

Submitted to Skagway Municipal Clerk for the public record 9-15-22

My name is Tom Cochran 303 11th Avenue. I formally request on the public record that all future Assembly Finance Committee reports include Municipal fund balances and current Municipal indebtedness. The last Municipal "Outstanding Bond Balance" report that I have seen was dated February 5, 2021. That was a year and a half ago and the outstanding balance was over 17 million dollars.

The Skagway Port Protection Committee that I have become involved with is a group of concerned citizens with Port of Skagway experience. We came together because individually we tried unsuccessfully to be heard by this Administration. In one case we were publicly admonished by Assembly members for expressing our concerns, in another we were banned from being placed on a committee agenda. We tried very hard to stay positive and keep a supportive and co-operative attitude. We did not want to take a negative approach. As we tried to educate and contribute it seemed only to upset and anger our elected representatives.

We are very supportive of Port Development, and we strongly advocate for improving the Skagway waterfront. I thank the Assembly, staff, and committee members for their diligent work in trying to make this happen.

My fear is that the goal of this Administration is to eliminate all ore transfer operations, remove the ore terminal and curb industrial capability/activity in the Port of Skagway. I feel that you want a cruise only port that looks pretty and mimics the Juneau waterfront. I hope I am wrong but my reasons for this include comments made by the Mayor when I was still serving on the ports and harbors advisory board concerning beautification of the industrial side of our port. This was further hit home by a question I was asked when applying for the Port Administrative assistant position. Specifically, "How would you react if you were directed to decommission the Ore Terminal?"

I think the current ore dock improvement project while admirable in its intention misses the mark. It does not provide the necessary berthing and industrial capacity that we need in Skagway. We are told that the revenue bond that is

being proposed to pay for this project will be paid by user fees and not taxes. However, we have never been provided with revenue projections for this repayment. If the Municipality intends to use waterfront lease revenue and/or CPV funds to help pay for this revenue bond, then to say it will be paid by user fees is untrue. *Lease revenue and CPV funds are NOT user fees.*

I take exception that this project has been totally vetted and approved by the public and port committee. One of the main reasons I resigned from the Ports and Harbors Advisory Board is because we would get material the day of or the night before our meeting and be expected to approve it. Then pass a motion recommending the Assembly approve it. This was becoming routine. That is not vetting. That's more like cramming it down our throat. I was not the only committee member who felt this way. As for public vetting, I think the public has seen so many proposals, plans, and presentations regarding the port of Skagway that they have become numb and just want something done.

I don't understand the Municipality's rush to March of 2023 like it is some ultimate finish line or goal post. That is actually when the real work starts. The Municipal Port Commission that I served on for close to a decade continuously proposed to keep things status quo for 5 to 10 years after March of 2023 in order to build a strong, competent port department and possibly a Port Authority. All you had to do was negotiate 4 leases (Temsco, AML, Petro Marine, and Cruise Line Agencies). That alone would have increased Municipal port revenues by roughly 1000%.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas D. Cochran Sr.