



DOCKS AND HARBORS OPERATIONS MEETING MINUTES

January 22, 2025 at 5:00 PM

Port Director's Conference Room/Zoom Webinar

- A. **CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Sooter called the January 22nd meeting to order at 5:00pm.
- B. **ROLL CALL:** The following members attended in person or via zoom - James Becker, Tyler Emerson (arrived late via zoom), Don Etheridge, Clayton Hamilton, Debbie Hart, Matthew Leither, and Shem Sooter.

Absent: Annette Smith, and Nick Orr.

Also in attendance: Carl Uchtyl – Port Director, Matthew Sill – Port Engineer, Matthew Creswell – Harbormaster, and Melody Musick – Administrative Officer.

- C. **PORT DIRECTOR REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES** – No Changes
- MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.**
- Motion passed with no objection.
- D. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** - None
- E. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
1. December 11th Meeting Minutes – Hearing no objection, the minutes were approved as presented.
- F. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

2. Transfer of \$3,000,000 from Docks Funds Balance to CIP Statter Phase IIID
- Mr. Uchtyl said on page 13 & 14 in the packet is the Statter Phase IIID 65% design outline. This phase is curb, gutter, paving, and planter for the upland's excursion parking lot at Statter Harbor. Staff would like to get this project awarded this Fiscal Year. The contractor can mobilize late August and into September. They would be able to work through October and November which would have the least impact to Statter Harbor operations. This has been discussed before about using Docks Enterprise funds to finish off the Statter Harbor project. There appears to be no issue with the Finance Department or the Managers office to use Docks funds at Statter Harbor. This is an impact born by the cruise industry so there should not be any issue. On page 16 is the construction estimate at \$2.7M. We are asking for a \$3M transfer to get us through the bid award and that should cover contingency. The final design and contract documents have already been funded. The first step is having enough money in the CIP to advertise.

Committee Questions – None

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion & Action -

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY APPROVE THE TRANSFER OF \$3M FROM THE DOCKS FUNDS BALANCE TO STATTER PHASE IIID PROJECT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE CURB, GUTTER, PAVING AND LANDSCAPING FOR THE EXCURSION BUS PARKING LOT AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

3. Process to Select Patron to Construct New Boat Shelter at Aurora G22/23
- Mr. Uchtyl said on page 17 in the packet is the process, with input from the Board, where staff went out with a deadline for anybody that was interested in purchasing competing rights to build a new boat shelter at Aurora Harbor float G22/23. That boat shelter was removed last January due to snow loads.

There were no takers in this process. Staff did receive an email from one person that indicated they were not going to submit a bid if they had to pay a \$100 non-refundable application fee. Mr. Uchtyl asked how the Board wants to proceed. He said there are options, remove the non-refundable application fee, keep or remove the minimum bid of \$500, or we could ask who wants to build it and randomly select if there is more than one applicant.

Committee Questions –

Mr. Hamilton asked what happens if nobody wants it?

Mr. Uchtyl said a couple alternative ideas would be to build a 42' finger float in that open space which would provide two 40' slips as general moorage, or we could build a boat shelter ourselves and lease it out. Mr. Uchtyl commented that it could be left open until there is interest.

Mr. Creswell said currently there is a catamaran in that open space and we are generating about half of the revenue the boat shelter generated.

Public Comment-

Karl Leis, Juneau, AK

Mr. Leis asked what size boat house can be put in there?

Mr. Uchtyl said the boat shelter can be no larger than the largest boat shelter on G float. That is probably 42' to 44'.

Committee Discussion/Action –

Mr. Sooter said he would like to see if there are any takers if some of the restrictions were removed.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO REMOVE THE \$100 NON-REFUNDABLE FEE AND PUT BACK OUT FOR SOLICIATION, IF THAT DOES NOT WORK, PUT IN A FINGER FLOAT AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

Ms. Musick asked how long did the Board want it advertised for?

Mr. Etheridge said 30 days.

G. NEW BUSINESS

4. FY25/FY26 BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. Uchtyl showed a power point presentation and provided handouts for the Docks and Harbors budgets.

The presentation showed the Docks & Harbors organization chart, Docks overview, Docks pie charts, and Mr. Uchtyl noted the Docks budget for FY25 is \$3.8M. He explained we are in the first year of the biennial budget. In this part of the budget cycle, staff predicts what our budget will be at the end of this fiscal year and amend the next fiscal year budget If needed. The next slide showed a line graph with Docks expense, revenue and Docks fund balance. Also in the presentation were all the expense and revenue line items that staff will go into more detail later in the meeting.

Docks part of the presentation ended with a summary

- FY25 Dock revenue is anticipated to remain strong through the end of the fiscal year. Revenues will exceed expenditures.
- Unbudgeted personnel expense - \$100K
 - Redistribution of two 0.33 FTE to a total of nine benefitted Harbor Officer and Harbor Technician positions to extend their seasonal time frame.

- Increase in Workers Compensation Rates.
- Anticipating transfer of \$3M from Docks fund balance to Harbors CIP for Statter Harbor Phase III D
- On going Cruise Ship Electrification Study

Mr. Uchytel continued with the presentation showing the Harbors budget. It showed the Harbors overview, Harbors pie charts for FY25 and FY26, and he noted Harbors FY25 budget is about \$7M. The next slide showed line graphs with Harbors expense, revenue, and the Harbors fund balance. Like Docks budget, the presentation included all Harbors expenses and revenue line items that staff will go into more detail later in the meeting. The next slide showed the Interdepartmental fees that Docks & Harbors Enterprise funds pay. He noted since FY13, our interdepartmental expense has more than tripled. The presentation ended with the Harbors summary –

- FY 25 Harbor Revenue is anticipated to remain strong through the end of the fiscal year.
- Unbudgeted increase in User Fees by \$250K
 - Internal administrative review of billing practices through implementation of strategic workplan
 - Implementation of Uninsured Vessel Disposal Surcharge
- Increase in State Shared Revenue by \$101K
 - Salmon Disaster Relief Fund
 - State of Alaska Fish Tax
- Unbudgeted increase in Land Lease revenue by \$300K due to increase in rent market value

Mr. Uchytel now turned to the Docks sheets handed out at the meeting. He is anticipating having \$4.5M in the Dock fund balance at the end of FY25. He talked about the FY26 revised budget expenditures and revenues.

Committee Questions on Docks budget -

Mr. Hamilton wanted Ms. Musick to explain why there is a difference on any item with a \$10,000 difference between FY24 actual and what we budgeted for 2025. He also asked what the benefits are?

Ms. Musick explained the benefits are for our full time and seasonal employees. In the overview, they are all wrapped in under personnel services. Personnel services consists of salaries, overtime, accrued leave, benefits, deferred comp, and workers comp. With budgeted merit increases for full time employees, that incrementally increases. She said regarding the FTE restructure, we took two part time positions and redistributed it to nine different benefitted employees so they could have a longer season since our cruise ship season has expanded. More funding has been allocated to those benefitted employees because their season has been extended by two months.

Mr. Hamilton commented that there is a \$200K difference from what we paid in 2024 to what is projected for 2025. He asked if that is because we changed the type of positions?

Ms. Musick said part of what was already approved in the FY25 budget wraps in the salary merit increases throughout the year and the deferred comp match and workers compensation has increased. Ms. Musick said the personnel services numbers are given to us from Finance and not entered by her. Finance and Human Resources manages personnel services for Docks & Harbors.

Mr. Etheridge said personnel services are all controlled by Human Resources now. We do not have any control over what those costs are.

Ms. Musick pointed out that after the budget cycle last year and approved by the Board, there was a Deputy Port Operational Supervisor and other personnel added, and that is part of why the increase from 2024 actual to 2025 projected actual.

Mr. Hamilton asked why exactly \$10K was budgeted from 2024 to 2025 for travel and training and why did refuse disposal jump by \$17K?

Ms. Musick said travel and training is done on a separate work sheet consisting of the AAHPA conference, ½ of Mr. Uchytel's and ½ of Mr. Creswell's travel, as well as personnel training throughout the year.

Mr. Hamilton asked if there was going to be more travel than last year?

Mr. Creswell pointed out that our travel and training is more on a calendar year. Some of the new employees do need to attend special FSO training and between FY25 projected actual and FY26 revised budget, the budgeted amount for travel/training is decreasing.

Ms. Musick also pointed out that our FY25 projected actual budget decreased from originally budgeted for FY25 due to one employee not attending the AAHPA conference and we are now hosting the AAHPA admin conference so that travel has been taken out of the budget.

Mr. Hamilton asked if it was normal to have that large of a change from year to year?

Mr. Uchytel said one trip can really change your travel budget. Staff tries to budget higher so there are no surprises but that is not always known. One of our new employees will be attending FSO training in New Orleans and with just that trip it increased our budget by \$2,500.

Mr. Uchytel pointed out Mr. Emerson is now attending via zoom.

Mr. Hamilton asked why the increase in refuse?

Mr. Uchytel said waste management increased their rates. There is also some concern we may be collecting more residential trash because of the increase. Trash has always been a large, budgeted item.

Mr. Creswell said we noticed at the Port with the longer season, more passengers and yachts, we are having our dumpster emptied more times in a season than previous years. We are taking in more trash.

Mr. Hamilton asked what is specialty and property?

Ms. Musick said this is a number also given to use by Finance.

Mr. Uchytel said specialty and property is insurance.

Mr. Hamilton asked about our contractual services from 2024 being \$35K less than what is budgeted in 2025?

Mr. Uchytel said there are three-line items on both budgets that are a catch all for our maintenance for our operations; contractual services, repairs, and material and commodities. Contractual services typically capture our port-a-potty use, term contract use, studies, anything else that may come up throughout the year which are unknown two years out. In 2024, actual was \$127K. For FY25 we budgeted \$100K and we are currently at \$54K. The projected \$125K for FY25 is put in as a marker if we need those funds. Mr. Uchytel explained he looks at the expenditure budget as an authority from the Assembly to spend. It is in our best interest to not exceed our budget and have enough in our budget in case something breaks we have sufficient funds for repairs.

Ms. Musick pointed out that the budget numbers come directly from our operations staff from what they are seeing our needs will be for the next two fiscal years.

Mr. Hamilton will send more questions via email to staff.

Public Comment on Docks budget –

Shelly Leis, Juneau, AK

Ms. Leis asked about the marine passenger fees. If the season is extended, and the ships are larger, why is it projected to decrease?

Ms. Musick explained that due to the cruise ship rate increase is why it looks different.

Mr. Uchytel continued with going over the expense and revenue Harbors budget sheets handed out at the meeting that have the budget broken down per line item.

Committee questions on Harbors budget—

Mr. Etheridge asked if we are paying for Wayside Park in the landscape fees?

Mr. Creswell said we pay landscaping for Statter and Aurora Harbor. Wayside Park he believes is done by Parks & Rec. He only knows of the Wayside Park float under Docks & Harbors management.

Mr. Hamilton asked why waste disposal for Harbors is going up \$59K?

Mr. Creswell said there is more trash. We had a high yacht and busy year at Statter Harbor. Staff added a cardboard recycling dumpster at Statter Harbor to try to cut down on trash but we are still charged to dump that dumpster. He said all the boats that are disposed of are also captured under the refuse budget item.

Mr. Uchytel pointed out regarding the boat disposal; the dump fees are only part of getting rid of a boat. We will also have more fees under contractual services for Trucano Construction who has the term contract for boat disposal.

Mr. Emerson asked how staff is tracking the boat disposal expense if they are in different line items?

Mr. Creswell said all the boat disposal expense is captured in a separate system called Lucy where each boat is assigned a work order and has its own history.

Mr. Hamilton asked what we are anticipating for repairs in 2025? He noticed an increase by \$40K from 2024 to 2025 and then it goes back down in 2026.

Mr. Creswell said we do not know exactly what is going to need to be repaired at this time, but we have money if something breaks. If we have the money obligated, then we are not exceeding our budget authority. It is in our best interest to budget high for that reason.

Mr. Uchytel said staff has discussions on this topic about what projects/maintenance is needed, or will be needed two years out. He pointed out, if the budgeted money is not used, it rolls over into our fund balance. The budgeted line items provide Docks & Harbors the authority to spend money.

Mr. Sooter asked what are the steps if Docks and Harbors exceeded any of the budgeted line items?

Mr. Uchytel said the authority to spend is the budget, and that is approved by the Board. At the end of the year, Finance reviews our budget, and if all our expenditures are below what was budgeted, we are good. If we exceed our authority to spend, we will need to go back to the Assembly and ask for a supplemental because we exceeded our authority to spend for that year. There is just another step that needs to be taken if we exceed our budget amount.

Mr. Hamilton asked what specialty and property is?

Mr. Uchytel said it is insurance. Another part of our insurance is general liability insurance. All the insurance numbers are provided by CBJ Risk. Another line item is loss contingency used for our deductible if we make a claim. One thing that happened this year was our nighttime security officer hit a bear resulting in \$8K in damage so we paid \$1K for our deductible from the loss contingency budget line item.

Mr. Emerson asked if the Assembly approves the overall expenditures? He clarified, can we have positive and negative variances in the budget line items, but not exceed our overall expenditure.

Ms. Musick said the Assembly approves the overview budget, but the line items are reviewed through the Finance Department. Every line item with a positive or negative 3% variance, she entered a reason for that variance. Staff does have several meetings to talk about the budget line items to determine what is the best amount to budget based off past years and things to come.

Mr. Emerson asked if we could move funding around to different line items if needed?

Mr. Uchytel said yes. The Finance Department and Assembly only care about the bottom line.

Mr. Hamilton asked what the full cost allocation is.

Mr. Uchytel said this is what is paid to other CBJ Departments for their services.

Mr. Hamilton said he would like to see the breakdown of all the line items budget amount. He does not understand the ability to move funds around. If there was a contingency fund, then he would understand.

Mr. Hamilton asked why are bank card fees expected to go up by \$30K and then go down again?

Ms. Musick at the time the biennial budget was prepared we anticipated the \$30K increase but based off the current actuals, we lowered the projected actual. All of the automated services fall under the bank card fees.

Mr. Hamilton asked if it was going to be cheaper in FY26?

Mr. Uchytel explained that we budgeted this in 2024, and staff may have estimated a little high. Under the review this year, based on actual and the five months left in the fiscal year, we decided to decrease it by about \$20K for FY25. This is bank fees provided to staff by Finance, and it is what it is.

Mr. Hamilton commented that it looks like we raised the line items before we raised the rates, and now we are lowering them.

Ms. Musick commented that we do carry over our bank card fees to the next fiscal year and we anticipate they will level out, but we are unsure at this time how much. Staff prepares the budget with continuity and conservative fiscal spending, but we do not have too much control with how the end bank card services end up.

Mr. Uchytel showed on page 32 in the packet Harbors line graph. He commented there is a gradual slope up in our expense and revenues for basically over a decade but pretty consistent overall. He showed on page 24 the Docks line graph. He commented that during COVID Docks really was affected but again it is fairly consistent until we needed to meet the mandate by the CG for security.

Mr. Emerson asked if he wanted earlier detailed data, would it be possible to get it at a later date?

Mr. Uchytel said staff could reproduce the granularity for each line item as far back as wanted.

Ms. Musick asked if an excel file format would work?

Mr. Emerson said excel is fine and he requested the last five years.

Mr. Hamilton also wanted a copy of the last five years.

Public comment on Harbors budget - None

Committee/Action -

Mr. Leither commented from his perspective, the budget is basically identifying the needs for running the day-to-day operations. He looks at Mr. Uchytel and Ms. Musick and other staff as the experts and trusts their work.

Mr. Uchytel said the Assembly does not get to the granularity discussed tonight.

Mr. Etheridge commented that we have changed the process over the years based on Board requests. Any Board member can contact staff to let them know what they want to look at.

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO APPROVE THE PROJECTED ACTUAL FY25 BUDGET AND AMENDED FY26 BUDGET FOR THE DOCKS ENTERPRISE AND THE HARBOR ENTERPRISE AS PRESENTED AND MOVE TO THE FULL BOARD AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Mr. Hamilton objected.

Ms. Musick called the roll.

Mr. Becker - Yes

Mr. Emerson – Yes

Mr. Etheridge – Yes

Mr. Hamilton – No

Ms. Hart – Yes

Mr. Leither – Yes

Mr. Sooter – Yes

Motion passed.

Mr. Uchytel was instructed to put this on the Board agenda as an action item.

5. Pioneers of Alaska Lone Sailor Statue - Waterfront Location Request

Mr. Uchytel said at the September Board meeting there was a request from Pioneers of Alaska Igloo six and we have a Mr. Tom Dawson here tonight representing that organization. The request was for the Alaska Lone Sailor Statue to be installed along the waterfront. On page 43 in the packet was the information provided to the Board with information about The Lone Sailor Statue. The Lone Sailor Statue program is managed by a non-project organization in DC called US Navy Memorial. There are 19 of these statues around the world which is a 7'4" statue cast in bronze. The Pioneers of Alaska would like to fundraise for a statue to be located along the waterfront. On page 40 in the packet, Mr. Uchytel drafted a memo through this committee, through the Board, through the City Manager, to go to the Public Works and Facility Committee using the source document of our Marine Park to Taku Dock Urban Design plan. He is recommending the Board approve and recommend that the Assembly also approves putting this in as a waterfront attraction in the Marine Park to Taku Dock Urban Design plan. The location for this statue he is calling it the deck over between the steam ship and the cruise ship terminal. He has had discussions with the Tourism and City Manager and asked who they wanted to take the lead on this topic, and he was instructed to work with Pioneers of Alaska. For the Pioneers of Alaska to start fundraising, they need to identify a location. Selecting this area and getting approval from the Assembly allows the Pioneers of Alaska to move forward with fundraising.

Committee Questions – None

Public Comment –

Mr. Tom Dawson, Juneau, AK

Mr. Dawson said he is with the Pioneers of Alaska. One of the main purposes of this statue is to honor the sea service throughout Alaska and not only the military. He believes this would be very beneficial for our Juneau community and he has wide support for this statue.

Mr. Becker said he supports this, where it goes in the end can be discussed later.

Committee Discussion Action

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY ALLOW FOR THE PIONEERS OF ALASKA TO PLACE AN UNITED STATES NAVY MEMORIAL "LONE SAILOR STATUE" IN THE TIMBER DECK AREA BETWEEN THE ALASKA STEAMSHIP AND CRUISESHIP TERMINAL DOCKS AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

6. ADOT HARBOR FACILITY GRANT APPROPRIATION - \$5M AURORA HARBOR PH IV

Mr. Sill said he sent the beginning documents to contracts this last Monday, and they are compiling the bid documents. He received the 95% drawings from his consultants, and he will review those drawings tomorrow. Staff plans to advertise for this project on February 1st, opening bids on February 27th, Board meeting approval on the 27th, and Assembly approval after that. Before the Board tonight, our process is that we are not able to advertise until all the grant funding has been secured. However, DOT's grant process does not allow them to sign the grant until we have awarded our bid because the grant amount is based on our awarded bid amount. The way we have gotten around this in the past is they provide a letter of award that says they will provide grant money once we get our bids back. We received this letter on December 11th and approval through the Assembly is the last process to be able to advertise for this project.

Committee Questions

Tyler Emerson asked if this is a 50% matching grant and is the 50% pulled from our fund balance?

Mr. Sill said the matching portion is pulled from the 1% sales tax that is allocated already.

Mr. Uchytel said that we do have more money allocated for this project, \$5M from 1%, \$5M DOT, and \$1.5M moved to this project from our fund balance. The estimate is \$9.5M for construction so staff thinks we have sufficient cushion for contingency and inspection services.

Mr. Emerson asked if the CIP projects are managed separately than our budget?

Mr. Uchytel said we have CIP projects that are separate from the operating budget.

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion/Action

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY ACCEPT A \$5M ADOT HARBOR FACILITY GRANT FOR AURORA HARBOR PHASE IV AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

7. Boatyard Trailer Bid Award

Mr. Uchytel said on page 52 in the packet is a memo with an explanation on where we are regarding the Boatyard trailer. In 2012, Harbors secured an apparatus called the Sealift which was a self-propelled hydraulic boat lift. In 2021, it no longer served the needs of the boatyard. We paid approximately \$530K in 2012 and sold it in 2021 for \$250K. This was sold at public surplus so 10% went to public surplus. The remaining \$225K from the sale is what we will use to secure a new boat trailer. Looking for a replacement boat trailer, the only one found to meet our needs was Canadian. Because the original purchase was through a maritime administration grant, we were not allowed to procure replacement from a Canadian manufacturer. Staff has been working with the Maritime Administration, and in January, we received a letter from the Maritime Administration that they are relinquishing their interest in the 2012 procurement of the Sealift. This means we are free to purchase a piece of equipment that

does not meet the requirement of the buy American act. In preparation, staff went out for a request for bid. Staff only received one bidder which was that Canadian company. Their bid was for about \$320K. Everything is lined up now and we can procure that piece of gear for the Auke Bay Boatyard. We have the \$225K in our fleet reserve, we can take an additional \$94K from our fleet reserve, and we will be able to procure this equipment. Staff is asking the Committee to approve the bid award, and because this is more than \$100K it will need to be approved by the Assembly as well.

Committee Questions

Mr. Becker asked if there is a picture of the new trailer he could see.

Mr. Uchytel said staff has worked with the Boatyard operator and he believes it will meet his needs.

Public Comment –

Mr. Karl Leis, Juneau, AK

Mr. Leis said he has been waiting for this for four years.

Committee Discussion/Action

MOTION By MR. ETHERIDGE: TO RECOMMEND THE ASSEMBLY AWARD A \$319,700 BID CONTRACT TO KROPF INDUSTRY FOR A BOATYARD TRAILER USING FUNDS FROM DOCKS & HARBORS FLEET RESERVE FUNDS AND ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion passed with no objection.

8. CY2024 URBAN ALASKA CONSUMER PRICE INDEX (CPI)

Mr. Uchytel said on page 55 in the packet, the Board has a CPI policy paper with guidance or reasons on justification for the CPI. The CPI came out on January 15th and the Urban Alaska CPI was 2.2%. On page 58 is a memo from Mr. Uchytel with a recommendation for the Board to accept the adjustment for all applicable fees in 2025. The fees are tied to CPI in regulation, but the Board by motion has the right to keep the fees the same as the previous year. On page 59 is a memo sent out to Cruise Line Agencies of Alaska to provide them the fees for the upcoming cruise ship season. Our fees change at different time, January 1st, April 1st, and July 1st. On page 60 are the updated fees effective January 1st for the Harbors Moorage 3% increase. Page 63 shows the April 1st increased rates and the next fiscal year rates with the 2.2% increase.

Committee Questions

Mr. Etheridge asked if the Board does nothing, the CPI automatically takes affect?

Mr. Uchytel said if the Board takes no action, it automatically happens.

Mr. Emerson asked for clarification on what increase page 60 was showing? Was that just showing the 3% increase the Board approved a number of years ago?

Mr. Uchytel said yes, and page 63 shows the 2.2% increase.

Public Comment - None

Committee Discussion/Action

Mr. Emerson asked when the Board was discussing a price change, was it decided that 9% was the number needed to get caught up to where we needed to be?

Mr. Etheridge said the 9% was to get caught up to where we needed to be, and the CPI adjustment is to keep up from falling behind again so we do not have to do a large increase again. Prior to adding the CPI, the Board elected to do nothing for years and that was what caused the large increase.

MOTION By MR. HAMILTON: TO ZERO THE ADJUSTMENT FOR THE HARBORS FEES AND RAISE THEM 2.2% FOR THE DOCK FEES.

Mr. Etheridge objected.

Roll call vote by Melody Musick –

Mr. Becker – Yes

Mr. Emerson – Yes

Mr. Etheridge – No

Mr. Hamilton – Yes

Ms. Hart – No

Mr. Leither – No

Mr. Sooter - No

Motion failed 4 to 3

H. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

9. Aurora Harbor Office Building Evaluation Report

Mr. Sill said in the packet is the evaluation report prepared by our term contract Engineer and Architect for the Aurora Harbor Office. Staff has suggested the building is past it's useful life. We brought in some experts to give a better report on the condition of the building.

He read a couple of comments in the report and the full report with pictures is in the packet–

- The existing structure is in fair to poor condition.
- Humidity and moisture allowed biological growth and decay in the timber components.
- Numerous water leaks in the structure.
- Leaking sewer gas from the floor drains cause significant health concerns.
- Moisture in the office structure has deteriorating plywood sheeting with staining and mold growth observed.
- Lateral force resisting system is non-existent in the garage.
- Exterior of the building has widespread damage and deterioration and lack of roof gutter increases moisture exposure.

The Engineer concluded in his report that it is apparent these buildings have exceeded their useful life and need replacement to provide a safe and healthy place for Harbor staff and patrons. It is recommended CBJ look at replacement versus renovation.

Committee Discussion –

Mr. Etheridge recommended to build a new building, but we need to come up with funding.

Mr. Becker asked if we have space for the building?

Mr. Sill said we do have adequate space, but we will need to tear down the existing buildings.

Mr. Becker commented that we need this new building.

Mr. Hamilton asked if we go to PND for everything?

Mr. Sill said PND is one of our Term Contractors and has a lot of experience in this area of expertise.

Mr. Uchytel asked how old the buildings are?

Mr. Sill said post 1964.

Mr. Etheridge commented the office was put in the year the Harbor was built.

Public Comment - None

10. Project Prioritization and Community Outreach

Mr. Uchtyl said this was a request at the last Operations Committee to bring back more discussion regarding what the best way is to communicate with our user groups and receive feedback on future prioritizations of Docks & Harbors projects. He said he added the last two pages of the packet where we ended up on the projects from the strategic retreat. Docks & Harbors staff is willing to do surveys and outreach however the Board thinks appropriate to meet the expectation of community input.

Committee Discussion –

Mr. Hamilton asked if there is Committee support for more surveys to solicit input from the public?

Mr. Leither asked for an estimate for ranges of prices what we are looking at?

Mr. Uchtyl said from the discussion at the Operations Committee, it was recommended to bring back this discussion to this Committee and somehow apply what the Board did at the Strategic retreat to the general public to solicit input.

Mr. Etheridge said his concern is the process the Board went through was to make a list for the Engineering Department in case there was money that came available. He is concerned the same thing will happen like did with North Douglas is people will start asking when the project is going to be started but there is no funding for the projects. Do we provide a big wish list for them to rank when we don't have any funding.

Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Creswell how much the last survey cost?

Mr. Creswell said it was fairly inexpensive.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the interaction between the public is a bad thing?

Mr. Etheridge asked why throw a wish list out there that we know we can't do because of funding.

Mr. Hamilton commented that it is important to find out the public opinion so if we do get money, we do not put it into something no one wants. He believes it would be easy to do a ranking survey similar to what the Board did.

Mr. Sooter asked if it would be easy to put an open comment section in the Tide Line just asking for ideas.

Mr. Uchtyl said the easiest for him would be to write a paragraph in the Tide Line that the Docks & Harbors Board welcomes input into project prioritization and send your ideas to the Harbor Board at juneau.gov.

Mr. Sooter asked Mr. Hamilton if that would meet what he was looking for?

Mr. Hamilton said that is not even close. What happened with the Territorial Sportsman's survey was very specific and we got valuable information from that.

Mr. Sooter commented a lot of projects put on the Engineers list will probably never have funding for and just fills the requirement from that Department.

Mr. Hamilton commented that is his concern, and spending Board time on projects we know will never happen is a waste of time.

Public Comment - None

I. STAFF, COMMITTEE AND MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Uchytel said we currently have two-night security personnel that run five days a week and all night. One tendered a resignation and went back to the Philippines and the other was on leave for three weeks.

Mr. Creswell said the one that resigned is now back and the other one is back from leave. There was a change in the Harbors crime during that time because no one was patrolling the Harbors.

Mr. Etheridge asked to have advance notice when there is no patrolling. He said the Juneau Citizens Patrol could provide the patrolling if Harbors personnel is out for some reason. He asked for notification for anytime there is an extended absence.

Mr. Creswell provided his Harbormaster report due to him not attending the Board meeting next week.

- There was a sinking vessel in Harris Harbor, it was a liveaboard and uninsured. The person was out of town. The Coast Guard declined to federalize it because there was no fuel onboard. The Owner has been provided the opportunity to raise the vessel and remove it from the water. It is not allowed back in the water until it is seaworthy. He will keep you up to date when he knows more.
- We have several jobs posted getting ready for the season.
- We had a meeting with NOAA to do some surveying where the Ice breaker will go and they need a vessel. We have a vessel and need some survey work done so we plan to do some swapping to fulfill both our needs come April.
- JPD is going to provide our staff with a formal de-escalating training in the Assembly Chambers.
- Sea trials are always in progress. In 2022 we did Douglas, 2023 we did Harris, and 2024 we did Aurora, 2025 we start back in Douglas. Letters will go out soon.
- Harris Bathrooms - we still have vandalism and we are working hard on this. We plan to go with just a fob system.
- UAS is going to build a cover over our used oil filtration system. We provide the material and they build the cover.
- Admins are getting busy with preparing permits for the summer.
- We are hosting the AAHPA admin conference and Ms. Thrower and Ms. Musick are working hard to finalize the agenda. It looks like we will have a good turnout for that.

Mr. Leither asked when Statter Harbor is going to have Seaworthy trials?

Mr. Creswell said Mr. Norbryhn manages Statter Harbor separately. All boats that have not moved have received notification and he is working through the process.

J. ASSEMBLY LIAISON REPORT - None

K. BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

11. Next Meetings:

Thursday, January 30th - Regular Board Meeting

Wednesday, February 19th - Operations-Planning Committee Meeting

L. ADJOURNMENT – The Meeting adjourned at 7:48pm.