City Manager Tom Moran

Port Director Joy Baker

Harbormaster Lucas Stotts



Nome Port Commission Jim West, Jr., Chairman Charlie Lean, Vice Chairman Doug Johnson Derek McLarty Shane Smithhisler Scot Henderson Denise Michels

102 Division St. • P.O. Box 281 Nome, Alaska 99762 (907) 443-6619 Fax (907) 443-5473

NOME PORT COMMISSION WORK SESSION AGENDA THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 2017 @ 5:30 PM COUNCIL CHAMBERS IN CITY HALL

WORK SESSION - 5:30 PM:

- Capital Improvements Plan Cordova Consulting
 - o Review/Discuss User Survey Responses on Facility Needs
 - Prioritizing of Projects
 - Discussion of Financing Options

Worksheet #1 – Updated based on August 17 Work Session

Pending capital improvements have been previously identified by harbor staff and port users as needed. These are ranked in order of importance based on survey responses.

| Pending Capital Improvements | Short ¹ (1 -2 years) | Mid ¹ (3 - 5 years) | Long ¹ (more than 5 years) | Potential for financing ² | Estimated Cost ³ |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| Better dock protection for inclement weather operations ⁴ | Х | | | | |
| SBH Waste oil/bilge pumpout ⁵ | Х | | | | |
| Port Deep Water Expansion ⁴ | Х | | | | \$300,000,000 |
| Port Ship's Waste Reception Facility 5 | Х | | | | |
| SBH Electrical Shore Power ⁶ | х | | | | |
| Outer harbor dolphins | | Х | | | |
| SBH Fueling Station ⁷ | | | х | | |
| Causeway Communications connection ⁸ | х | | | | |
| Causeway Electrical Shore Power ⁹ | х | | | | |
| Snake River Moorage Development ¹⁰ | x | | | | \$ 13,000,000 |
| 7-acre parcel development for vessel storage (WNTF) ¹¹ | | х | | | |
| Cruise Ship Tender Floats in SBH ¹² | х | | | | |
| Harbor Bathhouse/Laundry facilities ¹³ | | Х | | | \$ 805,000 |
| GARCO building upgrade | Х | | | | \$ 550,000 |

Notes to Table:

- 1. Indicate if these improvements should be considered in the short, mid, or long-term.
- 2. City, State, Federal, grant funds, or user fees for potential financing. To be determined in the future.
- 3. If cost estimate known, please fill in. Engineering estimates will be completed at later date.
- 4. Combine better dock protection for inclement weather operations with Port Deep Water Expansion both needs met with one project.

- 5. Combine SBH waste oil/bilge pumpout with Port Ship's waster reception facility can be one project or perhaps different phases of same project. Need to work with the utility company on this effort.
- 6. Electrical shore power can be installed in phases. Need to work with the utility company.
- 7. Real estate in the harbor is already at a premium. Need to investigate a public/private partnership for this endeavor.
- 8. Cameras going up with a potential for wireless connection by next season. Test model next summer.
- 9. Need to work with the utilities could allow ships to shut down completely and has the potential to reduce black carbon emissions.
- 10. This has the potential to reduce conflicts between different users at the Port, could allow the fishermen and crabbers to be sited away from the gold miners.
- 11. Waiting on the final negotiations with the Air Force to proceed with this effort.
- 12. This could be a temporary gangway and could address dual purposes. Customs is conducted on ship and security folks could be onshore.
- 13. Potential for private industry to take this on. Could be a laundromat only. Is this a port issue or a city issue?

| Short-Term Project Status | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------|-------------|--------|--|--|--|
| Pending Capital Improvements | Project Lead | Estimo | ited Cost | Status | | | |
| Better dock protection for inclement weather | | | | | | | |
| operations – Port Deep Water Expansion | | \$ | 300,000,000 | | | | |
| SBH Waste oil/bilge pumpout - Port Ship's Waste | | | | | | | |
| Reception Facility | | | | | | | |
| SBH Electrical Shore Power | | | | | | | |
| Causeway Communications connection | | | | | | | |
| Causeway Electrical Shore Power | | | | | | | |
| Snake River Moorage Development | | \$ | 13,000,000 | | | | |
| Cruise Ship Tender Floats in SBH | | | | | | | |
| GARCO building upgrade | | \$ | 550,000 | | | | |

Note: A similar table could be used for reporting out to the Port Commission at monthly meetings.

Worksheet #2

| Requests from survey respondents | Short ¹ (1 -2 years) | Mid ¹ (3 - 5 years) | Long ¹ (more than 5 years) | Potential for financing ² | Estimated Cost ³ |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Causeway turning basin expansion | | | | | |
| Causeway turning basin dredged deeper | | | | | |
| Rubber fendering on sheetpile | | | | | |
| Second fuel header at Causeway | | | | | |
| Additional dock space in small boat harbor | | | | | |
| Provide additional ladders for seasonal users in small boat harbor | | | | | |
| Ability to discharge regulated garbage | | | | | |
| PON purchase of fork lift or mobile crane | | | | | |
| Floating dry-dock or graving dock | | | | | |
| Vessel lift for larger vessels | | | | | |
| Wintertime snow removal from vessel storage lots | | | | | |
| WiFi free to Port users | | | | | |

This worksheet includes additional items identified by survey respondents as needed/desired at the Port and Small Boat Harbor facilities. These are in no particular order.

- 1. Indicate if these improvements should be considered in the short, mid, or long-term.
- 2. City, State, Federal, grant funds, or user fees for potential financing. To be determined in the future.
- 3. If cost estimate known, please fill in. Engineering estimates will be completed at later date.

Financing Options

- Federal grants
 - Corps of Engineers
 - o EDA grants
 - o US DOT grants
- State grants
 - Legislative
 - Harbor DOT matching grants
 - o Denali Commission
 - State bonds
- Other local grants
 - o NSEDC
- User fees

Port of Nome Capital Improvements Plan Summary Survey Results

Cordova Consulting

1191 South Lower Road Palmer, AK 99645 (907) 957-0581

AUGUST 2017

Introduction

The Port of Nome survey was emailed to 228 current and former users of the Port. Emails were provided by the Port of Nome. We received 20 completed surveys representing a range of Port users from research vessels to cargo ships to mining and fishing vessels. There were 191 valid email addresses so the rate of response for this survey was 10%. Using a 90% confidence level, the margin of error for this small sample size is about 11%. Following are the results of the survey questions.

Survey Results Summary

1. Do you currently use the Port of Nome?

Eighteen of the 20 respondents indicated that they currently use the Port of Nome.

2. Do you have multiple vessels using the Port of Nome?

Thirteen of the 18 respondents currently using the Port of Nome have more than one vessel.

3. If yes, how many vessels does your company currently have visiting the Port of Nome?

One respondent has 10 vessels currently using the Port. The average number for all respondents was 4 vessels. A total of 50 vessels were represented by the survey respondents.

4. On average, how many times a year does your company use the Port of Nome and how long do your vessels typically stay?

Eight of the respondents are long-term users of the Port. Low usage from one respondent was an annual visit for about 2 days. The highest usage amount outside of the long-term users was 26 to 30 times a year staying for approximately one day.

5. If no, what are your reasons for not using the Port of Nome?

- New Arctic rules make it impossible for our ship to work in the Arctic
- Inadequate depth and Port is sometimes too congested
- We are based out of Emmonak and generally pull our boats out of the water here. Last winter we pulled out one boat in Nome. Great facility and service and would use again if we need to pull a boat elsewhere than our own yard.
- Inadequate berth length for large cruise ships
- Vessels requesting fuel don't meet draft or length requirements, congestion at fuel docks prohibitive costs at Port (tariffs, taxes) compared to offshore fueling alternatives.

6. Please select the vessel type that best describes your operations:

| Number | Vessel Type |
|--------|------------------|
| 2 | gravel |
| 5 | cargo |
| 2 | fishing vessel |
| 4 | mining vessel |
| 4 | research vessel |
| 2 | landing craft |
| 4 | tug |
| 1 | passenger/cruise |
| 1 | freight |

Several respondents provided information on more than one vessel so the types of vessels will exceed the total survey responses. Of note here, however, is that the survey respondents represent a good mix of the vessel types currently using the Port of Nome.

7. Please indicate your vessel specifications:

Vessel lengths overall were somewhat balanced with about a third of the vessels under 100feet, another third in the 100 to 200-feet category, and the balance greater than 200-feet. The shortest length vessel was 20 feet and the longest length vessel was 820 feet. The beam for vessels calling at the Port of Nome had a wide range with 5-feet as the smallest and 106-feet as the widest. Most vessels fell in the 21 to 50-foot beam category. Vessel drafts range from 1 foot to 25-feet with almost half of the vessels falling in the greater than 12-foot draft category.

| Vessel Dimensions Summary | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Category/ # Vessels | Vessel Size | Most/Least | Feet | | | | | |
| LOA | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Vessels under 100-feet | Longest length: | 820 | | | | | |
| 14 | Vessels 100 to 200-feet | Shortest length: | | | | | | |
| 14 | Vessels greater than 200-feet | | | | | | | |
| Beam | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Vessels under 20-feet | Greatest beam: | 106 | | | | | |
| 25 | Vessels 21 to 50-feet | Least beam: | 5 | | | | | |
| 9 | Vessels greater than 50-feet | | | | | | | |
| Draft | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | Vessels under 7-feet | Greatest draft: | 25 | | | | | |
| 9 | Vessels 8 to 12-feet | feet Least draft: | | | | | | |
| 21 | Vessels greater than 12-feet | | | | | | | |

The following capital improvements are currently under construction at the Port of Nome:

- Security camera system
- 18-acre parcel for uplands storage (9 acres in 2017)
- Snake River dredging to -8-feet MLLW
- Dead-man mechanism for equipment and vessel haul-outs
- 8. The Port of Nome also has the following capital improvements projects pending on its Ports/Harbors list. Please rank these projects in order of importance for your business operations with "1" being most important and "14" being least important.

| Pending Capital Improvement | Ranking: (one vote per survey) |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Better dock protection for inclement weather operations | 1 |
| Waste oil/bilge pumpout | 2 |
| Port expansion to deeper water | 3 |
| Port Ship's Waste Reception Facility | 4 |
| Electrical shore power in harbor | 5 |
| Outer harbor dolphins | 6 |
| Fueling station in small boat harbor | 7 |
| Communications connection on the Causeway | 8 |
| Causeway shore power | 9 |
| Snake River Moorage Development | 10 |
| 7-acre parcel for vessel storage near existing launch ramps | 11 |
| Disembarking floats for cruise ship tenders in SE corner of harbor | 12 |
| Shower facilities | 13 |
| GARCO building upgrade | 14 |

The 14 items listed in the pending capital improvements have been previously identified by the harbor staff and Port and Small Boat Harbor users. The ranking in this table shows that "better dock protection for inclement weather operations" and "waste oil/bilge pumpout" was of the most importance to the Port of Nome users. "Shower facilities" and "GARCO building upgrades" were least favored by the current users.

9. What other port improvements at Nome would make your operations more efficient or make you want to use the Port of Nome more frequently? Please list the improvements in order of your preference with "I" being the most important.

Other Port Improvements desired fell into the general categories of Causeway infrastructure, small boat harbor infrastructure, management techniques, assistance with inclement weather conditions and include: (Responses here are listed in their entirety without editing)

Causeway Infrastructure:

Widen entrance so there is not a need for an assist boat Break wall in front of entrance to knock down swell in inclement weather Being able to moor large/deep draft vessels at the Outer Cell Turning basin dredged to deeper level Turning basin expanded Rubber fendering to protect sheet piling Second fuel header on Causeway for large vessels (outbound)

Small Boat Harbor Infrastructure:

More dock space

Provide more docking space and control in harbor for seasonal users, allow larger vessels to have wall space for repairs and fueling, with smaller vessels handled by docking or docks

More docking space for mining vessels

Provide ladders for seasonal users, and control areas people can park in.

Capacity of Snake River Bridge

Management Techniques:

Assist tug near port

Assist tug available 24 X 7

Please do not further limit full time users for once in a while users. i.e. occasional cruise ship float. This would take up additional wall space that is so badly needed for every day users. Rather reform the current fuel dock with a walkway to unload cruise passengers on that would have them walk up to the top of the current gravel ramp, via steps and a walkway

Assistance with Inclement Weather:

Wintertime snow removal from vessel storage lots

More protection from the weather

Other Services:

The ability to discharge regulated garbage at Port of Nome Number of docking cells expanded to decrease schedule conflicts The Port of Nome should purchase a fork lift or mobile crane A floating dry dock or graving dock Vessel lift for larger vessels Free Wi Fi

10. Would you be willing to pay a small fee on top of your moorage/dockage to support capital improvements at the Port of Nome?

Eleven of the 19 respondents (55%) answering this question indicated they would be willing to pay a fee to support capital improvements at the Port of Nome. Eight respondents indicated they would not be willing to pay an additional fee.

11. If yes, what amount would you be willing to pay in addition to your moorage/dockage and other fees at the Port? Please indicate amount that you would be willing to pay each visit or an amount up to annually.

This question asked users if they would be willing to pay a fee per visit or an annual fee. Of the respondents indicating they would be willing to pay a fee, the high amount per each visit was \$50 and the low amount was \$20 per visit. For those indicating a willingness to pay an annual fee, the low amount was \$50 and the high amount was \$2,000 annually.

- **12.** Other comments or information you would like to share with the Port of Nome: (these comments are listed in their entirety without editing)
- Frankly, the deficit now showing in the port report that was provided by your firm??? Is skewed. Showing depreciation as a tangible deduct item in the report is misleading as to the actual costs and projected costs to run the port, and projected port deficits. The basis used is not correct, thereby, there will be extra funds left for capital improvements if the report is used as gospel. You should correctly show the accounting in the proper format so as not to be misleading.
- We already pay such high prices for our usage in such a crowded port, I would figure there would be enough money to make improvements with what is already being collected without further raising prices. It is packed in the harbor.
- Please note that the above is submitted on behalf of the Cruise ships Silver Discoverer, Bremen, Crystal Serenity, and Le Boreal which will be the 4 cruise vessels calling at Port of Nome in 2017. Note that Crystal Serenity and Le Boreal must conduct their calls at anchor due to insufficient berth size.
- Additional 2% sales tax during summer months s/b used to support port improvements, not tariff or fee increases. The Port needs to develop an asset replacement schedule to determine appropriate planning and funding requirements for improvements and repairs of existing infrastructure.

PORT/HARBOR PROJECTS STATUS

| | | PROJECTS | | ESTIMATED | FUN | IDING |
|------|--|--|--|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| TYPE | NAME | SCOPE | STATUS | SCHEDULE | SOURCE | Estimate |
| ONGO | ING CONSTRUCTION (FUNDED) | | | | | |
| | SECURITY CAMERA SYSTEM | Install 24 camera security system in Port/Harbor w/desktop stations, server, software and fiber connections | In-house work underway/contractor procuring with install scheduled for early Sept 2017 | COMPLETION SEPT 2017 | FEMA CITY | \$202K \$70K |
| | CAPE NOME JETTY REPAIR | Repair Jetty from Nov 2011 storm - replace missing core rock and key in armor stone surface layers-remove scattered rock | Field work is complete - awaiting topo and bath survey for engineer review | COMPLETION SEPT 2017 | ADHES FEMA | \$4.55M |
| | VESSEL SCRAP | Hazmat Cleanup/Demo Cabin/Disposal of 65' tugboat | tug house demo partial - awaiting PWR staff availability | COMPLETION OCT 2017 | P&H Op Funds | ROM \$16K |
| | THORNBUSH SITE DEVELOP. | Development of portion of 18 acre parcel for needed uplands space. | Project fill underway - survey expected in mid-Sept | COMPLETION SEPT 2017 | SOA Crapta | ¢1 395 |
| | SNAKE RIVER DEVELOPMENT ADDT'L DREDGING | Additional dredging to -8' MLLW along west bank of Snake River to accommodate light draft anchorage | 60% of material captured - remaining 40% scheduled for Mar/April 2018 | COMPLETION MAY 2018 | SOA Grants | \$1.285 |

PENDING (SECURING FUNDS)

| | | Cost-share project w/ADOT to widen, resurface Port Rd w/drainage and | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|------|---------|
| P | PORT RD IMPROVEMENTS | safety improvements (sidewalks) | Eng/Design Awarded to PDC Engineers | Construction 2020 | SOA | City | pending |
| | | | | | | | |

PORT/HARBOR PROJECTS STATUS

| | | PROJECTS | | ESTIMATED | FUI | NDING |
|-------|------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| TYPE | NAME | SCOPE | STATUS | SCHEDULE | SOURCE | Estimate |
| PROPO | DSED (IN PLANNING) | | | | - | |
| | | Cost-share project w/USACE for a rescope of the draft Arctic Deep Draft | | | | |
| | | Port Study, followed by the design of the project, once authorized by | | | | |
| | ARCTIC DEEP DRAFT PORT STUDY | Congress. Execution of cost-share agreement pending confirmation of | Awaiting USACE HQ approval of recoping | Study Rescoping 2018 - | SOA F17 | |
| | & DESIGN | USACE rescoping plans. | plan options & timeline | 2020 | Grant Funds | \$1.6M |
| | | Design/install dead man mechanism to serve as anchoring point for | | | | |
| | HAUL OUT - DEAD MAN | equipment in vessel haul-outs | In design with engineers | Summer 2017 | City | \$20k +/- |
| | HAGE OUT - DEAD MAN | | | | City | Ş20K +/- |
| | | Evaluate/conceptualize/ROM Costs for buried pipeline and surface | | | | |
| | Port Ship's Waste Reception | infrastructure to receive ship's sewage and gray water -evaluate NJUS | Feasbility effort underway with Bristol, | | | |
| | Facility | WWT capacity to accommodate marine volume levels | | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| | | Rescoping of original design to more economically feasible, reduced scale | | | <u>Onknown</u> | Onkiown |
| | SNAKE RIVER DEVELOPMENT | or phased construction to include floats, shore protection and uplands | Pursuing reduced scale design and grant | | | Full design |
| | COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION | development | | Unknown | Unknown | ROM @ \$13M |
| | | Development of 7 acre parcel to provide additional vessel storage near | ADEC has issued approval of USAF | | | |
| | | existing and future launch ramps. USAF installed fence in 2015 and | mitigation measures - City awaits interim | | | |
| | WNTF SITE DEVELOPMENT | placed cap in 2016 | | Anticipated 2017 | Unknown | Unknown |
| | | Demo existing walls/roof, Install new roof/panels, prep interior for | , | | | |
| | GARCO BUILDING UPGRADE | insulation install - concrete curb around perimeter | Evaluating funding source | Unknown | Unknown | ROM \$550 |
| | | Design/procure/install large diameter dolphins inside east breakwater in | Evaluating priority before expending | | | |
| | OUTER HARBOR DOLPHINS | outer harbor for vessel standby. | | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| | | Evaluate/conceptualize establishing disembarking floats at ramp in SE | Evaluating before expending ROM & | | | |
| | CRUISE TENDER FLOATS | corner of harbor for cruise ship tenders to minimize congestion | concept funds | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown |
| | | Design/install shower facilities by SBH floats, extend existing water/sewer | Evaluating priority and ROM costs - | | | |
| | SHOWER/LAUNDRY FACILITIES | from Office & coin-op or credit card mechanism | specifically water/sewer charges | Unknown | Unknown | \$800K |
| | | Design/install electrical outlets near base of street lights, develop suitable | Evaluating priority and ROM costs - | | | |
| | ELECTRICAL SHORE POWER | mechanism to charge users to access | specifically charging mechanism | Seeking | Unknown | Unknown |
| | | Work w/terminal fuel operators to develop fueling station in SBH, identify | ROM/Concept Design Underway with In- | | PRIVATE | |
| | SHORE-SIDE FUELING | most suitable site and preferential access agrmt | house City Engineer | Unknown | INDUSTRY | Unknown |
| | | Pursue as adjacent operation to terminal operator fueling station - | ROM/Concept Design Underway with In- | | | |
| | WASTE OIL/BILGE PUMPOUT | potential cost-share | house City Engineer | Unknown | CITY | Unknown |

PORT/HARBOR PROJECTS STATUS

| | | PROJECTS | | ESTIMATED | FUN | IDING |
|-------|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------|---------|-----------|
| TYPE | NAME | SCOPE | STATUS | SCHEDULE | SOURCE | Estimate |
| MAINT | TENANCE | | | | | |
| | | Bury overhead lines crossing Port Rd & WNTF entrances to allow for | | | | |
| | PORT RD OH LINE BURY | unobstructed vessel/equipment movement | Obtained estimate from EPS | Unknown | Unknown | \$670K |
| | PORT NO OT LINE BORT | | | | P&H Op | |
| | | Permitting - engineering - design | Estimate from EPS | Identifying Funds | Funds | \$56K |
| | CSWY BRIDGE FUEL LINE | Replace corroded hangars/rollers - recommend USACE adjust fill behind | Repair Summary Completed - Work | | P&H Op | |
| | HANGAR/ROLLER REPAIRS | backwalls located under bridge approaches | Scheduled for Winter | Winter 2017/18 | Funds | \$40K +/- |
| | HYDROTESTS & CP INSPECT - | Annual maintenance tests/inspection/maintenance on port fuel lines | Hydrotesting Complete | | P&H Op | |
| | PORT FUEL LINES | system to meet compliance/ensure integrity | CP Work Scheduled | PERFORMED ANNUALLY | Funds | \$15k +/- |
| | | Remove upper concrete planks at harbor launch ramp and fill with grout | | | P&H Op | |
| | LAUNCH RAMP REPAIR | to fill in voids and increase structure support | Evaluating repair scope & costs | Potential 2017/18 | Funds | Unknown |
| | INNER HARBOR | There is a periodic need to survey/dredge the SBH and Snake River ramp | Evaluate pre & post COE 2018 surveys - | | P&H Op | |
| | SURVEY/DREDGING | approaches to ensure control depth maintained | determine if shoaling | Potential 2018 | funds | Unknown |
| | More Ladders to allow full wall | User request for additional ladders to avoid wasting dock space and allow | PND cost estimate fabricate/ship/install - | | P&H Op | |
| | use/reduce congestion | crew to reach top of dock | \$10k/each | Potential 2018 | funds | \$60K |

Completed Projects

* - Combined Projects