

CBJ DOCKS & HARBORS BOARD
CIP/PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

For Thursday, August 19, 2010

I. Call to Order.

Committee member Mr. Williams called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

II. Roll.

The following members were present: Mr. Williams, Mr. Kueffner, Mr. Preston, Mr. Jardell, and Mr. Donek.

The following member was absent: Mr. Wostmann.

Also in attendance were: Mr. Stone – Port Director and Mr. Gillette – Port Engineer.

III. Approval of Agenda.

Mr. Gillette stated that under items for information he would like to add #2 float plane float and Norway Point development planning.

MOTION by Mr. Kueffner: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED. The motion passed without objection.

IV. Public Participation.

There was none at this time.

V. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes.

MOTION by Mr. Donek: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO APPROVE THE PREVIOUS MINUTES OF July 22, 2010. The motion passed without objection.

VI. Items for Action.

1. Aurora Harbor Rebuild.

Mr. Stone stated that they have developed a concept plan for Aurora Harbor rebuild (See attached). He went over the plan with the committee members and the cost for the rebuild. He said that they have applied for a State Harbor Grant of 2 million dollars to be matched with 2 million of harbor money. The thought was that this amount would probably do the south portion of the harbor, floats A and B. This would leave the remaining floats to be completed later of which at this time there is no funding identified for this. Mr. Stone stated that we need to look into getting support for additional funding.

Mr. Stone recommended that we at least inform the Assembly that this is a capital improvement need of the docks and harbors and they should at least consider this in the next few years when they are looking at sales tax extensions and/or any general obligation bonds.

CIP/Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

August 19, 2010

Page 2

Mr. Stone stated that what he is looking for from this committee is a recommendation to the full board that we provide notice to the Assembly that funding will be needed in order to complete the rebuild of Aurora Harbor.

Further discussion among the committee members and Mr. Stone took place at this time.

MOTION by Mr. Kueffner: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD REQUEST THE ASSEMBLY CONSIDER FUNDING TO DO THIS PROJECT AT LEAST TO GET IT ON THEIR RADAR SCREEN. The motion passed without objection.

2. Statter Harbor Repair Projects.

Mr. Stone stated that in the member's packet there is a cost estimate for repairs to be done at Statter Harbor (See attached). He stated that we are no where near able to do these projects with the harbor revenues. He stated that there are several things going on out at Statter Harbor. There is the launch ramp project that we are all familiar with. The cost estimate for this project is going to be about 10 million, which moves around a bit because we are still going through the permit process and the regulatory agencies can greatly influence how much it will cost. When this project is done it will leave some money for dealing with the Statter Harbor float system. With the remaining funds Mr. Stone stated that we would like to start working on the basic moorage system. There are a few priorities; one is the gang way going to the landing float which is in need of being replaced.

The harbor electrical feed into Statter Harbor is marginal and needs to be dealt with. Then there is a section starting at the gangway head float that is in need of being replaced. The reason for this is to follow with the master plan of building the new Dehart's floats for moorage.

The last priority is dealing with the replacement of the anchors of the breakwater. He went on to show the committee members the way the anchorage works and where the wear and tear may possibly be. The expectancy of life for these is twenty years and we are there now. He stated that we would systematically go through and replace these chains and will take several years and more money but at least we will get started on the places with the highest wear areas.

This is all rebuild work so it can be done under a general permit with the Corp of Engineers.

Further discussion among the committee members and Mr. Stone took place at this time.

Mr. Stone stated that what he is looking from this committee is to move forward with this work and get a bid packet ready to put out.

More discussion took place regarding the replacement of the anchorage for the breakwater and where the funding sources would be coming from.

MOTION by Mr. Donek: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO FORWARD THIS TO THE FULL BOARD FOR APPROVAL OF STAFF TO PROCEED WITH GETTING COST ESTIMATES FOR THESE PROJETS AT STATTER HARBOR AND FINAL APPROVAL BY THE ASSEMBLY. The motion passed with out objection.

3. DeHart's Marina Replacement/Fuel Dock Relocation.

Mr. Stone stated that the condition at DeHart's is well known to all the committee members. There is one main issue and that is that under the lease with Petro Marine they are getting a bit nervous because the pipes for the fuel float and is getting tough to keep their pipes out of the water. We have approached them in regards to moving them sooner than later recognizing that it could be a few years before we replace the DeHart's Marina moorage and towards that end we asked them to think about maybe moving to the Statter Harbor float system somewhere.

They are thinking about it, and what Mr. Stone wanted to do was at least get recognition from the Board and even potentially approval to continue discussions with them about trying to relocate them if possible. It is likely that we will have to renegotiate the lease and there will be changes in terms and conditions of which he is sure it will come back to the board several times.

We do get a good chunk of revenue from them and Mr. Stone stated we would surely not want to lose them. One area that has been discussed is along the main float and he went on to explain this to the committee members at this time.

The second issue that Mr. Stone spoke about with the DeHart's Marina is what to do with the patrons if it gets to the point that we would have to close it down and we don't have replacement moorage built.

There are a couple approaches to handle the moorage, one is to at least notify the patrons that there will be a dilemma of having to close the facility and there is a likelihood that we may not be able to replace it by that time and possibly have them look for arrangement to look for alternate arrangements. We do have other stalls in our harbor system where we can accommodate some of the people and even if the timing were such we rebuild it in the winter and move them to the Statter facility for a winter while it is done.

There is some other issues regarding moving the patrons over to Statter and they are the electricity is not the same and the first come first serve open moorage concept. The final issue is going to be people that are on the transient dock questioning why we are assigning permanent moorage to the Dehart's patrons. We could get by this if it were a temporary thing.

Mr. Stone stated that there are no easy solutions to this and he suggested that the best one would be to try to find funding to rebuild it and the estimate is about 5 million.

Further discussion among the committee members and the Mr. Stone took place at this time.

Public Comment: Mr. Fisk commented regarding adding additional moorage out at the Statter Harbor. He stated that with the funding source available at this time that some of the projects should be done now.

Public Comment: Ms. Danner inquired about the way the transient moorage works out at Statter Harbor regarding a possible Mediterranean style moorage. Mr. Donek stated that it wouldn't work due to the tides and the depth of the water.

More discussion took place at this time.

MOTION by Mr. Jardell: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO GIVE DIRECTION TO THE PORT DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS ON WHERE THE FUEL DOCK MAY BE RELOCATED FOR THE PURPOSES OF BRINGING BACK SOME PROPOSALS TO THE CIP TO LOOK AT AS TO ALTERNATIVES OF WHERE IT MIGHT BE FUNCTIONALLY DUABLE. The motion passed without objection.

MOTION by Mr. Kueffner: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO FORWAR THIS TO THE FULL BOARD TO COME UP WITH SOME TYPE OF PLAN OR FORMAL DOCUMENT TO BE WORKED OUT AND THEN BE ABLE TO PRESENT IT TO THE ASSEMBLY FOR FUNDING OF THE REBUILD OF DEHARTS MARINA. IN ADDITION TO THIS ASK THAT NOTIFICATION BE SENT TO ALL THE STALL HOLDERS OF DEHARTS MARINA OF THE POSSIBLE CLOSURE OF THE FACILITY WITH ALL KINDS OF OPTIONS. The motion passed without objection.

4. ADOT STIP List.

Mr. Gillette stated that every year we get asked by DOT what our needs are that they will then evaluate and ultimately decide whether it goes on to the statewide transportation improvement program list. Mr. Gillette went over the current list with the members at this time (See attached).

Mr. Gillette is recommending that we remove numbers 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, and 11 from the list and to retain projects numbered 5, 8 and 10 and project #4 should have the dollar amount modified from 300,000 to 17,000,000 (See attached list).

After further discussion among the committee members and staff they concluded that the committee would like to see the list priorities with the highway related projects at the top of the list. They also discussed the entrance ways into the harbors via the main highway and the concerns for safety issues in these areas. It was then discussed more in regards to combining the two highway items and removal of the harbor building construction projects.

Further discussion took place at this time.

After further discussion the committee concluded that they would combine the highway related

intersection ones into one and put them at the top of the list and remove the new Harbormaster building.

MOTION by Mr. Donek: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO FORWARD THE LIST TO THE FULL BOARD FOR APPROVAL AND THEN FORWARD THE LIST ON TO ADOT. The motion passed without objection.

5. Cruise Terminal Restroom Study.

Mr. Gillette stated that during the design process for this project the issue was brought up by some of the vendors and others that we should look at the adequacy of toilet rooms in this area. The tram has facilities and under their lease agreement it is that these facilities would be provided to the public. He stated that they have been talking with people in this area and this is one of those things that if you needed a toilet there are never enough around. We are trying to get a handle on what is the real need? At certain times of the day there is quite the influx of people coming from other areas to catch their tours.

Mr. Gillette stated that what we thought we could do is expand the contract that we have with Jensen Yorba Lott, who have been doing the design work for us. Have them take a look at trying to identify what the need is and then come up with some concepts. What we found with the survey is that there is sort of a gap of toilet facilities between the tram building and the parking garage.

The biggest need is at the tram area and Mr. Gillette has come up with three scenarios, one is adding on to the tram facility. Second would be a separate facility but he isn't exactly sure where that would be possibly on some of the uplands area. Finally, look at some sort of facility out on the dock area and the distinction is that building them on the dock structure is more expensive to get the utility lines up there than if you were on land.

Mr. Gillette has asked Joan to put together a scope of work and a fee proposal to take a look at the needs, come up with some concepts, and some cost estimates. The fee proposal to have this done is \$13,700.00 which would just be added to their existing contract.

Discussion among the committee members and Mr. Gillette took place at this time.

Public Comment: Ms. Danner stated that with the amount of passengers coming into town there is a definite need for enough stalls to accommodate them.

MOTION by Mr. Jardell: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE THIS TO THE FULL BOARD WITH A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE STUDY IS DONE, AND THAT THE PORT DIRECTOR ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CITY FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS OR SOME TYPE OF AGREEMENT ON MANAGEMENT OF THE FACILITIES. The motion passed with a 5 to 1 vote.

VII. Items for Information/Discussion.

1. Fisherman's Memorial Committee Comments on 16B.

Mr. Stone stated that they had met with the committee about a month ago and spoke with them about plan 16B. He had a power point and went over where the traditional blessing of the fleet is held each spring. He went over the alternatives for relocation of the ceremony with the committee at this time.

The fleet committee members had a meeting and they considered the pros and cons they stated that they don't think that it will work with the new dock and now the only solution is not to build 16B or to move the memorial to a place where we can do this ceremony the way it has been done in the past.

Mr. Stone stated that he is going to try and talk to them again to see if we can convince them to maybe move the blessing of the fleet ceremony down to the float. This would offer them an opportunity for expansion and would provide a much closer venue to the vessels than they have been able to provide in the past.

Further discussion among the committee members and Mr. Stone took place at this time.

2. Float Plane float and Norway Point.

Mr. Gillette stated that the Public Works and facility is moving out of their building under the bridge soon. It is getting to be that time that we should be thinking about what we want with the area to accommodate and use. He said what we should do is hire a firm to take a look at the area first and also the Norway Point area, primarily because we have been getting some requests for lease space to put up buildings to support some of the charter boat operators and other business. It would be worth while to take a look at what sort of things could be accommodated in the space and get some ideas out on the table.

If the committee concurs Mr. Gillette will select a firm to take a look at this with us. The committee concurred and staff will move forward on this.

Public Comment:

Mr. Fisk discussed with the committee what were some of the original plans for the area, south of the bridge and what were some of the ideas to utilize it at that time.

Further discussion took place at this time.

CIP/Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

August 19, 2010

Page 7

VIII. Member & Staff Reports.

There were none at this time.

IX. Committee Administrative Matters.

The next meeting will be rescheduled for later date as many of the committee members will be out of town.

X. Adjournment.

**MOTION by Mr. Donek: ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.
The motion passed without objection.**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.