

# Haines Lutak Dock Project Community Meeting #3 Joint Work Session Summary

02.01.17



**Prepared For:**  
Haines Borough  
**Submitted By:**  
R&M Consultants, Inc.

**Community Meeting: Haines Borough Lutak Dock Design and Development Concepts Project  
Joint Work Session with the Ports and Harbors Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission**

**MEETING INFORMATION**

Date: Wednesday, February 1, 2017

Location: Chilkat Center Lobby

Time: 5:30 PM – 7:00 PM

**MEETING ATTENDEES**

---

**Haines Borough Staff:**

- Brad Ryan, Interim Borough Manager
- Krista Kielsmeier, Public Facilities Executive Assistant
- Shawn Bell, Acting Public Facilities Director
- Gabe Thomas, Acting Harbormaster
- Jan Hill, Mayor
- Jila Stuart, CFO

**R&M Consultants:**

- John Daley, PE Project Manager
- Van Le, AICP, Planning & Stakeholder Outreach

**Members of the Public:** 28 people signed in, including the following Commission, Committee and Assembly members:

**Haines Borough Assembly**

- Ron Jackson
- Thomas C. Morphet
- Heather Lende
- Margaret Friedenauer, Assembly Liaison

**Planning Commission**

- Lee Heinmiller
- Rob Goldberg
- Jeremy Stephens
- Don Turner III

## Ports and Harbors Advisory Committee

- Bill Rostad
- Glen Jacobson
- Brad Badger
- Fred Gray
- Don Turner Jr.

### Purpose of Community Meeting 3 – Joint Work Session

The Lutak Dock is in need of repair or replacement as it is nearing the end of its useful life. The Lutak Dock Project will outline feasible alternatives for the replacement or refurbishment of the dock. This Joint Work Session between the Port and Harbors Advisory Committee and the Haines Planning Commission is the third community meeting for the project. The purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss the recommended alternatives for the replacement of Lutak Dock and provided the community an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback to help inform future decisions on the preferred design concept. The public meeting was scheduled and noticed two weeks in advance. Community members were notified through direct emails from the project team, updates on the Haines Lutak Dock project website, postings on the Haines Borough website, flyers posted throughout the city, an advertisement on the Haines Community website.

Shawn Bell, Acting Director of Public Facilities for Haines Borough, introduced the project team and provided an overview of the project. John Daley, R&M Project Manager then gave a brief presentation on the project schedule, information on existing conditions of the dock, concept designs, and the information provided in the Joint Work Session Memo. The attending Committee, Commission, and community members were informed of the Memo and its availability for review on the project website and were asked to provide comments on the information presented thus far. John's presentation is an attachment to this summary.

Following the presentation of the project, the meeting went into a question and answer session and concluded at the scheduled time of 7:00 PM. The following is a summation of the questions asked and answers provided during the meeting:

- 1. Question: Since funding is limited, can we go with Alternative 3 now but then change to Alternative 1 at a later date when more money becomes available?**

*Answer: This is possible. However, once major construction is complete it is unlikely that things would change. The dolphins are a significant structure that would be difficult to build around.*

- 2. Question: DOT conducted a study in the 1990s and there is a concern with the encapsulated alternative and driving piling in unknown fill. It sounds like there could be lots of change orders.**

*Answer: There is risk associated with this alternative. It is likely that excavation around and between the existing cells would be required. Temporary shoring may be required. We can*



*include some contingency bid items to deal with obstructions. The alternative is to completely remove all the existing cells and start over. This would add to the cost.*

**3. Question: How much contingency money is included in the cost estimates?**

*Answer: 25% contingency on costs. This accounts for some uncertainty because we only have a preliminary design.*

**4. Question: Is the existing dock too far gone for a ground stabilization option?**

*Answer: That could work for small areas as a temporary repair but in general the dock is too far deteriorated for that option at this point.*

**5. Question: What is the difference from Alternative 1B and Alternative 3?**

*Answer: Alternative 1B is a modified diaphragm dock that would function much like the existing dock. Alternative 3 is all dolphins that would result in the loss of some uplands.*

**6. Question: Do you need fuel headers?**

*Answer: This depends on the operator of the fuel facility. In general a steep pipe header is more secure than a hose so it would be preferable.*

**7. Question: What work was done to Lutak dock 10 years ago?**

*Answer: New sheet piles were added at the interconnecting arcs, new fenders were provided and sacrificial anodes were installed.*

**8. Question: Regarding the sheet pile cells, faults on the water side could be catastrophic. But is this on the side where they face each other? The critical side is the side that faces the water, the other side is less critical, so could we replace just the water side? Looking at the Harbor \$7 million wave barrier.**

*Answer: We looked at a cantilever and tied back sheet pile wall outside of the existing dock. The earth pressure is very high and required multiple levels of tie backs. While theoretically possible it would be challenging and expensive to build this. A cell structure better for this site.*

**9. Question: Could a different kind of wall be used instead of combi-wall? The concern here is with the height of the wall.**

*Answer: There are lots of options but these get challenging with a high wall and significant earth pressures. Although it's expensive a cellular dock is probably the most economical and straightforward option.*

**10. Question: What about materials produced locally such as concrete? Is that feasible?**

*Answer: Similar to #9 there are lots of options but a cellular dock is probably the most economical and straight forward option.*

- 11. Question: The state bought steel pilings for a vacated bridge project. It is currently being stored in Seattle. Can we get a deal on this stockpiled material such as 1300-1400 ft. pipes that can be used to build a new dock?**

*Answer: It would be fun to design a new dock around the use of stockpiled materials. Pipe piling would be used in a combi wall type of dock. See replies to #9 and #10.*

- 12. Question: When the dock fails, goods will be forced to be trucked in and out and that is bad for the economy.**

*Answer: True except that the container and fuel service suppliers have contingency plans to provide emergency shipping access.*

- 13. Question: What happens to cell 6 and 7?**

*Answer: Alternative 1A encapsulates these two cell (along with cell 5) and reclaims the use of the uplands associated with them. Alternative 1B does not address these cells. They will remain a risk under this alternative.*

- 14. Question: What happens if cell 6 and 7 fall in?**

*Answer: If cell 6 failed it would likely result in a sink-hole and there would be sloughing of fill into the water. This would probably affect operations of the ferry berth.*

- 15. Question: Who owns cell 5?**

*Answer: It seems that the Borough owns the cell but gave some form of right of way to the ADOT.*

- 16. Question: If catastrophic failure occurs, is it by cell, such as self-separating as individual cells?**

*Answer: Most likely yes. The cells are stand-alone structures. So if one fails it doesn't necessarily propagate into the next one.*

- 17. Question: Over the dock's lifetime, what is the maintenance and operation cost because of the type of metal we're using?**

*Answer: The existing dock has been operating for over 64 years. This is not bad considering it was bare steel and someone turned off the corrosion protection system. New construction uses galvanized steel with sacrificial anodes that combined have a corrosion protection lifespan of 40 years. The anodes can be replaced every 20 years or so to increase this life span. The sacrificial anodes that can't be turned on and off. The fender system takes energy from the berthing vessels and has a shorter service life. This depends on use and might be 20 to 25 years. It is best to program regular inspections and maintenance. It can be expected that the dock will require major maintenance such as repairing fenders and replacing anodes once every 20 to 25 years. Major maintenance might cost 5% of the original capital cost.*

- 18. Question: Did you talk to DOT about what they did at their berth?**

*Answer: Yes. We had several conversations with the ADOT. The state didn't need uplands so the dolphins were a good alternative for how they use the dock.*



**19. Question: Will sheets be zinced?**

*Answer: Yes. We recommend hot dip galvanized sheets with aluminum alloy anodes.*

**20. Question: If the Roll-On Roll-Off (RORO) ramp is the main dock facility without the rest of the dock, can we leave the rest of the dock as is to save money? This seems to be the cheapest option.**

*Answer: The cost of demolition, pull out, and the existing armor slope make it more costly, but we can't leave the dock as it is.*

**21. Question: If the dock failed, who would cover the costs, the community emergency funds, state, or federal funds?**

*Answer: To be honest we don't know. This would be determined by your political representatives.*

**22. Question: If we just build new a dock to support current uses, what is the risk of leaving the structure as it is?**

*Answer: It is probably not ethical to abandon a failing dock. It could slough off into the waterway and affect the approach to the ferry berth.*

**23. Question: Are there contaminated soils near the rear wall? If so, can we drive a sheet pile wall into this?**

*Answer: The recent ADOT project did not encounter contaminated soils. For this project we would recommend a geotechnical field investigation that would include soil samples. We will screen the soil samples for contamination.*

**24. Question: Is there an alternative to back wall for the modified diaphragm in alternative 1? Can we just make an anchor of some sort to save on the cost of steel? We don't want an open cell.**

*Answer: There is an advantage in using closed cells such as modified diaphragms because they are a self-contained gravity structure which are resistant to several potential failure modes. They are detailed in several design manuals.*

**25. Question: The alternative that allows the dock to stay multi-use while private enterprise that needs more uplands can be taken care of in another location will be the best one. We should consider future mining operations but at another location and limit ourselves to realistic alternatives, not unrealistic ones.**

*Answer: Agree. Alternative 1 allows general cargo to support mining operations. Due to limited uplands, a mineral export terminal should be at another location.*

**26. Question: What is the difference between Alternative 3 (mooring dolphins) and Alternative 1B the (modified diaphragm)?**

*Answer: Current operations can be supported with either option but under Alternative 3 existing uplands are removed. Uplands are beneficial for cargo operations. The current uplands is already small at 4 acres and would be going down to under 2 acres with*

*Alternative 3. This would severely limit future growth. Alternative 1 retains the current upland area of just under 4 acres. It allows for a small amount of multi-purpose use and future development.*

## ATTACHMENTS

---

- Decision Memo (Available on the website)
- PowerPoint Presentation (Available on the website)
- Fact Sheet (Available on the website)

