



Port and Harbor Facility Development Plan

City of Ketchikan - Alaska

For discussion only - Draft

Ketchikan Cruise Berthing
NORTH END ALTERNATIVE - GTA

This shows how they Sabotaged our Plan



KPI
Consulting Engineers

hnl
Bernabe Alarid
& Partners, Inc.

Port and Harbor Facility Development Plan City of Ketchikan - Alaska

For discussion only - Draft

Ketchikan Cruise Berthing
NORTH END ALTERNATIVE

0 100' 600'
Graphic Scale



July 2, 2004

The Honorable Bob Weinstein
Mayor, City of Ketchikan
City Council Chambers
334 Front Street
Ketchikan, AK 99901

Dear Mayor Weinstein:

The City Manager, Karl Amylon, was kind enough to visit our office last week so that we could make him aware of our concerns regarding the potential location of a new dock for cruise ships south of downtown. I want to express our sincere appreciation for Mr. Amylon taking the time to meet with us. We told your staff of the difficulty we foresaw operating our cannery if the proposed project went forward. Since the meeting we have examined the situation carefully. We wanted to make you aware that it is doubtful we can continue to operate in Ketchikan if the dock is built in front of our cannery.

Our fishing fleet is comprised of approximately forty-five seine vessels. The Trident cannery in Ketchikan processes over 850,000 pounds of salmon a day during the peak of the run. As you know, we cannot afford to allow the cannery to be without fish during the season. High quality production requires that the salmon we process be as fresh as possible. We rely upon our fleet delivering directly to our cannery dock and to tenders anchored in front of the cannery. Every fishing vessel offloads its catch at our plant at least once every day (and some vessels deliver twice a day). Fishing vessels tie-up at our dock after they deliver and often come to our plant to take on ice before going out fishing. The waters off our dock are extremely busy during the fishing season.

Unfortunately these activities cannot take place with 950 foot long cruise ships docked in front of the cannery. The tides and wind in Tongass Narrows can be strong, and the fifty-eight foot vessels that make up our fleet simply cannot maneuver in that limited of a space. In addition, during the time period that cruise ships are approaching or leaving the dock, it appears that fishing vessels would be unable to even get to our plant.

It is not practical to stage the vessels waiting to offload in a different location. The tides South of our plant would make it difficult for vessels to operate. The time lag in vessels arriving at our plant from some distance staging area would cause gaps in our offloads. The simple truth is that our cannery requires space in front of it for vessels to

quickly and efficiently offload, clean-up, take on provisions and return to the fishing grounds.

There are other critical issues regarding locating the dock south of town. Our outfall line is located very near the proposed dock. We could not receive a discharge permit from the Environmental Protection Agency without first dredging all of the existing waste pile. We are concerned about interactions between cruise ship passengers and the industrial nature of fish processing. Our discharge has a legal "mixing zone" in the water column surrounding the discharge point which passengers might find offensive. There is obviously noise and odor associated with salmon canning. We operate twenty-four hours a day during the season. Trident has in the past operated a meal plant barge at the Ketchikan plant. This allows for us to be more economically efficient by produce revenue from fish wastes. The meal plant is currently being used at another location. If the cruise ship dock were built in front of our plant, we would be precluded from operating a meal plant at the cannery in the future.

We want to be helpful and do recognize the importance of the tourism industry to Ketchikan and the important role that the cruise ship industry plays in the economic well being of the community. Trident has always tried to take the view that what is good for Alaska and the communities where we operate will ultimately be good for our company. We must make you and the City Council aware of the serious doubts whether we can continue to operate if the dock is built in front of our plant.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your consideration of our position.

Sincerely,

Joseph T. Plesha
General Counsel

cc: Members of the City Council



HISTORIC KETCHIKAN

POST OFFICE BOX 23364
KETCHIKAN, ALASKA 99901
907-225-5515 • Fax: 907-225-5515
Email: dave@historic-ketchikan.org

7/28/04

Mayor Bob Weinstein
Members of the Ketchikan City Council

The Historic Ketchikan Board of Directors supports the development of additional cruise ship berthing space north of the tunnel. There are several reasons why we feel that this is the proper course of action:

- The primary reason we support additional dock space north of the tunnel is economic development. The Hopkins Alley-Newtown area has yet to benefit from the tourism related economic boom in the downtown area.
- Establishing cruise docks in this area will broaden the tax base and enhance the upland areas through such projects as the expansion of the Waterfront Promenade. Improved uplands in this historic area will create a showcase for residents and visitors alike.
- There is strong, broad-based community support for docks in the area north of the tunnel.
- Spreading out the cruise docks to this area will also help alleviate some of the downtown congestion. Reducing that congestion will also improve the experience for the visitors.
- We are concerned that development south of Thomas Basin could have a negative impact on the industries currently located there. The fishing industry in particular is undergoing significant changes and deserves the full support of the community.
- Road bypasses have been built north of the tunnel, but any development on south Stedman Street has the potential of creating a significant bottleneck. There is no alternative route around this potentially congested area.

- Given the proximity of the community's main tank farms and the Coast Guard base we believe that expanding the docks south of Thomas Basin creates a safety and security hazard.
- The city previously announced plans to build small cruiseship dock on the outside of the Thomas Basin breakwater. We believe that is the proper scale for port development in the south Stedman Street area.

We recognize the difficulty the city faces in determining the best way to expand the port facilities and meet the needs of the cruise industry over the next decade. We also strongly support the city's efforts to ensure that effective uplands development is a crucial component of any port expansion. We offer whatever help we can provide to accomplish those goals

Sincerely,

Terral Wanzer

Terral Wanzer, president

Rick Hardcastle. Vice president

Ralph Gregory, secretary-treasurer

Tom Ferry. member

Len Laurance, member

Dave Rubin, member

By KPFF

REVIEW OF NORTH END PROPERTY OWNERS ALTERNATIVE

Estimated Project Cost

- Phase I (Property acquisition, two berths, GTA, water tours float, uplands improvements, and environmental contingency) \$55,250,000
- Phase I (Common improvements including downtown uplands, GTA, berth 1 rehabilitation and study costs) \$20,590,000
- Total Estimated Cost - Phase I \$75,840,000
- Phase II (Modified berths 2 and 3 creating fifth berth, GTA) \$23,050,000

not true

Navigation

- Berth 4 - Difficult to access in some wind conditions - NOT TRUE
- Berth 5 - Vessel movements restricted in some wind conditions - NOT TRUE

Security

- Berth 4 - Difficult due to linear wharf configuration } maybe true
- Berth 5 - Good ability to secure the pier

Impact of the project on adjacent properties and/or businesses

- Six air taxi operations (20 aircraft) are potentially displaced — NOT TRUE
- Potential bow/stern thruster and azipod drive damage to older over water structures
- Potential noise, view and emission impacts on adjacent residences — NOT TRUE

Impact of the project on the community including:

Vehicular and pedestrian traffic

- Traffic signalization required Schoenbar — NEEDED NOW
- Four lane outlet from GTA due to turning areas — SO? BUILD IT
- Coach and shuttle traffic to city center on narrow corridor — SAME AS NOW
- Slow-moving vehicles problematic due to lack of turn-offs — NOT TRUE
- Increased foot traffic - must have wider sidewalk areas — SO? BUILD THEM

View corridors from adjacent commercial and residential properties

- One business has requested compensation for loss of view — SO HAVE TUNNEL NEIGHBORHOOD
- View corridor issues with residences expected — AS WITH DOWNTOWN ALSO

Parking issues

- Phase I - Loss of approximately 43 on street stalls — NOT TRUE
- Phase II - Loss of approximately 77 Berth 2 stalls — NOT TRUE

We have come up with
A parking plan that city
will not acknowledge

Impact of the project on the existing (downtown) retail/commercial investment

- Vessels/passenger diverted from the existing retail area -

Not True -

New retail/commercial opportunities

- Generates expanded retail opportunities -

Yes! Plus Expand the tax base

Community satisfaction

- To be determined

Stupid question -

Cruise Line passenger satisfaction

- Long walking distance to city center
- Existing retail limited in area
- No immediate venues or attractions

Not true

It will happen very fast

old Ketchikan - not 60 jewelry stores

Cruise Line satisfaction

- Concerns with navigation
- Cruise lines have sensitivity to project budget -

Not true

too bad

Thomas Basin access/dolphin

- Thomas Basin dolphin remains

So

Preservation of City Float/Ryus Float/Hansen Float

- Opportunity to reconfigure/expand City Float
- Movements of vessels restricted during the cruise season at City Float
- No tendering operations to Ryus and Hansen Floats

Yes

Not true

Not true

Ability to economically add an additional berth at a later date

Same cost Anywhere

- Estimated cost for the fifth berth - \$23,050,000

Financial contribution/commitment required from "others" (other than cruise lines)

- Estimated Phase I contribution required from "others" is \$17,970,000

Not Accurate