-5:42) Bud Simpson, James Becker (Via Telephone 5:00 -5:17, in person 5:29 to end of meeting) Bob Wostmann, and Weston Eiler.

Absent: Dan Blanchard, David McCasland, and Mark Ridgway.

Also present: Carl Uchytel – Port Director, Gary Gillette – Port Engineer, David Borg – Harbormaster, and Matthew Creswell – Deputy Harbormaster.

**III. Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Uchytel said he pulled the minutes for the November 14<sup>th</sup> meeting at the request of a Board member and moved the Downtown Waterfront Improvements Project to items for information because there is no action.

**MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Motion passed with no objection.

**IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items –  
Kay Sullivan, Juneau, AK**

Ms. Sullivan said she is here to talk about the proposed changes at Amalga Harbor along with several neighbors. She said she was just recently made aware of the changes and she would like her voice heard. Amalga Harbor is a small, shallow harbor and there was a lot of pressure put on it, especially when the Auke Bay boat launch was under construction. There was relief when Auke Bay opened this last year and considerably less conflict at the dock. We have seen eight bears consistently throughout this past summer at the Harbor and one killed a dog. There is also pressure from DIPAC, who has the hatchery, and the seine fleet in July. She said she understands the proposed changes are supposed to deal with the congestion of the Harbor but she said that was relieved when Auke Bay re-opened. Looking at the plans, the longer dock at best will only help on those rare occasions when the lowest tides correspond with sunny weekends and high use. The vast majority of delays and conflicts come from boater inexperience and an occasional inconsiderate boater. She said it is not all tide problems. It doesn't matter if it is low or high tides and it will not be fixed with more dock. She is suggesting handing out brochures describing docking and launching etiquette which may help people to get in and out of the launch area quicker. The next issue she wanted to talk about was debris in the Harbor. She said she was told by Docks & Harbors that the amount of fish debris will not increase with the creation of three cleaning stations. She said the Neighborhood Association whole heartedly disagrees with that assessment. Not everyone coming into the Harbor right now cleans their fish there so putting in three cleaning stations is bound to increase the amount of debris. What happens

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

when the people are cleaning their fish is they throw the carcasses into the water and initially the halibut carcasses sink but they later float as they decay and the stomach fills with gas. Once this happens they rarely float out of the Harbor. With each tide they move further upland. She said the carcasses on the South side work their way up toward their homes. The Harbor is too small, shallow, and protected to flush the fish debris. It tends to flow to the head of the Harbor and drops the debris in the tall grass which then creates a terrible odor and provides an incentive for the resident bears to come in close to the homes. The bears are becoming habituated and they are not easily scared off. They have become aggressive and are a threat to life and property. If the bear survives the winter, it will return. Even if that bear doesn't come back, there will be another bear because of the incentive. There is also a layer of scum on the water because of the fish decomposing. When you go out to kayak or paddle board, you are walking through all the scum. At the end of the day, all the boaters go home and we are left with the debris to deal with. The last issue is the navigational aid. We are told the plan is to install a 25' piling with a red triangle on the top of it right in the Harbor. For the Neighborhood Association, that is unacceptable. It will be right in the middle of our view and we would look at it everyday all day. She said she does not believe there was consideration given to the Amalga Community when proposing this option. There are at least four rocky areas that line the navigational channel at Amalga Harbor. The Neighborhood Association thinks a better solution than a piling is education for the boaters with better signage at the dock and a handout provided when a launch permit is issued which clearly shows all the rocky obstacles. She said education is a better solution than an unsightly piling and triangle.

Doug Larsen, Juneau, AK

Mr. Larsen said he has property at Amalga and his family has been there since 1959. Over the years, there have been incredible improvements at Amalga Harbor, and the Amalga Community is deeply appreciative of all the work. He said he remembers as a kid watching people back down into the muck to launch their boats and get stuck. He said he wants to be clear that the Amalga Community is not opposed to development or improvements. This is more of a matter of scope and Ms. Sullivan did a good job laying out the concerns of the Amalga Community. He said he has worked 30 years in the wildlife department. He said he understands the bear issues and knows there are bears living in Juneau, but anything people can do to alleviate or minimize that is good. In Amalga Harbor, all the fish carcasses promote more bears. In terms of the rocky obstacles, he said anything to help people from damaging their prop the Neighborhood Association is in support of, but hopefully there can be something other than the piling with the red triangle that will be more of an eyesore in this quaint little bay.

Mr. Janes said he knows about the rock and lost a lower unit on his boat in 1966. He saw the picture of it the first time the other day and was somewhat surprised on how big the rocky area is. He asked Mr. Larsen if he had an idea on an alternative to the piling that would be more appropriate for the area?

Mr. Larsen said some signage at the dock that shows where the obstacles are or remove it. He said he doesn't know the magnitude to remove it but he suggests looking into removal.

Deven Mitchell, Juneau, AK

Mr. Mitchell said he is not part of the Amalga Neighborhood Association. He said he made a mistake about sending a letter some time ago to Docks & Harbors about his experience at Amalga Harbor

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

which was pretty unpleasant. He said he goes to Amalga Harbor frequently since he was a kid, but the day he is talking about he was in a 28' boat and it was probably a 10' tide. He pulled into Amalga Harbor and there were two boats, one on each side of the dock cleaning fish. There was still room for one boat on the front end of the south side of the dock, he pulled into that spot and walked over to get his truck at the far end of the parking lot. He pulled his truck to the ramp and the guy at the end of the dock that was cleaning fish had finished cleaning fish and was parked front row at the launch ramp. This guy now thinks he is cutting him off. Mr. Mitchell said he knew the guy, but he was told by him that he would have physically attacked him if he hadn't known him. He was upset enough that their friendship ended. He said that was the worst experience, but there have been other times when he pulled into the Harbor and there wasn't room at the dock because of people cleaning fish. Amalga Harbor has a small dock and a small ramp to launch and retrieve boats which results in having to idle and wait for people to clean fish. He sees this project as a potential solution to his past experiences. The alternative he would like to see is a fish cleaning dock totally separated from the float but he understands that is illegal.

John Cooper, Juneau, AK

Mr. Cooper said he is an Amalga Harbor user. He would like to see the fish cleaning on the other side of Amalga Harbor where DIPAC has its facilities. He understands Fish & Game has a problem with that and they do not want to solve that issue so this plan seems to be the best available solution. He said the fish cleaning problem exists, but not all the time. However, it will be a problem even more because we keep getting more boats in Juneau and that is a reality. The problem with one cleaning station and four or five people wanting to clean is boaters will be idling near the rock and if there is wind, boaters will tend to drift into that rock. Instead of watching other boaters, people are watching their fathometers so they don't take their lower units out. A marker on the rocky obstacle so boaters can see it will help the boaters watch what's going on and be out of the cockpit which would be a big safety improvement. If there are other alternatives, he would be glad to look at them but right now this is the best idea that Fish & Games agrees with that he has seen in two or three years and he said he is in favor of it. He said there are ways to remove the rock by using expanding chemicals but it will be more expensive than the proposed current project.

Mr. Simpson said the fish waste has been a concern of the Board. He asked if the additional cleaning tables are not expected to generate more fish waste because there is a finite amount of boats coming in to clean fish and this would just spread it out?

Mr. Uchytel said the proposal with the 75' extension would push the fish cleaning further off the shore and he has no doubt that not everybody cleans their fish at Amalga. He said because we are building three fish cleaning stations we will have three times the amount of carcasses is not true. There could be more but he does not think so. This is not our preferred alternative but this is the alternative that Fish & Game said they would fund for a fish cleaning station.

Mr. Wostmann asked Mr. Uchytel about the currents. He asked if Mr. Uchytel knew another location for a fish cleaning station, like a separate dock, that would not have the fish carcasses drifting on the south shore.

Mr. Uchytel said he does not have any data for currents.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Mr. Eiler asked Mr. Uchytel to clarify the Alaska Department of Fish & Game's role in the funding and approving the project.

Mr. Uchytel said the initial study was done by our part time employee Harold Moeser. He looked at several options and our preferred location was an off shore fish cleaning station. However, Fish & Game said they would not support it and would not fund it if it is off shore and preferred the float extension. Fish & Game is funding \$280,000 of this project and anything over Docks & Harbors will fund. Staff believes the majority of the work can be completed with that amount. Harold Moeser also had an estimate to remove the rock for \$300,000. Staff asked Fish & Game if they would fund the removal of the rock and they said no.

Mr. Becker said he is also on the DIPAC Board and he has experience with this issue. He is not speaking for DIPAC but he would be an advocate for satisfying the disturbance because they have been very patient. These bears have memories and they will come back again.

Mr. Eiler asked if the Board had any other questions, and asked Mr. Uchytel about the timeline and future public process.

Mr. Uchytel said about 2 ½ years ago Mr. Moeser started with the study and staff came up with the preferred option. That was on hold until we had a good sense of what the new Statter Harbor launch ramp would do to the use of Amalga Harbor. Although we didn't collect hard data, anecdotally from staff even though Statter Harbor launch ramp is used, they did not see a decline in use at Amalga so it merited moving forward with a solution. The cooperative agreement with Fish & Game was expiring at the end of this month so last summer staff re-engaged with Fish & Game. They asked staff what we wanted to do, we told them our preferred plan, but they would not support a remote fish cleaning station. Staff brought this plan before the Board in August with our plans and held a public meeting at the Mendenhall Library in October. Now staff is moving forward with final design with PND Engineers. The plan is to get this installed before July. If it doesn't happen before July staff will wait until October. We still need a permit with the Corps of Engineers and they will also reach out to the other federal services.

Mr. Eiler encouraged additional comments be sent to the Board.

Debbie Driscoll, Juneau, AK

Ms. Driscoll suggested in the future when changes occur in a Harbor where individuals live, please make an attempt to contact those individuals so they can provide input.

Mr. Uchytel said we do advertise on the radio and newspaper when we are having public meetings. Mr. Uchytel passed around drawings of what the float would look like at low tide.

5:42 pm Mr. Janes left the meeting.

**V. Approval of Wednesday, November 14th, 2018 Operations/Planning Meetings Minutes**

Mr. Eiler requested the minutes be held over to next meeting.

**VI. Consent Agenda - None**

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

**VII. Unfinished Business - None**

1. Downtown Waterfront Improvement Project

**Moved to Items for information**

**VIII. New Business**

1. Yankee Cove Lease – Rental Adjustment Objection

Mr. Uchytel called Mr. Charles Horan, our term contract appraiser, so he could participate in the discussion.

Marion Hobbs, Juneau, AK

Mr. Hobbs said he is here to object to the latest adjustment on his tideland lease which was done by Mr. Horan. He said he rents his dock to Coeur Alaska. Their Attorneys came to Mr. Hobbs and said they had some legal problems with the lease between Mr. Hobbs and the City, and it is causing problems with the lease between Mr. Hobbs and Coeur Alaska. He brought this to Carl's attention a year and a half ago. He said his lease was supposed to be renewed every five years but it has now been 10 years since it has been looked at. He said the more he looked into what was going on, the more complicated it got.

Mr. Eiler asked Mr. Hobbs to clarify what he is objecting to and what he is specifically asking of the Committee.

Mr. Hobbs said his objection is that when he received his new appraisal, that didn't fall under the category of what his agreement was with the City for a re-evaluation. The problem is, Docks & Harbors requested a new appraisal on a different piece of property than what was in the original agreement 10 years prior. He provided the Committee with a handout and talked about a map on page three saying that the area originally requested, and the area leased/dock and breakwater are built on are two totally different areas. When the new area was requested by CBJ to be appraised, it entailed a lot more area. In the actual documents of the lease agreement from 10 years prior, it has the description of the lease area. There is 25,000 sq ft of dock facility and 10,800 sq ft of the breakwater area. Also in the agreement this was suppose to be re-evaluated every five years. He doesn't understand why the City asked Mr. Horan to do a new appraisal on a completely different area. The area that has been requested by Harbors is the area that contains the smaller area with his dock facility which is the as-built area survey that is the area agreed upon in our first agreement. He said Mr. Horan looked at this as if the City has over 3 acres but he is only leasing a small portion of it. This was agreed upon 10 years ago. A lot of the area in the over 3 acres is not useable. Part of it belongs to DOT right of way. Another area that people are not allowed to do anything on is near Besse Creek. He does not understand why the City had to get another whole new appraisal on another area which is the right area that was not in the original lease. He said in a way this is his mistake. He thought between Docks & Harbors and the attorneys there would have been research done and there would have had the correct legal description so when he signed the papers he thought it was all correct. He said one more problem that exists is in the agreement, it says the City pays for the initial appraisal and the re-evaluations are to be paid by the person doing the

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

leasing. What got his attention is he is paying for a completely new appraisal which was \$4,900. When he went to Mr. Uchytel about this, he was told he could get another appraisal if he didn't like it. He asked why he just paid for the appraisal for the City and now he should have to pay for another one because he didn't like the first one. There is not a lot of logic in this. Why did he pay for something he does not agree with, which he wishes he had more input on in the first place, and then have to pay for another one. He said he is requesting the City return his money that was paid to Horan & Company and he will go get another appraisal. It doesn't make sense to pay for one and then have to turn around and pay for another one. He said this is not just him but it is a problem that lies within several different tideland leases. He said the Board needs to standardize things a little better so people know where they stand and what is happening and not have so many mismatched systems for owners of leases. Mr. Hobbs said he is asking for the money he paid for Mr. Horan's appraisal to be returned or reallocated toward his lease. His lease went from \$.05 per sq ft to \$.12 per sq ft. The comparisons that were used were the Smith property at 3 mile which is the barge landing, Alaska Seafoods fish plant, and Allen Marine. He said his dock facility has a boat that comes in twice a day, loads up people and takes them to the mine and comes back. This is very similar to the other end at Kensington where the same people unload and come back again. It is also similar to Young's Bay (Greens Creek) where they go over and back again. He asked why he is not compared to something similar to what he does? The comparisons don't make any sense to him. He would like to find out what a fair appraisal of his lease is, and should he go from \$.05 per sq ft to \$.12 sq ft?

Committee Questions

Mr. Eiler asked Mr. Uchytel to remind the Committee about the terms of the lease, the appraisal and the process. He noted this lease has been before this Committee previously.

Mr. Uchytel said Mr. Hobbs has been working with Ms. Larson the last several months and she listened to Mr. Hobbs and has told Mr. Hobbs the process allows for a challenge. The lease states the Lessee is to pay for all costs in re-evaluating the property. If he doesn't like the appraisal he can get another appraisal which is the process.

Mr. Eiler recounted Mr. Hobbs testimony in detail. He asked about Mr. Hobbs' claims that the areas his lease is being compared to do not provide for an apples-to-apples analysis. He asked staff to explain the appraisal's peer group analysis and what might have changed over the past 10 years.

Mr. Uchytel said Mr. Hobbs did not like the answer he received so he wanted to come to the Board.

Mr. Eiler asked what decision is before the Committee tonight? Are we making a recommendation to staff or a recommendation to go to the full Board?

Mr. Uchytel said to the full Board.

Mr. Uchytel said the whole system of appraisals is set up around an appraiser. Staff hired a qualified appraiser that brings credibility to the process. He does not like picking and

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

choosing certain appraisals and deciding what is too high or what is too low. Mr. Horan has been around for 40 years doing this type of work and he knows what property to compare to another.

Mr. Wostmann said he would like to start with what Mr. Hobbs said about the property that was appraised being different from what is in the lease.

Mr. Uchytel said when the State transferred property to Docks & Harbors the survey instructions was the initial lease area. Because Mr. Hobbs asked for a greater area for dredging, the survey instructions came back with a larger parcel which was a greater area than he wanted, and Docks & Harbors did not receive the plat from the survey instructions until 2013. Mr. Hobbs construction started in 2006 and the lease was signed in 2008 and at that time it had a smaller footprint.

Mr. Wostmann asked to clarify the area on the map.

Mr. Hobbs said the area on the map was the area he was originally going to lease from DIPAC but his facility is in a different area and the original ATS number is what is in his lease. He said his complaint is that when Mr. Horan was asked to do a new appraisal by the City was for the whole orange dotted area on the map. He took that into consideration which also includes the green area which is a state DOT right of way.

Mr. Wostmann asked Mr. Uchytel to explain.

Mr. Uchytel said this was because the new survey instructions from the state gave the City a new platted tideland which was primarily because Mr. Hobbs asked for a larger area due to dredging in support of his dock.

Mr. Wostmann asked if this occurred in 2007?

Mr. Hobbs said the area used came from the map in the Corps of Engineers permit application which included the dredge area he thought he was going to have to dredge because at the time that area was a big sandy beach. He asked for a larger area because he didn't want to go back and ask for more and that was what the state took into consideration. He said when he actually did the work he didn't have to dredge as much because he ran into rock and he did not need to dredge a lot of that area.

Mr. Eiler said that illuminates why this area was used in his appraisal. He asked Mr. Uchytel to go over Mr. Hobbs' second contention regarding re-evaluation and the option for a new appraisal.

Mr. Uchytel said it was appraised in 2008 by Mr. Horan for the smaller area and he thought that ended up to be \$.12 per sq ft. Mr. Hobbs went to Mr. Stone and said the rate was too high and he was not going to pay it. At that time, Mr. Stone told Mr. Hobbs to get another appraisal. He went to the Board and they agreed to \$.05 per sq ft.

Mr. Hobbs said the Board saw what was going on at that time and agreed with what it really should be. He said because the State gave the City x-amount of property, and he

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

only needs to use part of it, does not justify tripling the rate because a smaller area is being used.

Mr. Eiler raised Mr. Hobbs' question of the peer group used in the new appraisal by Mr. Horan. What was the peer group used ten years ago and how does it compare?

Mr. Horan said the 2008 appraisal was based on a 3½ acre parcel and came up with about \$.05 per sq ft. He said Mr. Hobbs negotiated down to a much smaller parcel and negotiated using the much larger unit value at \$.05 per sq ft. This resulted in a below market rent at that time and he explained that to Mr. Hobbs when he was appraising the lease area. He told Mr. Hobbs his rent was going to increase because the original rent was low because it was based on a 3½ acre parcel and he only was leasing a .844 acre. He explained that in the appraisal because he knew it was going to be an issue. In the original scope of work for the current appraisal, it was based on the land the City received from the State, but when he discussed this with Mr. Uchytel's office, they agreed the proper thing to do is appraise the area that is in the lease. It is clear in the appraisal that the appraisal only appraises the size area in the lease. The original lease negotiations were a larger parcel which was what was appraised in 2006. The unit value of that larger parcel was applied to the small parcel which gave a below market rent at the beginning of the lease term. The small parcel is what was leased and that is what was appraised during the adjustment period. He said there was never any confusion on the parcel to be appraised and was the smaller area. He said if Mr. Hobbs' new lease area was reappraised in 2008, it would have been higher on a per sq ft basis. Mr. Hobbs lease has been at a below market rent due to that issue. Mr. Horan said the market is at \$.12 a sq ft because they went out and looked at comparables or peer groups as referred to. There are comparables that are larger in size and more remote in location with ranges from \$.05 per sq ft to \$.07 per sq ft for several acre parcels, and \$.15 per sq ft or higher for smaller parcels more like Mr. Hobbs'. Because his parcel was farther out the road it was at the lower end of the higher rate. Another thing the market does is look at the overall rent, which is \$4400 per year. For land in its pre-developed condition to support this type of facility was not unreasonable when you look at the peer group of other industrial land rental rates.

Mr. Wostmann said he is still confused with Mr. Hobbs' letter where he contends that the new appraisal was done on a much larger footage and he just heard Mr. Horan to say that was not the case.

Mr. Horan said Mr. Hobbs' point is that the original order from the Harbor for the new appraisal was for a larger area because it was for the new land that had been conveyed from the State but in concurrence with the Harbor, the appraisal is to address the smaller area as in the lease.

Mr. Hobbs said Mr. Horan did take the exact amount of square footage which is in the original lease he has had for the last 10 years. However, he used the reasoning of the City owning a large area and only a small part of it is used. He said the price was raised from \$.05 to \$.12 because Mr. Horan said it was worth more because the smaller area is being used. He also discussed the comparables used in his appraisal. He does not believe they

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

are true comparables. He asked Mr. Horan to point out the cookie cutter scenario in his appraisal to the Committee.

Mr. Horan said in the appraisal on page 14 it talks about the cookie cutter area. There is a large parcel area that totals over three acres and Mr Hobbs did the dredging, built the breakwater, added riprap, fill, the dock, and then had it resurveyed around his improvements to decreased the area from over three acres to just over .8 of an acre. What we are grappling with here is the concept of the law of diminishing returns as the size increases. As the size of a parcel increases, which is a general economic rule, the value increases. With all things being relatively smaller, a larger piece of real estate will sell for more than a smaller piece of real estate or will rent for more than a smaller piece of real estate but the unit value per sq ft diminishes as the property increases because the economic utility, the value, the utilization of that additional square footage is diminished as the size increases. But there is not an equal impact as there are exceptions to this rule. Mr. Horan said even though the rent is less for .8 of an acre than for three acres, the rent per sq ft is going to be higher and that is why Mr. Hobbs has had the low market rent for 10 years because he was able to get the three acre rate applied to the .8 of an acre parcel.

Public Comment-

Dennis Watson, Juneau, AK

Mr. Watson said he has been coming to the Harbor Board meetings since 2005 and he has sat in on most lease increases. The values that were established or agreed to by the Board were done out of compassion for an impact on business. He was at the meeting and he is also a licensed realtor so he is familiar with leases. It didn't hold water then, but the Board made a decision.

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Etheridge asked why there needed to be another appraisal?

Mr. Uchytel said Mr. Hobbs brings this up as one of the problems. The lease was signed in 2008 and was actually in place in 2006. There was an appraisal back then and the rate was negotiated down to \$.05 per sq ft. Docks & Harbors is required every five years to re-evaluate the property. In 2013, at the end of the five year period, staff was still in the process of receiving the State Tidelands through a survey. He said staff elected to not do an appraisal at that time because the amount was under \$2,000 and the new plat was just done. Now ten years has passed and per the lease agreement it says it should be done every five years. There are some leases that are so small in dollar value that it doesn't make sense to do one every five years but this did benefit him for not doing one. Staff tries to be consistent but we don't do appraisals for a living. We own the process but not the appraisal. He doesn't want Mr. Hobbs, Mr. Gitkov, and Mr. Duvernay go have breakfast at Donna's and ask each other what they pay and they say they went and talked to the Board and got their rate cut in half. He said he relies on the professionals hired to do this work. Right or wrong, that is how the lease is written that the lessee pays for the lease adjustments.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

Mr. Wostmann asked what action the Committee needs to take tonight other than a recommendation to put this on the Board meeting agenda.

Mr. Eiler said the Committee has now fully heard Mr. Hobbs objections, as well as the appraiser's and staff's position. He asked what the appropriate motion would be to conclude the Committee's work on the matter.

Mr. Uchytel said his recommendation to Mr. Hobbs was that if he didn't like the appraisal there is a process to appeal it but he didn't want to follow that because he does not think it is in his best interest.

Mr. Hobbs said he is already being charged for the first one of \$4,900 and when Docks & Harbors tells Mr. Horan to do an appraisal it's going to cost the customer. He said Mr. Horan basically has an open check book to do what ever he wants and to take as long as he wants and he had to pay for it. He said then he is told if he doesn't like the first appraisal he has to go pay for another one and oppose it. Where is the ethics here?

Mr. Eiler said all of the past lease assessments considered by the Board, that he's aware of, were conducted by Mr. Horan. That speaks to the caliber of his work and why he is so widely used by CBJ and others. He said he does understand that Mr. Hobbs does not like the answer Mr. Horan came up with, or the peer groups being used, but he has trouble finding an ethical or logical problem with Mr. Horan's methods. He said the lease Mr. Hobbs signed stipulates that he has the right to use another appraiser to get a second opinion.

**MOTION By MR.WOSTMANN: TO MOVE THIS DISCUSSION ON THIS LEASE TO THE NEXT FULL BOARD MEETING FOR BOARD ACTION WITHOUT A RECOMMENDATION AT THIS TIME AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

Mr. Eiler objected citing the Committee's lengthy work on the matter that evening. He requested to have what has already been discussed summarized so the Board can work toward a recommendation and not just start over on this issue next week.

Mr. Etheridge said this will also give more time to review what has already been discussed.

Mr. Eiler removed his objection.

**Motion passed**

**2. FY20 Marine Passenger Fee (MPF) Request**

Mr. Uchytel said even though the lawsuit is finished with Judge Holland's decision, the direction he received from the City Manager was to continue the process as in previous years. He read the list and gave a brief description.

- Area Wide Port Operations – This is asked for every year. \$60,000 was added this year for the potential augmentation for the two additional needed employees, Harbor Officer and Harbor Technician.
- Port Customs/Visitor Center Building Maintenance Support – We are asking for this again.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

- Landscaping – We are asking for \$45,000 and have never been successful with funding from the MPF.
- Weather Current Monitoring System – We will ask again and this will be funded because it benefits the vessel.
- Safety Guardrail on the dock – This is for \$2M. He said this is a 50/50 chance if this will get approved.
- Security check point structures phase II – This is a MPF project.
- Electrical EMS response vehicle –Mr. Borg said the docks were designed to drive down to the ship, but we are not able to get a vehicle through the massive amount of people getting off the ships. It takes more time when they try to drive rather than walking a gurney down to the ship and back to the parking lot. This smaller electric vehicle will be used to take a paramedic and their striker type gurney to and from the ship.
- Docks enterprise entire funding with MPF. Dock staff directly serves the vessels.

Mr. Uchytel said this list will be submitted to the City Manager and he will figure out what is appropriate use of the MPF funds.

Committee Questions-None

Public Comment-None

Committee Discussion/Action

**MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD APPROVE THE FY20 MARINE PASSENGER FEE REQUEST AS PRESENTED AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**

**Motion passed with no objection**

**IX. Items for Information/Discussion**

**1. Aurora Harbor Phase III**

Mr. Uchytel said Docks & Harbors has had some bad luck with the Statter Phase III project, and was not successful with the BUILD grants. Governor Dunleavy will put out his budget by January 15<sup>th</sup>. We are hopeful for \$4.5M. If we get \$4M for Aurora the idea is to demo the existing infrastructure and come in with a new headwalk and two main floats with power and no fingers. He would like the Committee to be thinking what if we don't receive any money for this project. We could ask the Corps to postpone the dredging for a year. However, the floats are past their useful life.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Simpson asked if that would put a few dozen smaller boats with no place to moor?

Mr. Borg said yes it would.

Mr. Uchytel said the entire project to replace in kind is \$7M.

**CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD**  
**OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**For Wednesday, December 12th, 2018**

2. Project Funding Strategies

Mr. Uchytel went over the last page in the packet with the projects and their funds available.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

3. Downtown Waterfront Improvement Project

Mr. Uchytel said at the Committee of the Whole Assembly meeting on Monday they approved moving the Purchase and Sales Agreement forward. The PSA and the funding strategy by the Finance Director will be introduced on January 7<sup>th</sup> and action on January 28<sup>th</sup>. Things are still moving in a positive way.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Eiler asked Mr. Uchytel to forward the Purchase and Sales Agreement on to the Board when it is released.

Mr. Uchytel said City Law and Morris did agree to the PSA and it has not changed much since that last one forwarded to the Board. He said the appraisal is public as well.

**X. Staff & Member Reports-None**

**XI. Committee Administrative Matters**

1. Next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting- **Wednesday, January 23rd, 2019.**

**XII. Adjournment- The meeting was adjourned at 7:01pm.**