CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
OPERATIONS/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 19th, 2016

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. in City Hall Conference Room 224.

II. Roll Call

The following members were present: John Bush, Tom Donek, David Lowell, David Summers, and Budd Simpson.
Also present: David Seng-Board Member, Carl Uchytil-Port Director, and Dave Borg-Harbormaster.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Uchytil recommended removed item 3. Regulation Changes – Boat Shelters from the agenda.

Mr. Simpson said to strike item 3. Regulation Changes – Boat Shelters from the agenda unless someone wants to speak about the topic. I would like to add an Administrative Item to the agenda.

MOTION by Mr. Bush TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The motion passed with no objections.

IV. Administrative Item – Appointment of a Vice Chair

Mr. Lowell volunteered to be the Vice Chair of the Operations/Planning Committee.

The Operations/Planning Committee accepted Mr. Lowell's appointment to Vice Chair of the Operations/Planning Committee.

V. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items – None.

VI. Approval of Wednesday, September 21st, 2016 Operations-Planning Meeting Minutes

Mr. Uchytil spoke with madam secretary about making changes and corrections.

MOTION by Mr. Donek TO APPROVE THE September 21st, 2016 Operations-Planning Meeting MINUTES WITH THE CORRECTIONS AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The motion passed with no objections.

VII. Consent Agenda – None.

VIII. Unfinished Business – None.

IX. New Business

1. Resident Liveaboard Regulations

Mr. Borg said on page 13 you will find the Residence surcharge information. The red text is what I am proposing we add to regulation 05 CBJAC 20.050 – Residence surcharge. In section "b" you will see my proposal to have the owner of the vessel as one of the liveaboards. Currently in Aurora Harbor 11 vessels are being leased to another patron by the owners. This has created issues when the landlord wants me to intervene and evict the unpaying tenant from the boat.

In section "c" I address the issue of waste in the harbors. Recently we tested for fecal coliform and the levels were 700 in one spot. This was after a 20 foot tidal change which allowed plenty of time for the fecal material to flush out of the harbor. The harbors are being used as a sewage dump. Ketchikan tested section "c" in their harbors and has had good results. Section "c" also falls into our clean harbor initiative. One of the requirements to receive the clean harbor certificate is to have a waste water plan.

Section "d" limits the amount of liveaboards allowed in each harbor. We have more than 88 vessels with liveaboards in Aurora Harbor and that puts a huge stress on the harbor. With that comes a high amount of crime, theft, drug use, and similar things I would like to minimize. This section also addresses the Statter Harbor transient area. In the summer month's liveaboards take up 800 linear feet of moorage space at Statter Harbor. That's just in the transient area and does not include the assigned stalls.

In section "b" I would like to strike the words "rented" and "leased" as I would no longer like the owners to rent or lease their boats to other individuals. In section "d" I have given my recommendation for rate changes and have added a pet surcharge. We do have a lot of dogs that show up in the harbors along with their liveaboard owners. These dogs are caught wandering the docks alone. Having a pet surcharge would help offset the cost of dog waste bags and staff time associated with cleaning up after the dogs.

Committee Questions

Mr. Donek asked in section "b" it says you will accept "requests for waivers", what do you mean.

Mr. Borg said patrons might have visitors in town and do not enough space in their home to have their visitors stay. I think it's reasonable to have them stay on the boat in that circumstance.

Mr. Simpson said charter vessels with a professional skipper and crew might stay on the vessel. I recommend you explain for which circumstances you are willing to waive the liveaboard regulation. Also, are there other options for sanitation devices other than what is listed?

Mr. Borg replied yes. I did not list all the options, but if a patron came to me and asked about a specific sanitation device I would look into it case-by-case.

Mr. Summers asked do other harbors allow a boat owner to lease their boat. It is private property. In section "c" where it says "upon reasonable notice" I recommend having a time associated with that, like 24 hours or 48 hours. Same goes for the sentence stating "require owners of live aboard vessels to demonstrate and/or document regular, legal off-loading of waste". Perhaps the owners of live aboard vessels will need to demonstrate this once a quarter. I recommend all liveaboards be documented with the Harbor and not just the boat owners.

Mr. Borg replied we do require every liveaboard to be documented with the Harbor Office. There are currently 111 liveaboards in Aurora Harbor.

Mr. Summers asked what is the total percentage of boats with liveaboards in Aurora Harbor.

Mr. Borg replied 20%.

Mr. Summers said you're looking for a reduction of liveaboards in the harbors by about half. Is the Clean Harbor Plan a standalone document?

Mr. Borg replied yes.

Mr. Summer said I recommend raising the pet fee to $10.00 because $5.00 seems low.

Mr. Lowell asked what is the timeframe for compliance with the marine sanitation devices.

Mr. Borg said I do not have a date at this time, but I will have a date for you next week.

Mr. Lowell asked what recourse do you have for patrons who do not comply.

Mr. Borg replied patrons who do not comply will not be authorized to liveaboard.

Mr. Simpson asked how much of a grace period will you allow.

Mr. Borg said he believes the first of June 2017 would be a sufficient amount of time.

Mr. Summers asked is that enough time for 88 vessels to get a contractor to update their boat in order to comply.

Mr. Borg said it is their responsibility to comply. A majority of these boats currently have marine sanitation devices and just need to stop pumping waste into the harbors. We have a portable waste removal machine for patrons to use.

Mr. Uchytil asked do you want all current liveaboards to be grandfathered in or do you want to have an end date. Also, I recommend giving patrons a year to comply with the marine sanitation device requirement because it is a burden.

Mr. Simpson said we can give a waiver to the patrons who can show progress, like by showing they have a contract to have a marine sanitation device installed.

Mr. Lowell asked do we want to put the total that 10% comes to in the regulation, because that number could change.

Mr. Borg said maybe we shouldn't have the numbers in the regulation because they could change. I put the numbers in the packet for the committee to reference. Also, I recommend looking at what is required for liveaboard insurance.

Mr. Simpson asked do other harbors have the same requirement for insurance.

Mr. Borg said he could not find any harbor that required insurance to receive moorage.

Public Discussion
Paul Swanson of Juneau, AK
Mr. Swanson said I understand you have problems with some of the liveaboards. However, I think if you own a boat you should be allowed to rent to someone. I am not in favor of being told what I can and can't do with my boat.

Committee Discussion/Action
Mr. Donek said currently our regulations require patrons to have insurance, but it is not specific enough. I am in favor of doing away with the Vessel Disposal Surcharge of $0.25 per foot per month required from patrons who do not have insurance.

Mr. Borg said the Vessel Disposal Surcharge revenue from last year totaled $16,000, which is not enough to cover an accident.

Mr. Bush said he recommends patrons have at least minimum liability insurance in case they are at fault for damaging another boat in the harbor.

Mr. Uchytil said the process we have followed in the past for regulation changes is to pass the information to the standing committees, then to the Full Board, when approved by the Full Board it goes to the Law Department, and then comes back to the standing committees, then to the Full Board for public hearing, and finally to the Assembly.

Mr. Simpson said we can send this to the other committees and to the Full Board for review.

MOTION by Mr. Lowell TO APPROVE THE RESIDENT LIVEABOARD REGULATIONS AS PRESENTED AND MOVE TO THE FULL BOARD AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The motion passed with no objection.

2. Resident Surcharge Fee (05 CBJAC 20.050)
Mr. Uchytil said this motion is to increase the Resident Surcharge Fee from the current rate of $69.00 per month for up to four liveaboards per boat to $75.00 per month for the first liveaboard and $25.00 for each additional resident. Also, do you want to add the Pet Fee at this time?

Mr. Simpson said he recommends the $25.00 for each additional resident be for only patrons 18 and older. This would help families with children.

Committee Questions
Mr. Simpson asked does this rate increase reflect harbor expenses directly related to the liveaboards.

Mr. Uchytil said in FY16 harbors collected $119,527.55 in revenue from the Resident Surcharge Fee. We cannot divide our expenses based on user groups, but I can give you the total of the expenses. The expense for trash removal totaled $173,000.00, water totaled $20,000.00, and sewage totaled $8,000.00.

Mr. Simpson asked are we going to have a fee for the boat waste removal?

Mr. Borg said he recommends we do not charge for waste removal because I want to encourage patrons to use the service. The equipment for waste removal costs about $15,000.00 per unit and is expensive to fix. Many of the harbors I have look into do not charge a separate fee for waste removal, they lump the fee into the liveaboard fee.

Mr. Simpson said your sewage and water for a home costs $113.00 per month.

Mr. Borg said yes, and we pay for trash.

Mr. Bush asked would this new Resident Surcharge rate include the Vessel Disposal Surcharge fee of $0.25 per foot per month and the other fees.

Mr. Borg replied yes, if the Board agrees. There are many fees associated with liveaboards. We have heat trace on the water, and we would not need that if there were no liveaboards. If the power goes out the liveaboards want the power turned back on no matter what time of day or night. That costs overtime for when our on call staff have to work at night.

Mr. Simpson asked can a patron use their vessel to run a business like a bed and breakfast.

Mr. Uchytil said I would need to run this by the Law Department.

Mr. Simpson asked if you have an apartment over your garage do you need a business license.

Mr. Uchytil replied no.

Mr. Lowell said that is a different situation because you are renting your private property, whereas these boats are in a public space.

Mr. Uchytil said we're not opposed to having liveaboards. What we are seeing is an increase in nefarious activity and we want a policy in place to regulate the illegal activity.

Public Discussion
Dennis Watson of Juneau, AK
Mr. Watson said patrons who are renting their boats do not have a business license. Also, the liveaboard situation is discourteous to patrons who use their boats for pleasure. I support the requirement to have the boat owner living aboard if the vessel is a liveaboard.

Committee Discussion/Action
Mr. Donek said I'm not in favor of the rate proposal for the Resident Surcharge of $75.00 for the first liveaboard and $25.00 for each additional. The original $69.00 covered a family. There's merit to having one set fee for the first four people. The additional fee is to discourage having too many liveaboards on one vessel. This seems like a rate proposal pending better estimates on expenses associated with liveaboards. I would propose a larger fee for the first four liveaboards, perhaps $100.00, or $125.00.

Mr. Simpson said we could have the fee be $75.00 for the first two liveaboards and $25.00 for each additional liveaboard over 18 years old. That would mean a family of four with two kids would only pay the $75.00 giving a family a break.

Mr. Seng said liveaboards are receiving far more in value than they are currently paying.

Mr. Simpson said a homeowner pays $150.00 per month for city services including water, sewage, and garbage.

Mr. Uchytil said $150.00 isn't a great comparison; a boat owner does not typically have a washing machine or dishwasher on their boat, and so they don't use the same amount of water. Perhaps we should have a separate fee for using the portable waste removal pump.

Mr. Donek said that makes sense because some patrons have a marine waste disposal that does not require the waste pump. Perhaps waiving a fee for those patrons would be an incentive to get a type of marine waste disposal that does not require a pump. I recommend the Finance Committee run through the numbers one more time.

MOTION by Mr. Donek TO SEND THE RESIDENT SURCHARGE FEE BACK TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The motion passed with no objections.

3. Removal of the Marine Park Lightering Float
Mr. Simpson said I recuse myself from voting on the Removal of the Marine Park Lightering Float item and turn this over to the newly appointed Vice Chair Mr. Lowell.

Mr. Uchytil said Wings Airways has requested the Marine Park Lightering Float be removed for safety purposes.

Al Clough of Wings Airways in Juneau, AK said we did some trial runs to see what it was going to be like to operate with the Marine Park Lightering Float and the new dock in place. We made it work but it was very tight. We did look into moving our float and we can only move it 25 feet southwest. That would not improve our situation enough.

Committee Questions
Mr. Donek asked has anyone come forward opposing the removal of the Marine Park Lightering Float.

Mr. Uchytil said he had informal conversations with people from the public who would like us to find a way to keep the Marine Park Lightering Float. None of them want to go on record saying they know more than the pilots about the safety of the location of the float. It would cost about $20,000.00 to have the float removed.

Mr. Donek asked could we put it in storage or use it elsewhere.

Mr. Uchytil said yes, we can maintain the float. However, it might need to be replaced soon.

Mr. Simpson said I think that float is less than 10 years old.

Mr. Summers asked how many feet would you have to move your float to make this work for you.

Mr. Clough said the room is not there. We would need to relocate our facilities to where Goldbelt ties ships. Also, the amount of cruise ship lightering has continued to decline. If there is a vessel lightering on the dock we cannot operate because it's not safe.

Public Discussion
Dennis Watson of Juneau, AK
Mr. Watson said anytime there's an accident it's all over the news. We saw this when the cruise ship hit the dock in Ketchikan, AK. That was advertised worldwide. I don't want to take the chance of having an accident. It is prudent to remove the float.

Paul Swanson of Juneau, AK
Mr. Swanson said I respect airplane pilots and if Mr. Clough says it's a safety hazard I believe him.

Committee Discussion/Action
Mr. Summers said the float does have an impact for other businesses. How many people would be displaced if we remove the Marine Park Lightering Float? Can we accommodate the displaced people elsewhere?

Mr. Uchytil said we can accommodate them at the Port Field Office float.

Mr. Summers asked does that push us past capacity at the Port Field Office float.

Mr. Uchytil said there are 10 days scheduled for lightering at the Marine Park Lightering Float for 2017. So, there will be 10 ships displaced. I have reached out to Steve and Winona Weber on the Adventure Bound and asked if they would like to oppose the removal of the Marine Park Lightering Float. They have not responded.

Mr. Summers asked will there be an issue with congestion if we displace these boats to another float.

Mr. Uchytil said I don't know how much congestion will result from the displacement.

Mr. Donek asked do the people using the Marine Park Lightering Float have a preference on which float they use.

Mr. Seng said if we remove the Marine Park Lightering Float Wings Airways won't be able to operate, but the other businesses will still be able to operate. This is an unsafe situation for Wings Airways. I recommend we take preference out of the equation.

MOTION by Mr. Bush TO APPROVE THE REMOVAL OF THE MARINE PARK LIGHTERING FLOAT AND FORWARD TO THE FULL BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The motion passed with no objections.

4. Alaska Glacier Seafood (AGS) Lease Amendment
Mr. Uchytil said the current lease allows Alaska Glacier Seafood (AGS) access to the adjacent property, which is the Auke Bay Loading Facility (ABLF). Is this the route this committee wants to take? It benefits AGS and is a minor convenience to Docks and Harbors.

Committee Questions
Mr. Donek asked has AGS been a good neighbor.

Mr. Uchytil said the first year I had to suspend their lease because they were not following the rules. Since then they have followed the rules. They intended on getting a driveway permit to connect to Eagan, but I'm not sure where that stands.

Public Discussion
Dennis Watson of Juneau, AK
Mr. Watson said access to Eagan would require a permit from the Department of Transportation (DOT), and they are not issuing any more permits for access to the highway in that area.

Committee Discussion/Action
Mr. Uchytil asked does the committee want the lease to be for 3 years or 10 years. Part of keeping it for a shorter period was so we could determine how we want to expand the ABLF. This is an amendment to the current 35 year lease to allow AGS access to the ABLF from their property.

Mr. Donek said I would like to keep this lease on a short cycle. I recommend 5 years and to match this amendment with when their main lease is set to renew.

MOTION by Mr. Bush TO APPROVE THE ALASKA GLACIER SEAFOOD LEASE AMENDMENT WITH THE AMENDMENT TO RUN

CONCURRENTLY WITH THE MAIN LEASE AND PRESENT TO FULL BOARD AND ASKED UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The motion passed with no objections.

5. Potential Tideland Lease – Opportunity
Mr. Uchytil said Mr. Heumann is asking for consideration in leasing the area shown on page 27 of your packets. It is a portion of the Seawalk that is not currently being used. This is Docks and Harbors managed tidelands. Do we want to open it up for private development on the Seawalk? Do we want to look at the entire Seawalk plan before opening any area for private development? What would this look like if we open it for private development? CBJ Regulation 53.09.260 states, "No lands may be leased which have not, at least 30 days before award or execution of a lease, been declared by the assembly by resolution to be available for leasing or identified in the approved land management plan for disposal by competitive bid leasing in the current year. The call for bids for leases shall be advertised in the same manner as provided for auction sales…" I have understood this to mean all City & Borough of Juneau lands need to be competitively bid. However, Mr. Heumann referenced another section of CBJ Regulation 53 that allows for leases to be negotiated directly with the Assembly by the private entity. The Law Department said both interpretations are correct. How would the committee like to proceed?

William Heumann said in the past the City & Borough of Juneau approached me and asked me to relocate my business for construction of the Seawalk. The purpose of the Seawalk was to reduce congestion on South Franklin Street. A portion of the Seawalk accomplishes that task. However, the area between the Library and cruise ships only receives 10% of the traffic from the cruise ships. So, the Seawalk is not functioning as intended. I am trying to find ways to manage these changes, which is why I thought we could develop this area. I would only need a third of the area proposed on page 27. I do not know specifically what I want to do with the area and I am waiting to see what offers I am given. I challenge you to have that area developed. I am willing to take the step forward to develop the area.

Committee Questions
Mr. Summers asked are any of the businesses in your area open year-round.

Mr. Heumann replied no.

Mr. Summers said at one time the plan included public restrooms in that area. Is it possible for your plan to include public restrooms?

Mr. Heumann replied yes. Restrooms would increase traffic around my building.

Public Discussion

Mr. Heumann said there are Transportation Security Administration (TSA) barriers around my building and they are impeding foot traffic. Now that we have more docks is there a way to have those moved?

Mr. Uchytil said TSA and the United States Coast Guard still require the barriers to be there.

Mr. Borg said there will most likely be an increase in the security plan that will require more changes.

Mr. Heumann said property owners of the uplands historically have a right to negotiate for the tidelands so other people cannot build in front of their property.

Mr. Uchytil said what I received from the Law Department states that section of the code Mr. Heumann brought up, "could be used if you and your board want to entertain the idea of leasing that land. I will note that just because Mr. Heumann may own the adjacent uplands he does not have a preference right to lease the abutting tidelands. Ultimately if the Assembly wants to consider leasing that land to Mr. Heumann, or whomever, CBJ 53.09.260 enables the Assembly early on to make that decision. It can authorize you to negotiate with Mr. Heumann, it can say it wants a broader public request for proposal, or it can simply say 'no' to any leasing for now."

Mr. Seng said if we do make that property available for lease we would not be excluding Mr. Heumann from bidding and competing on equal footing with anyone else.

Mr. Heumann said there's an assumption that I have unlimited funds. I have the right to go to the Assembly and ask them to lease the property to me. I probably made a mistake by coming here first. However, if the Harbor Board does not want to make that property available for private use then it is unlikely I will be able to lease the property. I hope something will happen. Thank you.

Committee Discussion/Action
Mr. Simpson asked Mr. Uchytil, what is your recommendation?

Mr. Uchytil said time is of the essence for Mr. Heumann, but this process is not quick. If his expectations were to have an answer so he can build something for next year, I'm not sure that will be possible. We have it in our plans to use that property for restrooms. The Visitor's Center has been plumbed so we can easily install restrooms. I recommend we look at all the plans and see if there are other sites we want to lease or other sites to build the restrooms.

Mr. Donek said the Long Range Water Plan has not been updated since 2004. What was on the original plan?

Mr. Uchytil said that property is greenspace on the Long Range Water Plan.

Mr. Donek said I recommend we take a look at the Long Range Water Plan before we make a decision.

Mr. Summers said we recently had a patron interested in developing on Harbor property on Douglas Island. We informed that patron the public process had to take place. Public restrooms are a huge necessity.

Mr. Lowell asked in lieu of looking at the Long Range Water Plan which will take time, what is the process for moving forward with Mr. Heumann's request. Could we do a Request for Proposal (RFP) and have public restrooms be a requirement?

Mr. Uchytil said the Board can determine how they want to proceed and what the requirements will be. Using the Thane Ore House as an example, we came up with a set of criteria and used it to determine who we wanted to lease to. Do we want to open this to the public, and what criteria do we want to require?

Mr. Seng said there is competing interest in this property. There is value in open space. I recommend looking at the Long Range Water Plan so we can see what the original intent was for the property.

Mr. Simpson said Mr. Uchytil, be sure to bring the Long Range Water Plan to the next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting. We can verify this request is not inconsistent with what is in the Long Range Water Plan. I have a feeling the Long Range Water Plan is general and vague enough for us to decide what to do with the property. We created more greenspace when we moved the docks seaward. There are other locations we can consider developing or preserving. Goldbelt came to us with a proposal and negotiated a bid. It did not go through the same public process. As a matter of policy, we should not be building in front of another person's waterfront property unless it is part of a negotiated deal.

Mr. Donek said there have been many changes that are not in the Long Range Water Plan, which is why I recommend we look at the plan. I also recommend Mr. Heumann present something specific like Goldbelt did with the Tram.

Mr. Uchytil said the Tram proposal from Goldbelt took a lot of time and did go through a public process.

Mr. Simpson said the problem with the Douglas Island proposal was that the patron wanted to encroach on a significant amount of public parking for their staging area. We have a specific use for that area and he wanted to convert the use. We were not willing to give up trailer parking for a restaurant. The property we are currently discussing is not currently being used for a designated purpose. I recommend we entertain the idea of leasing the property. We can discuss leasing the property at the

next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting. We can also look at the Long Range Water Plan and the other tideland properties at the next Operations/Planning Committee meeting.

X. Items for Information

1. Archipelago Property

Mr. Simpson said I recuse myself from the Archipelago Property item.

Mr. Uchytil said I am looking for direction from this committee. I recommend we acquire the Archipelago property. What is the best way to move forward? I drafted a white paper and I can bring it to the next Board meeting or executive session.

Committee Discussion/Public Comment

Mr. Donek asked what would be the purpose of the executive session.

Mr. Uchytil replied there will be a discussion of financial interests when acquiring a property.

Mr. Donek asked why can't we have a public discussion to figure out if we want the property. If we decide we want the property then we can have an executive session to determine how much we're willing to spend on the Archipelago property.

Mr. Uchytil said the Board has previously discussed an interest in purchasing the Archipelago property. It's not a new idea. The question is how do you want to move forward?

Mr. Bush said I recommend Docks and Harbors acquire the Archipelago property. I request that Mr. Uchytil bring what he has to the next Board meeting. Then we can discuss if there is a need for an executive session.

Mr. Donek said we can schedule an executive session and cancel the session last minute if need be.

Mr. Uchytil said the Assembly went into executive session when they were discussing acquiring the Archipelago property. I will check with the Law Department to see if an executive session is necessary.

2. Resolutions

Mr. Uchytil said there are four resolutions. The first resolution is asking for full support of funding ($18,160,055) for the State of Alaska matching grant. We have benefited greatly from this program.

The second resolution is in support of adding harbor employees to the list of protected workers in a State statute. The statue allows for an additional penalty for assaulting a

listed worker. The Board has supported this resolution in the past, but the Assembly has not. The argument from the Assembly is that harbor employees should be treated the same as other city employees like lifeguards and Parks and Recreation employees. The Assembly has since changed and I feel confident this resolution could pass. We have had a lot of difficulty with harbor patrons and I believe the harbor employees deserve a higher level of legislative protection.

The third resolution is regarding management and prevention of derelict vessels. This resolution asks the state to take a more active role in the management of derelict vessels. Docks and Harbors have ordinances regarding management of derelict vessels. This resolution would help many other communities in Alaska.

The fourth and final resolution is regarding the 2017 National Electrical Code (NEC) Article 555.3: "FPN: The 30mA requirement can be applied to all feeder circuits or all branch circuits in lieu of the main overcurrent protection device." An example of what this would mean is if one breaker on the Main float goes out then the rest of the breakers on the Main float will trip too. The resolution is to do away with the feeder circuit requirement in harbors.

Would you like to adopt all these resolutions, or do you want them to go to the Full Board and then to the Assembly?

Committee Discussion/Public Comment
Mr. Simpson said I recommend we refer all four resolutions to the Full Board and go directly to the Legislature. The grant can go to the Assembly.

Mr. Donek said I recommend the first three resolutions go to the Assembly and the fourth resolution can go to the Legislature.

Mr. Simpson said send all four resolutions as action items to the Full Board first.

Mr. Donek said send resolutions one through three as one action item and send resolution four as a separate action item.

Mr. Lowell asked why is the electric code going through this procedure. For building codes the City & Borough of Juneau will adopt the codes and amend it to their needs. Why not go that route?

Mr. Uchytil said not all communities have a building inspector. This resolution is to help those communities. Those areas have to go through the State.

XI. Staff, Committee and Member Reports
Mr. Borg said the float on North Douglas was pulled today.

Mr. Uchytil said theft is high in the Harbors like the rest of the City & Borough of Juneau. On Tuesday one of Manson's skiffs was stolen. The skiff was found in Douglas Harbor.

Mr. Donek said a patron asked me what the story was regarding the theft out of a boat shelter on E float. There are missing items posted on the bulletin boards.

XII. Committee Administrative Matters

1. Next Operations/Planning Committee Meeting - Wednesday, November 9th, 2016

XIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 p.m.