

SCR

25

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

FURTHER

4/26/89

DATE TURNED INTO OFFICE

1/22/90

Mr. President:

FINANCE

Committee considered

SCR 25

plan for expansion of and major improvements to the Alaska transportation system

and recommended

- replace with _____ CS SCR 25 (Finance)) same title
- or adopt _____ CS _____) new title
- attached amendment(s) and _____) technical title change (HB only)
- _____ letter of intent adopted

do pass

do not pass

no recommendation

individual recommendations

further referral to _____

- FISCAL NOTE(S) zero fiscal impact appropriation no FN
- new updated previous
- same as previous fiscal note(s) published _____

MEMBERS SIGNING DO PASS

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

[Handwritten signatures]

[Large handwritten signature]

Chair: _____

signature and recommendation

Committee Backup attached

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: _____
 Title: Expansion of Transportation
System
 Sponsor: Duncan
 Requestor: _____

Agency Affected: Transportation and
BRU: Public Facilities
 Components: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING						

CAPITAL	75.0	0	0	0	0	0
----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---

REVENUE						
----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	75.0	0	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Prepared by: Senator Rick Uehling, Co-chairman
 Division: Senate Finance Committee

Phone: 465-4821
 Date: 1/22/90

Approved by Commissioner: _____
 Agency: _____

Date: _____

Distribution (by preparer):

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

Original sponsor(s): SEN. DUNCAN

1 IN THE SENATE

BY THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

2 CS FOR SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 25 (Finance)

3 IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4 SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE - SECOND SESSION

5 Relating to a plan for expansion of the

6 Alaska transportation system.

7 BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

8 WHEREAS the purpose of the Alaska transportation system is to provide
9 an intrastate connection between communities and an interstate link between
10 Alaska and the other states; and

11 WHEREAS the development of the Alaska transportation system has helped
12 foster the economic development and social progress of the state and indi-
13 vidual communities; and

14 WHEREAS a principal objective of the Alaska transportation system
15 should be to continue to stimulate the economic and social progress of the
16 state; and

17 WHEREAS there is not a significant source of funds for capital im-
18 provements for expansion of the Alaska transportation system other than the
19 federal highway and aviation programs; and

20 WHEREAS the current emphasis of transportation planning is on improve-
21 ments to existing facilities and few resources are available for long-term
22 planning for expansion of the Alaska transportation system; and

23 WHEREAS the state must allocate its financial resources among benefi-
24 cial projects and must establish priorities among those projects in order
25 to best stimulate the state's economic and social growth through a balanced
26 approach that includes expansion of and improvements to the Alaska trans-
27 portation system; and

28 WHEREAS the state must develop a long-term plan to prioritize major
29 projects for expansion of or improvements to the existing transportation

1 system before the Federal Highway Administration will allow use of federal
2 highway funds for environmental impact statements, design, rights-of-way,
3 or construction of such projects; and

4 WHEREAS no significant expansion of the Alaska transportation system
5 has occurred since the construction of the Dalton Highway;

6 BE IT RESOLVED that the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests
7 the Governor to direct the Department of Transportation and Public Facil-
8 ities to

9 (1) plan for expansion of the Alaska transportation system,
10 including the Alaska marine highway system, by identifying and selecting
11 new transportation routes; and

12 (2) establish a means for funding projects to expand the Alaska
13 transportation system through the existing allocations of federal funding
14 or through other funding mechanisms identified by the department; and be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED that the Department of Transportation and Public
16 Facilities report to the legislature by

17 (1) January 15, ~~1991~~, on the department's plan for expansion of
18 the Alaska transportation system and the sources of funding for the expan-
19 sion; and

20 (2) January 15, ~~1992~~, on the department's prioritized list of
21 projects to expand the Alaska transportation system and the proposed source
22 of funding for each project; and be it

23 FURTHER RESOLVED that the Department of Transportation and Public
24 Facilities include in the long-range transportation plans for the state
25 under AS 19.10.140 and AS 44.42.050 those projects to expand the Alaska
26 transportation system that have been identified as high priority projects.
27
28
29

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS - JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS

Provided by Senator Jim Duncan, January, 1990

- 1921 Taku Valley Recon. Report prepared for the Alaska Road Commission - Tidewater to the Canadian border.
- 1951-52 Reconnaissance Report on proposed Taku River Route and Photo Recon. Report for the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.
- 1954 December - Reconnaissance survey of the Taku route for the Alaska Road Commission.
- 1963 Taku Glacier Evaluation Study by Maynard Miller for the Alaska Dept. of Highways and Federal Bureau of Public Roads - indicated unstable situation.
- 1964 November - Reconnaissance Report for proposed Forest Highway done for the U.S. Forest Service. Access to timber and the Glacier Bay National Monument the goal.
- 1967 April - Reconnaissance Report on the Chilkat River Crossing by DOT/PF - to pick crossing location. Assumes a west side route.
- 1970 State Dept of. Highways develops plans for Chilkat River Crossing but finds Right of Way problems with Indian Reservation, also environmental issues arise.
- 1974 September - Lynn Canal Environmental Assessment for the Alaska Department of Highway.
- 1974 October - Alaska Department of Highways prepares a cost estimate on the Juneau to Skagway route.
- 1975 Lynn Canal Transportation Corridor Public Hearing Brochure prepared by the Dept. of Highways. Concentrated primarily on surface transportation, transportation costs and environmental issues.

Chronology of Events
Juneau Road Access
Page 2

- 1979 Southeast Transportation Plan by Wilbur Smith & Assoc. Examines Taku route and routes to Haines and Skagway.
- 1980 Cost estimates prepared on Juneau to Haines route by DOT/PF.
- 1981 January - Juneau to Haines location investigation done by R & M Engineering for the Senate Transportation Committee.
- 1986 Evaluation of Corridor Alternatives by Acres International for DOT/PF identifies most attractive options as 1) high-speed shuttle ferry between Echo Cove, Haines and Skagway, and 2) a road up the east side of Lynn Canal to Skagway with a shuttle ferry to Haines. Report also identifies status quo as the least costly option.
- 1987 March - Greater Juneau Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development Committee prepares an Evaluation and Recommendations stating the Acres report did not include important economic factors.
- 1987 May - Senator Duncan appropriates \$100,000 in federal funds to determine the economic feasibility of road access to Juneau.
- 1988 March - the Federal Highway Administration indicates the next step in the process should be an Environmental Impact Statement for a highway connection between Juneau, Haines and Skagway. The FHWA would require a commitment on the part of the Department to build in order to proceed.
- 1988 August - Maynard Miller releases information stating the TAKU Glacier was advancing at an accelerating rate and could dam the Taku River in six to 10 years.
- 1988 September 15 - Maynard Miller retracts his previous statement saying an assistant had confused feet with meters.
- 1988 September - Senator Duncan asks DNR, Fish and Game and the U.S. Geological Survey to determine whether or not the information on the glacial problems on the Taku route was correct.

Chronology of Events
Juneau Road Access
Page 3

- 1988 September - Senator Duncan asks the Juneau Economic Development Council to take the lead in pulling together a community consensus on a road option, by providing objective information on all possible options. The JEDC agrees to take on the project even though no funding is available.
- 1988 November - Senator Coghill asks for and receives a \$6,000 grant from the Senate Leadership funds for Red Swanson.
- 1989 January 18 - Senator Coghill introduces SB 124 and SB 125 which would authorize DOT/PF to construct the Lynn Canal Highway Project and appropriate \$102.0 million in federal and state funds.
- 1989 January 24 - the Juneau City and Borough Assembly endorses the Juneau Economic Development Council approach to improved access to Juneau in support of a rational process that will make obtaining funding a more realistic goal. The Assembly expressed concerns with SB 125, Senator Coghill's Lynn Canal appropriation, as being premature.
- 1989 January 27 - the Juneau Branch, Alaska Miners Association issued the following statement:
- "While the Juneau Branch of the Alaska Miners Association favors the concept of enhanced access to the State Capitol, it chooses at this time not to endorse any particular plan as the Branch feels the issue merits further study."
- 1989 March 3 - Senator Duncan formally asks Bob Ruby of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) exactly what the state should do to show a commitment to build a specific road project.
- 1989 March 6 - Bob Ruby, FHWA responds; "It is the FHWA policy that Federal-aid highway funds for preliminary engineering work, such as environment, location or design studies, should not be authorized without a reasonable assurance that construction will proceed within five years following the initial authorization...The normal procedures for this funding commitment would be inclusion of a significant construction project in the Alaska DOT&PF's Six-Year Plan." Mr. Ruby went on to say that "legislation to appropriate funds

Chronology of Events
Juneau Road Access
Page 4

in excess of those available to the State from FHWA can not be considered a satisfactory commitment for Federal-aid highway program purposes."

1989 March 8 - Report released by the Juneau Economic Development Council entitled "Juneau Road Access Improvements" which recommends high speed ferries as the short term alternative with long term commitment to hard link access recommended.

1989 March 8 - in response to the JEDC report, Senator Duncan:

1. requests that DOT/PF complete the Marine Highways' Master Plan and that it include funding for high speed ferries for the Juneau-Haines-Skagway route;

2. requests that the Governor initiate talks with the Canadian government concerning a possible joint project via the Taku route.

1989 March 9 - in response to the JEDC report of March 8, Senator Duncan introduces the following legislation:

SCR 25 - relating to a plan for expansion or major improvements to the Alaska transportation system. This resolution would require the DOT/PF to report to the legislature by January, 1990 on the Department's plan for expansion and major improvements to the Alaska transportation system and provide a prioritized list of such major projects to the Legislature by January of 1991, and include those projects identified through this process in the Department's Six Year Plan.

SB 210 - relating to planning for and funding of major projects. This bill designates ten percent of the annual allocation of federal aid highway funds for planning and construction of projects to expand the state's transportation system. It also amends the State Transportation Plan statute to require the Department to include system expansion and major improvements to our transportation system in their annual planning process.

Chronology of Events
Juneau Road Access
Page 5

- SB 211 - appropriates \$600,000 for the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to do a formal Environmental Impact Statement on the Taku River Valley route and the Lynn Canal route.
- 1989 April - Hearings on all legislation concerning Juneau access are held in the Senate Transportation Committee. SB 210, SB 211 and SCR 25 are amended and moved from committee on April 26.
- 1989 May - Senator Duncan appropriates \$100,000 in State general fund to begin environmental impact statements on the Juneau-Haines route and the Taku River Corridor.
- 1989 August - September - DOT/PF commences formal Public Hearings in Juneau, Haines, Skagway to begin the E.I.S. Expected completion of Phase I of the E.I.S. is January, 1990.
- 1990 February - E.I.S. Scoping Report with Detailed Work Plan and Budget due.

REGIONAL OBLIGATIONS FIWA (federal fiscal year 10/1-9/30)

REGION	1985	1986	1987	1988	4 YEAR TOTAL	% OF TOTAL
CENTRAL	\$65,994,920	\$62,287,166	\$66,332,534	\$56,926,235	\$251,540,855	42.2%
NORTHERN	\$68,325,725	\$68,659,852	\$62,472,840	\$48,367,167	\$247,825,584	41.6%
SOUTHEAST	\$15,810,749	\$13,599,446	\$13,587,649	\$13,179,368	\$56,177,212	9.4%
MARINE HIGHWAY	\$6,134,715	\$2,756,150	\$5,314,384	\$10,291,143	\$24,496,392	4.1%
PLANNING (ALL REGIONS)	\$2,869,019	\$3,456,449	\$3,864,573	\$3,115,518	\$13,305,559	2.2%
STATEWIDE *	\$228,178	\$391,260	\$824,423	\$774,165	\$2,218,026	0.4%
TOTAL OBLIGATED	\$159,363,306	\$151,150,323	\$152,396,403	\$132,653,596	\$595,563,628	100.0%
ALLOCATION FOR 1989						
CENTRAL	\$60,000,000					
NORTHERN	\$50,200,000					
SOUTHEAST	\$12,500,000					
MARINE HIGHWAY	\$7,900,000					
PLANNING (ALL REGIONS)	\$3,200,000					
STATEWIDE *	\$1,000,000					
TOTAL PLANNED	\$134,800,000					
* PROJECTS SUCH AS BRIDGE INSPECTION and GEOREFERENCING MONUMENTATION WHICH APPLY TO ALL REGIONS.						

Alaska State Legislature



SENATOR JIM DUNCAN

P. O. Box V JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-3100

(907) 465-4766

MARCH 8, 1989

COMMITTEES:
FINANCE
VICE CHAIR —
HEALTH EDUCATION
& SOCIAL SERVICES
BUDGET & AUDIT
BANKING &
ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

MR. MARK HICKEY, COMMISSIONER
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND
PUBLIC FACILITIES
P.O. Box Z
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811


DEAR COMMISSIONER HICKEY:

AS YOU KNOW, LAST SEPTEMBER I ASKED THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (JEDC) TO EVALUATE ALL POSSIBLE OPTIONS WHICH WOULD PROVIDE IMPROVED ACCESS FOR JUNEAU AND REPORT TO ME ON THEIR FINDINGS. TODAY I HAVE RECEIVED THEIR REPORT ENTITLED "JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS" AND I PROVIDE YOU WITH A COPY FOR YOUR INFORMATION.

I UNDERSTAND THE MARINE HIGHWAYS' MASTER PLAN WILL BE FINALIZED ON APRIL 15, 1989. IN RESPONSE TO THE JEDC REPORT WHICH IDENTIFIED HIGH SPEED SHUTTLE FERRIES AS THE BEST ALTERNATIVE TO IMPROVED ACCESS IN THE NEAR FUTURE, I ASK THAT YOU INCLUDE FUNDING FOR HIGH SPEED SHUTTLE FERRIES FOR THE LYNN CANAL FROM JUNEAU TO HAINES AND SKAGWAY IN THE MARINE HIGHWAYS' MASTER PLAN WHICH IS PRESENTLY BEING DEVELOPED.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION OF THIS REQUEST.

SINCERELY,



JIM DUNCAN
SENATOR

ATTACHMENT

Alaska State Legislature



SENATOR JIM DUNCAN

P. O. Box V JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-3100
(907) 465-4766

COMMITTEES:
FINANCE
VICE CHAIR --
HEALTH EDUCATION
& SOCIAL SERVICES
BUDGET & AUDIT
BANKING &
ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

MARCH 3, 1989

MR. BOB RUBY
DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 21648
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802-1648

DEAR MR. RUBY:

AS DISCUSSED WITH YOU AND BARRY MOREHEAD AT OUR JANUARY 30, 1989 MEETING WITH COMMISSIONER HICKEY AND JON SCRIBNER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES (DOT/PF), I WOULD LIKE TO PROCEED WITH AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON ROAD ACCESS PROJECTS FOR JUNEAU.

AT THE MEETING YOU INDICATED THAT A STATE COMMITMENT TO THE PROJECT HAD TO BE SHOWN BEFORE FEDERAL DOLLARS COULD BE USED FOR EITHER AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT OR CONSTRUCTION. I WOULD LIKE TO GET CLARIFICATION OF EXACTLY WHAT YOU BELIEVE WOULD CONSTITUTE A SUFFICIENT STATE COMMITMENT TO GUARANTEE FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT. FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS BE SUFFICIENT TO SHOW SUCH A COMMITMENT?

1. A REPORT FROM THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (JEDC) DUE ON MARCH 8 WILL PROVIDE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO WHICH JUNEAU ACCESS OPTIONS SHOULD BE PURSUED FURTHER, EITHER FOR CONSTRUCTION FUNDING OR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS.
2. INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO APPROPRIATE THE MINIMUM OF \$100.0 MILLION IN FHWA FUNDS AND STATE MATCH NECESSARY TO CONSTRUCT SUCH A PROJECT. THIS WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS WHICH ARE IN ADDITION TO THE ANNUAL STATE APPORTIONMENT FROM THE FHWA, WITHOUT A PREVIOUS COMMITMENT TO BUILD THE PROJECT NOR AN E.I.S. FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES, AND WITHOUT A COMMITMENT FROM THE FHWA THAT SUCH ADDITIONAL FUNDS, UNALLOCATED TO ANOTHER STATE, ARE AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION TO OUR PROJECT.


MR. BOB RUBY
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
MARCH 3, 1989
PAGE 2

3. DEVELOPMENT OF A MASTER PLAN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES WHICH PRIORITIZES MAJOR PROJECTS STATEWIDE AND PROVIDES A LONG TERM MEANS OF FUNDING THE PROJECTS WHICH ARE FOUND TO BE THE HIGHEST PRIORITIES. THE FUNDING MECHANISM WOULD POSSIBLY BE AN ANNUAL PERCENTAGE OF THE EXISTING STATE ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUNDS. ASSUMING THAT A JUNEAU ACCESS PROJECT RISES TO THE TOP OF THE DEPARTMENT'S STATEWIDE PRIORITIZATION, WOULD THE FHWA THEN PARTICIPATE IN THE PROJECT?

ANOTHER POINT UPON WHICH I WOULD LIKE CLARIFICATION IS, IF I WERE TO APPROPRIATE STATE GENERAL FUNDS TO CONDUCT A FORMAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ON THE OPTIONS IDENTIFIED BY THE JEDC AND ONE OF THE PROJECTS IN THE E.I.S. IS LATER SLATED FOR CONSTRUCTION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES, WOULD THE FHWA CONSIDER REIMBURSING THE STATE FOR THOSE COSTS AT A LATER DATE?

YOUR IMMEDIATE RESPONSE TO THIS INQUIRY WILL BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

SINCERELY,



JIM DUNCAN
SENATOR

887



U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

Alaska Division

P.O. Box 21648
Juneau, Alaska 99802-1648

March 6, 1989

HDA-AK
F-093

The Honorable Jim Duncan
Alaska State Senate
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Duncan:

Your March 3 letter requested clarification of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirement for a State commitment adequate to allow Federal-aid highway funds to be expended on current proposals to extend the highway system from Juneau to a connecting road system.

It is FHWA policy that Federal-aid highway funds for preliminary engineering work, such as environment, location, or design studies, should not be authorized without a reasonable assurance that construction will proceed within five years following the initial authorization. The primary purpose of this policy is to assure the limited amount of available federal funding will not be reduced by financing studies that do not result in the timely construction of highway projects. In accordance with this policy, we have indicated that before we could authorize Federal-aid highway funds for preparation of an environmental impact study or any other engineering studies on any of the Juneau access options, we need a State commitment that funds are available for construction.

The normal procedures for this funding commitment would be inclusion of a significant construction project in the Alaska DOT&PF's Six-Year Plan. For a system expansion of this magnitude a normal scheduling plan would be to authorize for year one and two, engineering funds for preparation of an environmental impact statement for the entire route. For year three, authorize funds for design of a segment of the approved route. For year four, authorize funds for acquisition of right-of-way for the first segment. For year five, authorize funds for preparation of contract documents. For year six, authorize construction of the first segment. Subsequent years would have similar funding authorizations for other segments until the entire route had been constructed. This schedule is only an example of one of several possibilities for an acceptable timeframe for funding commitments.

March 6, 1989

Your letter also presented three specific actions for comment.

In example No. 1, a report recommending development of an EIS or pursuit of construction funding can not be considered a satisfactory commitment for Federal-aid highway program purposes.


In example No. 2, legislation to appropriate funds in excess of those available to the State from FHWA can not be considered a satisfactory commitment for Federal-aid highway program purposes. This example also mentions additional unallocated funds received from other states. Additional funds are not received from other states. The annual redistribution is obligation authority and does not provide additional funds. To clarify, each year the states are apportioned more funds than they are allowed to spend. The spending limit is called obligation authority. In this fiscal year, Alaska was apportioned approximately \$157 million. The obligation limit for spending was set at approximately \$142 million. In August, this spending limit may be increased if other states have not spent up to their obligation ceiling. Historically, Alaska has received \$6 to \$8 million of additional obligation authority. However, the total funds available to the State will remain at the \$157 million limit.

Example No. 3 addresses our involvement in the statewide prioritization process for major projects. Each State can determine project priorities by whatever method they deem rational. FHWA will accept any major project selected by the State if it is included in the Six-Year Plan.

Your final clarification concerns Federal-aid highway program reimbursement for work done prior to federal authorization. For instance, development of the environmental impact statement with State funds and a later request for reimbursement during construction. The Federal-aid highway program regulations are very strict that any work done prior to the authorization date for Federal-aid fund participation is not eligible for reimbursement.

If any of these responses require further clarification, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,



Robert E. Ruby
Division Administrator

Alaska State Legislature



SENATOR JIM DUNCAN

P.O. Box V JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-3100
(907) 465-4766

COMMITTEES:
FINANCE
VICE CHAIR —
HEALTH EDUCATION
& SOCIAL SERVICES
BUDGET & AUDIT
BANKING &
ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT

MARCH 8, 1989

THE HONORABLE STEVE COWPER, GOVERNOR
STATE OF ALASKA
POST OFFICE BOX A
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-0101

DEAR GOVERNOR COWPER:

IN SEPTEMBER OF 1988 I ASKED THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL (JEDC) TO EVALUATE ALL POSSIBLE OPTIONS WHICH WOULD PROVIDE IMPROVED ACCESS FOR JUNEAU AND REPORT TO ME ON THEIR FINDINGS. TODAY I HAVE RECEIVED THEIR REPORT ENTITLED "JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS" AND I PROVIDE YOU WITH A COPY FOR YOUR INFORMATION.

RECOMMENDATION IV, ON PAGE 16 OF THE JEDC REPORT, STATES;

"THE STATE OF ALASKA, THROUGH THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR, SHOULD INITIATE IMMEDIATE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CANADIAN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING DEMAND THRESHOLDS AND THE PROTOCOL FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF JOINT ROAD PROJECTS."

THIS RECOMMENDATION IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE TAKU RIVER CORRIDOR WHICH IS ONE OF THE TWO HARD LINK PROJECTS IDENTIFIED IN THE JEDC REPORT AS BEING WORTHY OF FURTHER EVALUATION. I WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR STAFF INVOLVEMENT IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT CONCERNING THE POSSIBILITY OF A JOINTLY FUNDED PROJECT UP THE TAKU RIVER CORRIDOR.

YOUR FAVORABLE RESPONSE TO THIS REQUEST WILL BE APPRECIATED. I WILL BE HAPPY TO DISCUSS THIS MATTER WITH YOU AT YOUR CONVENIENCE.

SINCERELY,

JIM DUNCAN
SENATOR

ATTACHMENT

DISTRICT C



3CR25

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

March 20, 1989

The Honorable Jim Duncan
Alaska State Senator
P.O. Box V
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Jim,

Thanks for the copy of the Juneau Economic Development Council's report on "Juneau Road Access Improvements." I'll share it with both Mark Hickey and Ron Clarke. We'll examine the report's recommendations with an eye toward discussions with Canadian officials. Commissioner Hickey will contact you if he needs further information. We'll be in touch after we've looked through the report.

Sincerely,

Steve Cowper
Governor

cc: Commissioner Mark S. Hickey
Department of Transportation
and Public Facilities

Ronald G. Clarke
Special Staff Assistant
to the Governor

1
0
1



Alaska State Legislature

SENATOR JIM DUNCAN

P. O. BOX V JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811

(907) 465-4766

COMMITTEES:
FINANCE
RESOURCES
BUDGET AND AUDIT

SEPTEMBER 26, 1988

MR. JAMES KOHLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
POST OFFICE BOX 1227
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99802

DEAR MR. KOHLER:

AS YOU ARE AWARE, IMPROVING ACCESS TO JUNEAU IS AN ISSUE UNDER CONTINUING DISCUSSION AND DEBATE IN THIS COMMUNITY.

IT APPEARS THAT THERE ARE VARIOUS INTEREST GROUPS IN FAVOR OF A TAKU ROUTE, FAST FERRIES OR A ROAD LINK NORTH TO HAINES OR SKAGWAY. I FEEL IT IS IMPORTANT FOR SOME GROUP TO TAKE THE LEAD IN PUTTING TOGETHER A TASK FORCE TO EVALUATE THE THREE ALTERNATIVES TO SEE IF THERE IS SUFFICIENT INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON EACH ROUTE TO MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION. IF INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE ON ANY OF THE POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS, I WILL MOVE FORWARD NEXT SESSION TO APPROPRIATE THE FUNDS NECESSARY TO GATHER COMPLETE INFORMATION ON EACH ALTERNATIVE.

I FEEL THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL IS THE APPROPRIATE ORGANIZATION TO PULL TOGETHER THE VARIOUS PROPOSALS INTO A COHESIVE COMMUNITY APPROACH TO IMPROVED ACCESS FOR JUNEAU. THE ISSUE CONTINUES TO BE TOO POLITICAL AND I DO NOT THINK IT CAN BE RESOLVED IN THE POLITICAL ARENA. IT IS TIME TO LOOK AT THE OPTIONS MORE OBJECTIVELY.

I PROPOSE THAT THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL COORDINATE SUCH AN EFFORT AND PRESENT TO MY OFFICE A RATIONAL AND FEASIBLE PROPOSAL FOR ADDRESSING THE ACCESS PROBLEM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

I AM WILLING TO ASSIST YOU AND THE COUNCIL IN ANY WAY THAT I CAN. IF I CAN PROVIDE INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE PLEASE DO NOT HESITATE TO CONTACT ME.

SINCERELY,

JIM DUNCAN
SENATOR

cc: Greg O'Clary

JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

1907 463-3662

P.O. Box 21227 • 1107 West 8th St.

Juneau, Alaska 99802

**MEMBERS**

Greg O'Claray, Chairperson
Deborah Haley, Vice-Chairperson

William Brock, Treasurer
Patrick Anderson
William M. Howe

Peter Hildre
Theodore R. Merrell

CIB REPRESENTATIVES
Mayor Ernest E. Polley
Kevin Ruchie

September 28, 1988

Senator Jim Duncan
State Capitol Bldg.
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Duncan:

The Juneau Economic Development Council met this afternoon and took up your request to organize and lead a community task force effort focusing on improved transportation links between Juneau and Canada as part of its regular business.

The JEDC unanimously passed a motion accepting your challenging task. However, the Council felt it was necessary to express one qualification in its acceptance. The JEDC is simply not prepared to invest more than a very limited amount of its financial resources in the execution of this work effort. As a result, the Council may have to report back to you early with a summary of existing information and an outline of additional data requirements that will need to be met to reach any conclusions or recommendations.

With the qualification expressed and understood the JEDC welcomes the opportunity to assist the community focus its energies on a specific project.

Council members who will take a lead role in the execution of this effort are Greg O'Claray and Peter Hildre. I recommend that Greg, Peter and myself meet with you and your staff in the near future, at your convenience, to articulate consensus on expectations, process and schedule.

The entire Council looks forward to working with you on this task.

Sincerely,

James M. Kohler
Executive Director

Alaska State Legislature

SCR 25

SENATOR JIM DUNCAN

P. O. BOX V JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811

(907) 465-4766

COMMITTEES:
FINANCE
RESOURCES
BUDGET AND AUDIT

August 5, 1987

Honorable Ted Stevens
United States Senate
522 Hart Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Stevens:

The purpose of this letter is to ask you to support a project I believe is crucial to the economic vitality of Alaska's capital city, a Road Link North.

For years the possibility of a road/ferry link to Haines from Juneau has been discussed, and funding has been made available for "feasibility studies" on several occasions.

I believe it is time to quit talking about the Road Link North and build it. The Juneau Chamber of Commerce is highly supportive of the project and has economic analyses (copy attached) which favor construction of a road link to Skagway and on to Haines, rather than a road/ferry link to Haines then on to Skagway. The East side road-only route is estimated at \$365.0 million in construction cost, while a road with a bridge across Lynn Canal near Haines would cost around \$440.0 million.

A project of this magnitude will take a major long-term commitment of capital funds. I inserted \$100,000 in this year's capital budget to initiate work on the environmental and economic feasibility of constructing the project. Our next hurdle is to obtain sufficient federal funding to proceed into the design and construction phases of the project. Since the Federal Highway Administration funds available to Alaska annually amount to under \$150.0 million, and the Southeast region of the state receives less than \$15.0 million of that, or 10%, it seems likely we would need to go outside the normal federal highway allocation for funding. A phased construction seems to be the most reasonable approach, with an initial \$100.0 million commitment and around \$15.0 million annually thereafter for construction.


Honorable Frank Murkowski
August 5, 1987
Page 2

I would like your thoughts on the possibility of the Juneau Road Link North project being designated a "Demonstration" or "Pilot" project. I understand "Demonstration" projects of similar magnitude were funded in last year's FHWA budget.

This proposal provides the opportunity to replace an extremely expensive to operate ferry system with a relatively inexpensive to operate and maintain roadway. This tradeoff of cost is unique among new road project proposals and can be economically justified in the long term on this basis alone. In fact, the high capital roadway costs needed up front have made it difficult to begin this effort.

Please let me hear from you with any funding ideas for this project.

Sincerely,



Jim Duncan
Senator

Attachment

JOHN C. STENNIS, MISSISSIPPI CHAIRMAN

ROBERT C. BYRD, WEST VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM PROXMIRE, WISCONSIN
 DANIEL K. INOUE, HAWAII
 ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
 LAWTON CHILES, FLORIDA
 J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, LOUISIANA
 QUENTIN N. BURDICK, NORTH DAKOTA
 PATRICK J. LEAHY, VERMONT
 JIM SASSER, TENNESSEE
 DOMINIC D'ONOFIO, ARIZONA
 DALE BUMPERS, ARKANSAS
 FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, NEW JERSEY
 TOM HARRIS, IOWA
 BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
 HARRY REID, NEVADA

MARK O. HATFIELD, OREGON
 TED STEVENS, ALASKA
 LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., CONNECTICUT
 JAMES A. MCCLURE, IDAHO
 JAKE GARN, UTAH
 THAD COCHRAN, MISSISSIPPI
 ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR., WISCONSIN
 ALFONSE N. D'AMATO, NEW YORK
 WARREN RUOMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE
 ARLEN SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
 PETE V. DOMENICI, NEW MEXICO
 CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, IOWA
 DON NICKLES, OKLAHOMA

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
 WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6025

FRANCIS J. SULLIVAN, STAFF DIRECTOR
 J. KEITH KENNEDY, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

November 5, 1987

The Honorable Jim Duncan
 Alaska State Legislature
 P.O. Box V
 Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Jim:


Thank you for your letter concerning a road link from Juneau to Haines. Unfortunately, funding is simply not available for initiation of a \$300-400 million highway project.

The State Government is the final arbiter of highway projects in the State. I suggest you contact the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to explore what commitment they are prepared to make of their allocation of Highway funds toward this project. In the alternative, Alaska's share of the demonstration project funds which were contained in the Highway Bill have not yet been committed. In the Transportation Appropriations Bill, I included language that would allow the State of Alaska to use those funds for non-traditional modes of transportation.

Jim, I appreciate your interest in this project, and I'm sorry I can't be of more help.

With best wishes,

Cordially,



TED STEVENS

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI
ALASKA

COMMITTEES:
VETERANS' AFFAIRS (RANKING MEMBER)
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
FOREIGN RELATIONS
INDIAN AFFAIRS
INTELLIGENCE

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510
(202) 224-8685

September 8, 1987

SCR 25

ANCHORAGE
U.S. FEDERAL BUILDING
201 C STREET, BOX 1 99513
(907) 271-3735

FAIRBANKS
U.S. FEDERAL BUILDING
101 12TH AVENUE, BOX 7 99701
(907) 456-0233

JUNEAU
U.S. FEDERAL BUILDING
BOX 1647 99902
(907) 586-7400

The Honorable Jim Duncan
P.O. Box 020690
Juneau, Alaska 99802

Dear Jim:


Thank you for your letter which included a copy of the Lynn Canal Transportation Plan. I concur with you in your belief that a road connection to Juneau would be of immense benefit, and congratulate you on your efforts to get the project rolling with funding for environmental and economic feasibility studies.

Your suggestion that additional funding might be made available through the Federal government by means of a Highway Demonstration Project is a creative one and deserves serious thought. Although I am not sanguine about the possibility in the short term, it may be that the results of your studies would provide the information needed to convince others that funds should be made available.

As you know, the highway reauthorization bill passed earlier this year was for a period of five years, and it may be some time before another appropriate vehicle comes along. However, I will be happy to work with you on the strategy for gaining funding at that time.

On the positive side, it is worth noting the increasing support in Congress for taking the highway trust fund "off-budget," which would allow expenditures to be increased. If legislation on this matter is indeed approved, it could measurably improve our chance to gain funding.

Sincerely,



Frank H. Murkowski
United States Senator



U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

Alaska Division

P.O. Box 21648
Juneau, Alaska 99802-1648

March 17, 1988

HDA-AK
734.1

RECEIVED MAR 22 1988

Jon Scribner, Regional Director
Southeast Region, Alaska DOT&PF
Juneau, Alaska

Dear Mr. Scribner:

Your January 26, 1988 letter asked for an indication of support to fund an additional study of the Lynn Canal Corridor. Our review indicates the initial two phases of the proposed study seems to be adequately covered in your recently completed Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan. Therefore, we could not support a duplicate study. Phase III is the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for a highway connection between Juneau, Haines and Skagway. Providing you can furnish documentation of Legislative and AKDOT&PF Headquarter's intent to advance this route to construct, we could support this phase.

Should you wish to pursue this part of your proposal, we would estimate the cost of this work to be \$600,000 which is considerably in excess of the funds authorized last year by the Legislature.

Sincerely yours,

Barry F. Morehead
Division Administrator

cc: Mark Hickey, Commissioner

RECEIVED MAR 18 1988



RECEIVED JAN 31 1989

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

January 24, 1989

The Honorable Senator Jim Duncan
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Senator Duncan:

The members of the Juneau Assembly have asked me to write you regarding Senate Bill 125, "An Act Making a Special Appropriation for Construction of Roads and for Construction of Vessels and Ferry Terminals of the Alaska Marine Highway System for the Lynn Canal Highway Project." We share your concern about this bill.

While we appreciate and agree with the spirit behind SB 125, i.e., to increase the accessibility of Juneau, it seems reasonable to us to determine the best short and long term solutions for increasing access before seeking funds for construction.

The Assembly is on record as endorsing the effort you have requested of the Juneau Economic Development Council to determine the most feasible route. We are closely following the JEDC effort and believe it is a rational process that will make obtaining funding a more realistic goal.

We appreciate your efforts and look forward to continuing to work with you on this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce M. Botelho". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Bruce M. Botelho
Mayor

BMB:smo

Juneau Branch
Alaska Miners Association

Box 21684
Juneau, Alaska 99802

January 27, 1989

Mr. Curt McVee
Executive Director
Alaska Miners Assn.

Dear Curt,

The Juneau Branch Directors took two actions this morning in a Juneau Board Meeting.

① We passed unanimously, a proposed letter from Neil MacKinnon Chapter chairman to Steven Ambrose of the U.S. Forest Service protesting the construction of another hikers-recreationists cabin under the leadership of the Taku Conservation Society.


We also took action on the proposed Juneau - Haines Road. Motion by John Barnett, second by Lance Miller to pass the following statement:

② While the Juneau Branch of the Alaska Miners Association favors the concept of enhanced access to the State Capitol, it chooses at this time not to endorse any particular plan as the Branch feels the issue merits further study.

Directors and Branch officers in favor: Barnett, Bracken, Clough, Crafford, Miller, MacKinnon, Henkins, Deagen. Those opposed: none. Branch Directors absent: Denton, Kirkham, Tangen and Wanamaker.

A CONFERENCE JUNEAU planning session was also held, excellent progress is being made on all aspects.

Sincerely,


James R. Deagen
Secretary/Treasurer

JUNEAU ACCESS E.I.S.

SCOPING HEARING

AGENDA

- I. Introduction
- II. The E.I.S. Process and Public Involvement
- III. Purpose and Need
- IV. The Alternatives
- V. Issues
- VI. Intermission
- VII. Public Comments
3 minutes per speaker, please fill
out card at door

The E.I.S. Process and Public Involvement

The E.I.S. - a decision forcing document

- Scoping - Determine issues, concerns, viable alternatives.
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Compares alternatives and their impacts and benefits for public comment.
- Public Hearing - Opportunity to make comment into the formal record and talk to staff about the project.
- Final Environmental Impact Statement - Final Concise documentation and comparison of alternatives. Last chance for public comment.
- Record of Decision - Documentation of the alternative decided upon and why.

For further comment and/or information:

Mike McKinnon, Regional Environmental Coordinator
Dept. of Transportation and Public Facilities
P.O. Box 021467
Juneau, AK 99802-1467

Telephone: (907) 364-4256

PURPOSE AND NEED

PROBLEM:

INCONVENIENT ACCESS TO JUNEAU

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF IMPROVED ACCESS:

- o Improve Convenience of Access to Continental road system
- o Improve Access to State Capital
- o Improve Access from Haines/Skagway or Atlin, B.C. to Juneau
- o Increase Tourist traffic
- o Increase economic activity in Juneau by making Juneau the northern terminus of AMHS
- o Improve Access to Mining Districts
- o Lower travel costs to motorists
- o Increase Electrical Intertie opportunities

ALTERNATIVES

1. LYNN CANAL EAST
2. LYNN CANAL WEST
3. TAKU RIVER - ATLIN, B.C.
4. FERRY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
5. NO ACTION
6. OTHERS

ISSUES

Fish and Wildlife Impacts

Subsistence

Water Quality

Wetlands

Visual Impacts

Historical and Archaeological Impacts

Social

Economic

Cost/Construction Schedule

Induced Traffic

Existing Transportation Systems

MAJOR STUDIES

Fish and Wildlife Assessment

Visual Assessment

Socioeconomic Study

Induced Traffic/Tourism Study

Historical and Archaeological Study

Wetlands Delineation/Functional Analysis

Geotechnical/Soils/Geophysical Hazards

Bridges, Tunnels, Avalanche Sheds Costs and Feasibility

JUNEAU ACCESS EIS
WORK PLAN

PHASE I - \$100,000

EIS Scoping Process

September 1989 Defining the issues.

public meetings (Juneau, Haines, Skagway & Whitehorse).
resource agency meetings
federal register notice

October 1989 develop schedule, budget, alternatives and scope of
studies. Report back to the public meetings

October 1989 Reconnaissance Studies/Data Base Development

December 1989 Scoping Public Hearings

January 1990 literature/study review
historic resources survey
Aerial photography No. 1
economic impact studies

February 1990 Scoping Report with Detailed EIS Work Plan & Budget

PHASE II - (assumes additional funding based on Scoping Report)

Draft EIS

July 1990 Field Season - Primary Studies

fish and wildlife resources
soils/geophysical hazards
bridge/tunnel cost and feasibility
alignment analysis
hydrology/water quality

September 1990 Draft EIS

write document
compilation of studies and analysis
select preferred alternative
FHWA review and approval

March 1991 Draft EIS Public Review

document distribution
public meetings
Public Hearing

PHASE III - (additional funding required)

Final EIS

July 1991	Final EIS Preparation/Field Season based on preferred alternative and public/agency comments
November 1991	Final EIS Public Review document distribution public meetings
January 1992	Final EIS - FHWA Review & Approval
July 1992	FHWA Approval

STATE OF ALASKA
1989 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL VERSION: CSSCR 25 (Trsp)
PUBLISH DATE: 4/26/89

FISCAL NOTE

REQUEST:

Revision Date: _____
Title: Expansion of Transportation
System
Sponsor: Duncan
Requestor: _____

Agency Affected: DOT&PF
BRU: _____
Components: _____

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING						

CAPITAL		75.0				
---------	--	------	--	--	--	--

REVENUE						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND		75.0				
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
TOTAL						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS : (Attach a separate page if necessary)

SEE ATTACHED

Prepared by: R. T. Meker, Chief of Planning

Phone: 789-6264

Division: Southeast Region, DOT&PF

Date: 4-26-89

Approved by Commissioner: *M. L. H.*

Date: 4/26/89

Agency: _____

Distribution (by preparer) :

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

ANALYSIS - C. SCR 25 (Trsp)

Committee Substitute for Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 25 (CSSCR 25) relates to the need for a plan for expansion of the Alaska transportation system.

CSSCR 25 requests the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) to 1) develop a plan for identifying and selecting improvements; 2) establish a means to fund projects; and 3) report to the Legislature in 1990 on the plan and in 1991 with a prioritized list of projects.

The requested plan and list of projects is proposed to be developed through a consultant contract. However, DOT & PF would prefer to reserve the option to complete the task in-house in the event acceptable consultant proposals cannot be obtained. This would require the equivalent of one PFT professional planner, working over a one year period.

DOT&PF supports the resolution.

STATE OF ALASKA
1989 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL VERSION: SCR 25
 PUBLISH DATE: 4/26/89

FISCAL NOTE

Revision Date: 3/9/89
 Title: Expansion of Transportation System

Agency Affected: DOT&PF
 BRU:

Sponsor: Duncan
 Requestor: Senate Transportation

Components:

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

OPERATING	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
PERSONAL SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRAVEL	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONTRACTURAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPLIES	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAND & STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRANTS, CLAIMS	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPERATING	0	0	0	0	0	0

CAPITAL	0	75.0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	------	---	---	---	---

REVENUE	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---

FUNDING: (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

GENERAL FUND	0	75.0	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER*	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

See attached

Prepared by: R.T. Meketa, Chief of Planning
 Division: Southeast Region, DOT/PF

Phone: 789-6264

Date: 4/7/89

Approved by Commissioner: Mark S. Hickey *MSH*
 Agency: Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

Date: 4/10/89

Distribution (by preparer):

Legislative Finance
 Legislative Sponsor
 Requestor
 Office of Management and Budget
 Impacted Agency(ies)

ANALYSIS - SCR 25

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 25 (SCR 25) relates to the need for a plan for expansion of and major improvements to the Alaska transportation system.

SCR 25 requests the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) to 1) develop a plan for identifying and selecting improvements; 2) establish a means to fund projects; and 3) report to the Legislature in 1990 on the plan and in 1991 with a prioritized list of projects.

The requested plan and list of projects is proposed to be developed through a consultant contract. However, DOT & PF would prefer to reserve the option to complete the task in-house in the event acceptable consultant proposals cannot be obtained. This would require the equivalent of one PFT professional planner, working over a one year period.

DOT&PF supports the resolution.


THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT HAS
NOT BEEN FILMED BUT IS
AVAILABLE IN THE ORIGINAL
FILE

JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Prepared for:

Senator James Duncan

Prepared by:



March 8, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I:	PURPOSE OF STUDY	1
SECTION II:	METHODOLOGY	
	Access Options	2
	Construction Cost Estimates	3
	Other Considerations	4
SECTION III:	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	9
SECTION IV:	CONCLUSIONS	12
SECTION V:	RECOMMENDATIONS	15
SECTION VI:	ACCESS OPTION REVIEW	
	Option A: Taku River	17
	Option B: Juneau-Haines East	20
	Option C: Juneau-Haines-Skagway	23
	Option D: Juneau-Haines West	25
	Option E: Existing Ferry System	27
	Option F: High Speed Shuttle Ferry	28

TABLES AND FIGURES

MAP:	ACCESS OPTIONS	8
TABLE I:	CONSTRUCTION/O&M COSTS	Following 11
TABLE II:	OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	Following 11

SECTION I

PURPOSE OF REPORT

In late September 1988, Juneau Senator James Duncan requested the assistance of the Juneau Economic Development Council in investigating the pursuit of improved road access to and from Juneau. Specifically, he requested the JEDC to attempt two tasks:

- o First, review recommended road development options proposed and studied to date and determine which is the most timely and cost effective to pursue from this point forward; and
- o Second, determine if there is any consensus within the community and region for that or any other road development option.

Senator Duncan indicated in his request that the JEDC study effort would have to proceed without monetary support. He further indicated that the study's findings and recommendations would be needed by his office no later than early March 1989 to allow him to propose and advance through the state legislature the allocation of resources necessary to initiate a sustained effort aimed at implementing the recommendations advanced by this report.

The study effort culminating in this report required the expenditure of approximately \$3,000 of JEDC funds in out-of-pocket expenses. In addition, the community of local civil engineers contributed the equivalent of approximately \$25,000 - \$30,000 of billable professional services to this effort.

SECTION II

METHODOLOGY

Access Options

Since 1921 a wide range of options have been proposed and studied for the development of improved road access to and from Juneau (see appendix A). While many were similar in scope or configuration, differences existed in the form of specific variations of routing, construction parameters and design.

To create some manageable parameters to this study effort, six options were identified around which the many variations could be identified. These options, however, were postulated as "generic" and the study fully recognizes that variations exist.

This generic approach made it possible to develop cost estimates whose value rested as much in their comparative value as providing target estimates around which specific design and construction could be initiated. The ability to compare one option to another was a critical demand of this study's design from the beginning. In spite of significant resources spent on various investigations in the past, this ability to reasonably compare one option to another based on a single set of standards and design parameters did not exist at the outset of this study.

The six generic access options identified for purposes of executing a comparative review and analysis are:

A. Taku River:

This option would require road construction to begin at road's end south of Juneau and proceed up the Taku River Valley, connecting to the existing road system in British Columbia south of the community of Atlin.

B. Juneau-Haines East:

This option would require road construction to begin at road's end just south of Berner's Bay and proceed northward along the Lynn Canal shoreline to a point almost due east of Haines. A shuttle ferry would link the road to Haines and a second shuttle would link Haines with Skagway.

C. Juneau-Haines-Skagway:

This option would differ from Option B by replacing the Haines/Skagway ferry link with a hard surface road.

D. Juneau-Haines West:

This option would require shuttle ferry service east-west across Lynn Canal from the current road's end to a point in the vicinity of William Henry Bay. Road surface would be constructed northward along the west shoreline of Lynn Canal with bridging to the existing road system on the Chilkat Peninsula, connecting at a point just north of the Haines airport. A shuttle ferry would provide access between Haines and Skagway.

E. Ferry Service:

This option would simply continue the existing ferry service between Juneau, Haines and Skagway in its present form. This option provides a baseline scenario against which to compare the other options studied.

F. High Speed Shuttle Ferry:

This last option would provide high speed shuttle ferry service between Juneau, Haines and Skagway utilizing two high speed vessels each capable of providing 2-3 round-trips per day within a 16-18 hour period. While this option is defined here as departing from a point near current road's end on the east side of Lynn Canal north of Juneau, the same scenario is possible operating out of the existing Auke Bay Ferry Terminal. A point of departure from the northern end of the existing road system only becomes critical when running time saved by the shorter distance is sufficient to provide increased frequency within the proposed 16-18 hour time period.

Construction Cost Estimates

Construction cost estimates were calculated based on the following base assumption.

First, Federal Secondary Highway standards were adopted for base design.

Second, a project study period of 25 years was established for purposes of calculating operation and maintenance costs for each option.

Third, revenues from shuttle and mainline ferry service were estimated across the same 25 year project study period and credited against ferry system operation and maintenance expenses in calculating total project costs.

All cost estimates were generated in terms of 1989 dollars. A 10% rate of return was built into the calculations across the 25 year project study period to keep cost estimates tied to 1989 dollar values.

Design and engineering services and contract administration costs were calculated at 10% and 12% respectively. Contract administration costs are normally calculated at a rate of 15%, however, given potential economy of scale savings, a reduced rate of 12% was used for calculations. In addition, a contingency factor of 5-10% was included in construction cost estimates. Normally, contingency, design services and contract administration are usually calculated at a combined rate of up to 40%. The combined rate of 30% used in this study effort represents minimum estimates.

Costs for the construction and maintenance of O&M facilities were included as project lengths were considered too excessive to service from existing facilities.

Customs facility costs were calculated for the Taku River option only, as they already exist on the road systems running north out of Haines and Skagway.

Avalanche shed costs were calculated based on the assumption that the respective options were to be kept open at all times.

Generating cost estimates for each of the proposed road options was a difficult task at best. The difficulty was compounded by the fact that several options did not have associated ground surveys and other field data normally available upon which to base detailed estimating. To offset some of this disadvantage, selected representatives from the volunteer engineering community who worked on this project, including a member of the JEDC board, visually surveyed the proposed routes by air. This reconnaissance provided significant verification for much of the judgement decisions made by the group during the course of their work.

Other Considerations

In addition to design, construction and operation and maintenance costs, other factors were evaluated across each option. These factors were assigned a value on a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 representing the most positive or highest benefit. These factors were then weighted to recognize that, in a comparative matrix, some were more significant than others. Maximum weighting was a multiplier of 30.

The only factor assigned a weighting value of 30 was that associated with environmental sensitivity. This factor could have been split into many more factors with a more specific focus as was done with the socio-economic

variables considered. To prevent socio-economic considerations from completely dominating this review of other considerations, environmental sensitivity was assigned a weighting factor which approximates the total weighting across the various socio-economic variables.

This study assumed that the significant environmental problems associated with each proposed road alternative could be mitigated. However, only a full EIS and design can verify that assumption.

For purposes of comparison, a final overall "relative factor" was calculated to compare the cumulative impact of these other factors from one option to the other. For purposes of establishing a baseline for comparison, the existing ferry system option was assigned an overall factor of 1. By dividing the total values of all factors considered for each option by the total generated for the existing ferry system option, the overall relative factor was determined.

Other factors considered include:

1. Environmental Sensitivity: (Weighted 30x)
A value of 5 (weighted 30x = 150) indicates minimum environmental sensitivity.
2. Geotechnical Complexities: (Weighted 3x)
A value of 5 (weighted 3x = 15) indicates minimum complexity in encountering weak/unstable/seismically-sensitive soils.
3. All-weather Reliability: (Weighted 5x)
A value of 5 (weighted 5x = 25) indicates minimal potential for route closures due to climatic conditions other than avalanches, e.g. high winds, heavy snowfall, icing, high water, etc.
4. Alternate Funding Potential: (Weighted 5x)
A value of 5 (weighted 5x = 25) indicates maximum potential for economic subsidy as a result of resource development or other funding, e.g. foreign participation, resource development such as mining/forest products/fisheries/tourism, and other one-time federal sources.
5. Regional Factors: (Weighted 5x)
A value of 5 (weighted 5x = 25) indicates maximum benefits enhancing the socio-economic and political integration of Juneau, Haines and Skagway.
6. Utility Joint Use Corridors: (Weighted 10x)
A value of 5 (weighted 10x = 50) indicates maximum potential use of the access option corridor for expansion of utilities, e.g. electrical distribution, pipelines, etc.
7. Travel/Distance Time Factor: (Weighted 10x)
A value of 5 (weighted 10x = 50) indicates

maximum benefits realized in reducing travel distance and travel time between major communities within the region and to other major highways serving the rest of the state, Canada and the lower 48 states.

8. Staged Construction Feasibility: (Weighted 10x)
A value of 5 (weighted 10x = 50) indicates maximum potential for realizing significant user benefits as a result of staged construction.
9. Induced Traffic: (Weighted 10x)
A value of 5 (weighted 10x = 50) indicates maximum potential for generating new and additional travel patterns to, from and within the region.
10. International Factors: (Weighted 3x)
A value of 5 (weighted 3x = 15) indicates maximum benefits to Juneau and the region enhancing the socio-economic and political relationships with Canada and, potentially, with Pacific Rim countries due to enhanced trade and visitation.
11. Socio-Economic Impact - Haines: (Weighted 5x)
A value of 5 (weighted 5x = 25) indicates maximum benefit to Haines socially and economically with the least amount of negative impacts.
12. Socio-Economic Impact - Skagway: (Weighted 5x)
A value of 5 (weighted 5x = 25) indicates maximum benefit to Skagway socially and economically with the least amount of negative impacts.
13. Socio-Economic Impact - Juneau: (Weighted 5x)
A value of 5 (weighted 5x = 25) indicates maximum benefit to Juneau socially and economically with the least amount of negative impacts.

The ratings assigned within each category for each option are subjective in nature. A more complete and objective approach would have necessitated a level of effort, at a minimum, normally expended for an environmental assessment. The approach adopted within this study is comparative in its structure. Ratings were assigned to delineate relative differences between options, thus, allowing a gross level of overall discrimination between them. The inherent limitations imposed by this comparative approach cannot be overemphasized.

A more complete iteration of the rationale driving the comparative ratings assigned for these "other considerations" can be found in Section VI of this report.

That section provides an option-by-option summary of both capital construction/O&M cost estimates and other factors considered.

Public input as well as specific interviews played a significant role in analyzing the comparative ratings assigned. This input process, however, was also limited by time and available resources.


As limited as this approach was in attempting to identify and consider non-construction/O&M cost estimates, the exercise was essential to satisfy the scope of this report. The most compelling reason for reviewing these other factors was that such considerations have rarely been included in previous studies, yet they shape construction decisions as strongly as construction cost estimates.

Given the generic description of each option adopted in this report, the reader is cautioned to review cost estimates as being more an expression of order of magnitude than detailed bidding cost estimates. This delineation of cost estimates to such an order of magnitude permits the general comparative analysis set out as an essential scoping demand of this study. However, actual cost estimates cannot be defended as falling within the +/- 10% range a full design could ascertain. Estimates most susceptible to falling outside of this range are those for facets of the proposed project other than actual road construction, e.g. tunnel construction, avalanche sheds, bridges, etc.

Lastly, construction cost estimates for road, bridges, avalanche sheds, tunnels, custom facilities, maintenance facilities and O&M were generated by Juneau-based civil engineers, currently or formerly employed in private practice or with the State of Alaska. Their time was donated to the study's effort.

Ferry system cost estimates were calculated by Alaska Marine Highway System staff.

Rating values assigned to each of the other considerations identified earlier in this section were made by JEDC staff after conducting public hearings in Juneau, Haines and Skagway and personal interviews with limited number of individuals and organizations. The Southeast Transportation Plan (1986) prepared for Alaska DOT/PF by Acres International Corporation was utilized for establishing comparative values across each option for specific variables, e.g. induced traffic and time/distance benefits. While the actual numbers proposed within this study are questionable due to insufficient data base and scoping, the values are useful in identifying comparative values across each option. Induced traffic study is a critical activity demanded in the next level of investigation of this overall project.



SECTION III

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Tables I and II provide in matrix form the summary of both sets of calculations and analyses generated by this study effort.

In reviewing capital construction/O&M costs and the consideration of other factors across the various options identified, several findings emerge:

1. When considering construction dollars alone, the least expensive option is associated with improving the marine transportation system in Lynn Canal by adding two high speed shuttle ferries to serve Juneau, Haines and Skagway.
2. Even when considering other factors (Table II), achieving greater access for Lynn Canal users ranks as high as road construction options for the Taku River Valley and the east side of Lynn Canal.
3. Initiation of high speed shuttle ferry service would provide the least amount of environmental disruption or impacts and the most benefits overall for the communities of Haines and Skagway. Juneau, too, will benefit significantly.
4. Road surface construction beyond Haines on either the east or west side becomes substantially more expensive and almost cost prohibitive.
5. Short of executing ground surveys, an Environmental Impact Statement and actual design needed to generate requests for construction bids within a range of +/- 10%, the Taku River, Juneau-Haines East and Juneau-Haines West are comparatively competitive. Of the two Lynn Canal options, the eastside route is lower in cost. The Taku River is especially competitive when considering that a significant portion of construction costs would likely have to be borne by the Canadian government.
6. More than 20% of the costs identified for the Taku River option are attributable to maintaining the existing ferry service in Lynn Canal.
7. Even operating the existing ferry system will cost almost as much as capitalizing and maintaining a high-speed shuttle ferry service within the same corridor.

8. While environmental sensitivity is a critical factor across all of the proposed road options, the westside option poses greater difficulty due to the shuttling across active fishing grounds and the particular sensitivity of eagle nesting and perching, especially along its northern reaches.
9. The westside option is also more vulnerable to the severe weather conditions in Lynn Canal because of the need to provide shuttle service across the Canal perpendicular to the prevailing winds and high sea conditions during storms.
10. Of the three competitive road options remaining after considering construction costs, the Taku River option and the eastside option along Lynn Canal as far north as the Chilkat Peninsula provide the best potential for shared corridor use by utilities.
11. Socio-economic impacts are the most beneficial for Juneau across all options and the least beneficial for Haines and Skagway with the Taku River option.

JEDC staff conducted a series of public hearings in Haines, Skagway and Juneau during February 1989 for the purpose of gaining input on public consensus for any of the proposed access options as well as for soliciting comments on the benefits and drawbacks of each option.

Except for the community of Skagway, there appears to be little consensus on which of the proposed options should be executed.

The Skagway City Council expressed during the public hearing conducted as part of a regular meeting of that body that they were on record opposing any road construction projects within the Lynn Canal. They expressed the concern that any such project would significantly weaken the economic foundation of the community. Public testimony at the same meeting reaffirmed this position in all cases.

The public hearing held in Haines drew approximately three dozen participants. The vast majority of those testifying took a similar position opposing any road construction up Lynn Canal. However, at a public meeting sponsored by the Haines Chamber of Commerce held almost two weeks later, approximately 30 individuals attended and the vast majority expressed their preference for road development up Lynn Canal but did not indicate a strong preference for either the east or west side.

The public demand for increased access to and from Juneau has little to do with the length of time it takes to travel from, for example, Juneau to Haines. Instead, demand is for the opportunity for greater frequency of travel and the most reasonable schedules possible.

Two public hearings held on consecutive nights in Juneau generated mixed preferences. The first hearing drew over two dozen participants with the majority expressing their desire for Lynn Canal road development. The second hearing drew similar numbers but testimony was fairly split between those supporting road construction and those preferring the maintenance or expansion of the existing ferry system. The second hearing offered more support for a Taku River option than the first hearing.

Individual comment, submitted by letter or by personal contact, was mixed but slightly favored no road construction.

The Juneau Branch of the Alaska Miners Association took a position at there January 27, 1989 meeting which was stated as follows:

"While the Juneau Branch of the Alaska Miners Association favors the concept of enhanced access to the State Capitol, it chooses at this time not to endorse any particular plan as the Branch feels the issue merits further study."

TABLE I
 JUNEAU ACCESS ROAD
 CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION / O & M
 25 YEAR PROJECT LIFE

ACCESS OPTION	\$MILLIONS														
	Road Const. (1)	Bridge Const. (2)	Av'l'chc Sheds (3)	O&M (1+2+3) (4)	Maint. Facil. (5)	Customs Facil. (6)	O&M (5+6) (7)	Ferry Term'ls (8)	Ferry Vessels (9)	O&M (8+9) (10)	Ferry Revenue (11)	PS&E @10% (12)	Cont'ct Admin. (13)	TOTALS W/O O&M (14)	TOTALS W/ O&M (15)
A) TAKU RIVER	109.6	20.5	3.0	5.0	2.5	4.0	1.0	0.0	29.5	72.4	-49.0	16.9	20.3	206.3	235.7
B) JUNEAU- HAINES EAST	78.0	12.7	15.8	5.4	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	18.6	75.1	-35.2	13.0	15.6	158.7	204.0
C) JUNEAU- SKAGWAY	230.0	28.8	32.0	8.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	4.7	30.1	-8.4	30.0	36.0	366.5	396.7
D) JUNEAU- HAINES WEST	84.8	26.2	8.0	5.4	2.5	0.0	0.0	3.6	17.5	74.6	-34.8	14.3	17.1	174.0	219.2
B) FERRY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.5	72.4	-49.0	0.0	0.0	29.5	52.9
F) FAST FRRRY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	26.4	90.0	-50.2	2.9	3.4	34.9	74.7

NOTES
GENERAL

- All figures represent 1989 dollars with 10% per annum dollar adjustment across 25 year project life.
- O&M costs assume full 12 month/year use.
- All cost categories (except PS&E and Admin) consider capital facilities only.
- Ferry revenue represents cash income, therefore, displayed as a negative figure to offset ferry costs.
- Contract Admin. estimated at 12% of all capital costs less O&M.
- Maintenance facilities included as distances along each road alternative considered too great to allow use of existing facilities.
- All ferry costs supplied by AMHS.

OPTION SPECIFIC

A. TAKU

- Construction costs represent the entire length of the project. Canadian road mileage is approx. 2x the length of US miles; but construction costs are heavier on the US side, approx. \$80 million US/\$50 million Canadian.
- Ferry costs are the same as maintaining the existing ferry system as this option would still demand a minimum of existing levels of service on Lynn Canal.

OPTION SPECIFIC CONT'D

B. JUNEAU-HAINES EAST

- Ferry vessel costs include two shuttle vessels, the first linking road's end to the southern point on the Chilkat Peninsula, the second linking Haines and Skagway.

C. JUNEAU-SKAGWAY

- Road construction costs are the same as Juneau-Haines East with additional costs estimated for road linking Haines and Skagway.
- Tunnel costs included in road construction estimates.
- Ferry costs include shuttle costs between east side and the Chilkat Peninsula.

D. JUNEAU-HAINES WEST

- Ferry vessel costs include two shuttles, the first linking existing road's end to the west side on Lynn Canal, the second linking Haines and Skagway.
- Ferry terminal costs represent additional terminal at existing road's end in vicinity of Echo Cove.

E. EXISTING FERRY

- Ferry vessel costs represent existing vessel rehab and reconstruction only with no new vessels.
- Costs estimated for existing levels of service.

F. HIGH SPEED SHUTTLE FERRY

- Ferry costs include new high speed shuttle vessels only.

TABLE II
JUNEAU ACCESS ROAD
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

ACCESS OPTION	Enviorn- mental Sensi- tivity 30x	Geo- tech Complex- ities 3x	All- Weather Reli- ability 5x	Alter- nate Funding Potent 5x	Region Factors 5x	Utility Joint Use Corridor 10x	Travel Distance Time Factor 10x	Staged Const. Stasib 10x	Induced Traffic 10x	Inter- national Factors 3x	Socio- Econ Impact Haines 5x	Socio- Econ Impact Skagway 5x	Socio- Econ Impact Juneau 5x	Total Values	Relative Factor
A) TAKU RIVER	60.0	9.0	20.0	25.0	15.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	25.0	319.0	1.2
B) JUNEAU- HAINES EAST	60.0	6.0	20.0	20.0	15.0	50.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	9.0	15.0	15.0	25.0	325.0	1.2
C) JUNEAU- SKAGWAY	60.0	6.0	15.0	20.0	15.0	60.0	50.0	30.0	50.0	15.0	20.0	20.0	25.0	376.0	1.4
D) JUNEAU- HAINES WEST	30.0	12.0	10.0	10.0	15.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	9.0	15.0	15.0	25.0	261.0	1.0
E) FERRY	150.0	15.0	25.0	5.0	15.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	6.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	266.0	1.0
F) FAST FERRY	120.0	15.0	20.0	5.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	9.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	309.0	1.2

NOTES

1. Rating scale of 1-5 with 5 representing least impact/
greatest benefit.
2. Ratings multiplied by weighting factor listed in
each column heading.
3. Relative factor calculated by dividing total value for
each option by total value calculated for ferry
option.

SECTION IV

CONCLUSIONS

The most cost effective and timely improvements to access between Juneau and the existing road network in Canada connecting the region to the rest of Alaska, Northwest Canada, and the lower 48 states can be achieved by enhancing the Alaska Marine Highway System. These improvements can be achieved by implementing a high speed shuttle ferry service augmented by mainline ferry service during peak demand periods, particularly the summer months.

The addition of the high speed shuttle ferry service would provide for higher frequency service and better scheduling of that service in Lynn Canal between Juneau, Haines and Skagway.

The implementation of high speed shuttle service can be initiated more quickly than any of the proposed road alternatives, thus generating greater benefits to more people sooner.

The development of a hard surface road north of Juneau would provide greater overall benefit to the region and provide a more stable and long-term improvement to the transportation and, concomitantly, to the socio-economic infrastructure of northern Southeast Alaska.

Road construction, however, is expensive and, while there is significant demand for its construction, that demand is divided across several alternatives.

The potential for the realization of this increased economic demand sufficient to justify moving a particular alternative to full design and construction, however, is already evident in the region. Mineral development on the east side of Lynn Canal is potentially just a few years from reality. Similar mineral development in northern British Columbia and the southern Yukon Territory is potentially as near.

The implementation of the U.S. Canada Free Trade Agreement is already beginning to lure increased northwest Canadian interest and participation in Pacific Rim trade. That trade demands greater access to deep water ports in northern Southeast Alaska and access to and between those ports. The U.S./Canada FTA is also generating growing interest and participation between U.S. and Canadian businesses within the region.

Even though the initial conclusion of this report is that the existing ferry system should be enhanced by adding high speed shuttle ferry service, this conclusion does not preclude the initiation of a sustained effort to advance the development and construction of improved road access to and from Juneau.

Three things are preventing road construction at this time. First, sufficient information to allow the selection of the best road alternative, i.e. up the east side of Lynn Canal with shuttle service to Haines and Skagway or up the Taku River Valley, will not be in hand until a full Environmental Impact Statement is executed across both scenarios.

Second, stronger economic demand is needed to convince some policymakers that the required appropriation is justified in terms of perceived and/or documented cost/benefit ratios. While this demand could materialize within the next few years, it is uncertain at this point in time.

Third, funding for new road construction is lacking statewide. Unless and until the state makes a commitment to the construction of new roads in an orderly and systematic way, local and regional economic opportunity will continue to be lost well into the 21st century.

Enhancing the existing ferry system with the addition of high speed shuttle ferries accomplishes three important goals. First, improved access with higher frequency and improved scheduling is realized as quickly as possible. Second, when economic demand matches the level of public demand to warrant expenditure of significant amounts of road construction funds, these high speed shuttle ferries can be reassigned to other legs on the AMHS which could benefit from higher frequency/better scheduled service.

Third, sufficient time is permitted to execute the necessary EIS and identify the preferred alternative for road construction as well as a funding source or sources to initiate road construction.

The initiation of a sustained effort to advance the development and construction of improved road access to and from Juneau requires the execution of several steps before actual design and construction can begin. A full Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared for the two options that emerge from this study as the most feasible for development: the east side of Lynn Canal between Juneau and Haines and the Taku River corridor.

This EIS effort demands the immediate allocation of resources to execute. However, even with prompt action, the effort will likely take two years due to the complexity of issues involved. Besides the traditional areas of investigation, the effort needs also to undertake a

thorough induced traffic demand study so that a clear cost/benefit comparison between the two options can be delineated.

Most importantly, a commitment to construct this and other new roads must be made by the State of Alaska and a plan identified for their funding. The most direct approach, and an idea not new to this report, would be to allocate up to 10% of the annual Aid to Federal Highway Funds received by the State of Alaska to a new road construction fund. While this would not amount to enough funds in any one year to undertake full construction of this or any other new road project, it would allow the funding of staged construction of priority projects. Staged construction results in full construction. Waiting for the identification of sufficient funds to construct a new road in its entirety almost guarantees no construction at all.

Lastly, discussions between the State of Alaska and the British Columbia and federal governments of Canada must be initiated immediately to define the thresholds of demand and funding participation necessary to execute joint new road construction. This is especially important in examining the Taku River option to allow a full comparative review with the east Lynn Canal corridor.

Major new road construction is a complicated and long-term commitment. If the State of Alaska waits until full demand is evident before initiating the initial steps necessary to realize a project (i.e. EIS, corridor identification, funding identification, Canadian participation, etc.) road construction is needlessly set back by several years. The resultant economic capture and socio-economic benefits are set back as well and some significant opportunities lost.

SECTION V

RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the following recommendations are advanced:

RECOMMENDATION I:

The State of Alaska, through the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, specifically the Alaska Marine Highway System, should initiate the identification and allocation of resources to introduce high speed shuttle ferry service in Lynn Canal between Juneau, Haines and Skagway.

The actual implementation of this improved system should begin as soon as possible.

RECOMMENDATION II:

The State of Alaska should go on record with the commitment to improve hard surface access to and from Juneau, pending the results of detailed EIS and other investigations and negotiations with Canadian British Columbia and federal governments, either up the east side of Lynn Canal as far north as Haines or up the Taku River Valley.

This commitment should be to construct one of the two alternatives recommended in this report, thereby advancing the total process to its next logical step. Any action short of this will result in continued non-focused debate that will not lead to project delineation and construction.

This commitment will allow the use of federal matching funds to execute the required EIS and cost benefit analyses necessary to select the best of the two proposed alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION III:

The State of Alaska, through the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, should allocate sufficient resources and execute a full Environmental Impact Statement of the two road access alternatives recommended in this report (Recommendation II).

This EIS effort should be initiated in FY90.

This EIS effort should include a cost benefit analysis of the two alternatives that includes a detailed comparison

of induced traffic generated by the two proposed alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION IV:

The State of Alaska, through the Office of the Governor, should initiate immediate discussions with the Canadian British Columbia and federal governments for the purpose of establishing demand thresholds and the protocol for the construction of joint road projects.

RECOMMENDATION V:

The State of Alaska should initiate a new road construction fund by allocating up to 10% of annual federal aid to highways appropriations to the State of Alaska for that purpose.

SECTION VI

ACCESS OPTION REVIEW

This section presents a review of each of the six generic access options reviewed by this study against the capital construction/O&M cost variables and other factors considered as displayed in Tables I and II in Section III of this report.

OPTION A: TAKU RIVER

o Capital Construction/O&M Costs

The Taku River option would begin at road's end near Thane and extend up the Taku River Valley, connecting to an existing road south of Atlin, B.C. Total new road length is approximately 120 miles. Approximately 44 miles lie on the U.S. side of the border and the remaining 76 miles extend from the border to the road's intersection south of Atlin.

Construction on the shorter U.S. portion of the road would be more expensive than the Canadian length due to more difficult terrain. Over 80% of the road on the Canadian side of the border would traverse relatively flat topography. Conversely, approximately 66% of the U.S. road length would traverse moderate to steep sloping terrain.

The proposed road would bridge the Taku drainage at a point below Grizzly Bar. This would avoid the leading edge of the Taku Glacier.

Bridging costs along the entire route mostly require spans of 80 feet or less, although lengths of 100 feet and greater are required in some places.

The construction of avalanche sheds are required in selected locations to enable the route to be used all year around. However, these avalanche control measures are less demanding than other options investigated along Lynn Canal.

A road maintenance facility would be required along the new road since its 120 mile length would be too difficult to maintain from existing facilities in Juneau and Atlin.

Construction of custom facilities are required at the border, similar to facilities at border crossings north of Haines and Skagway. This is the only option investigated with this requirement as the facilities already exist at the border crossings at the northern end of the Lynn Canal corridor.

A Taku Road would still demand Lynn Canal corridor access. As a result, at a minimum, existing ferry service between Juneau, Haines and Skagway would need to be

maintained. The resultant ferry costs attributed to this option are the same as those calculated in Option E (Existing Ferry Service) for maintaining the existing ferry system.

Since the ferry service would also generate revenue, this projected income has been included in the cost matrix as a negative number to offset the total O&M costs to the ferry system.

Road construction costs were calculated across the entire proposed 120 mile length, including the approximately 76 miles in Canada. Approximately \$50 million could be subtracted from the total cost estimates to represent the Alaska/U.S. portion of total project expenses. However, unless the Canadian government agrees to participate, the project would lead nowhere and, thus, not be competitive with other options studied on a cost/benefit basis. For this reason, total project costs are included.

o Other Considerations

The Taku River road project poses significant environmental mitigation challenges. While the areas of sensitivity are different in scope than those along the Lynn Canal coast, this sensitivity is of the same order of magnitude. The river valley hosts a large variety of flora and fauna. The area is active with hunting/recreation use. The relative isolation of this area is held by many to be critical for the long-term balance of the ecosystem.

The river's mouth emerges from and into critical fish habitat areas, compounded by management of returning salmon from both sides of the border.

In summary, road access would have to mitigate a range of significant environmental problems. This report assumes these problems can be solved, but only a thorough Environmental Impact Statement and design effort can verify this assumption.

Soil conditions and other geotechnical complexities are more favorable here than along the east side of Lynn Canal, but not as favorable as along Lynn Canal's west side.

While keeping the road open all year long would not be an easy task, all weather reliability is feasible with some avalanche shed management. The lack of long stretches of steep slopes and tunnels make twelve-month maintenance quite feasible.

Of all options considered in this report, the Taku option has the most potential for securing alternate funding, that is funding from sources other than the State of Alaska and federal highway assistance programs. Not only is there a potential for support from specific mining ventures, if and when their projects develop and the road

reaches design certainty, but Canadian government participation must be assumed.

This option provides no more or less, positive or negative, impact on the economic, political and social integration of northern SE Alaska than the other options considered in this study.

The Taku road option would provide excellent opportunities to power and other utility providers for shared corridor use. This availability of existing developed corridors with road access for construction and maintenance is critical to keep utility capitalization costs down. The Taku corridor would provide shared corridor use for the execution of some eventual form of shared power intertie with British Columbia.

Actual travel distance between Juneau and Whitehorse is only about 20 miles longer up the Taku River Valley than through Skagway. However, this option does not increase or benefit travel/distance benefits between Juneau, Haines and Skagway.

All road options investigated would provide opportunities for staged construction, ranging from mining access support, access to private property and greater access for hunting, fishing and recreational use.

All recent studies agree that the presence of a road north from Juneau would increase traffic flow to and from the community. How much induced traffic there would be is uncertain. Comparatively, the Taku option would significantly increase traffic from Juneau to Whitehorse and could attract significant traffic from that area into Juneau. However, this benefit is reduced by the fact that the route would not significantly alter traffic patterns along Lynn Canal.

The enhancement of trade and socio-economic relationships with British Columbia and Yukon Territory interests is strongest with the presence of an uninterrupted hard surface road running between Alaska and Canada. On the relative scale adopted by this report, the Taku option is rated the highest. Interruption of hard surface road by shuttle ferries as found in the other options reduces this capability somewhat.

Juneau would receive significant socio-economic benefit from this or any of the other hard surface road options considered in this report. However, the Taku River option would provide the least positive impact for Haines and Skagway than any of the other options investigated. The Taku option would not change travel patterns within the Lynn Canal corridor significantly.

OPTION B: JUNEAU-HAINES EAST

o Capital Construction/O&M Costs:

This option would begin at Echo Cove and proceed up the northwest shoreline to Lynn Canal. At this point the road would follow the shoreline of the Canal to a point approximately due east of the lower end of the Chilkat Peninsula. A shuttle ferry would connect the road's end with the existing road system running south from Haines. Transportation between Haines and Skagway would continue to be provided with ferry service.

Total new road construction is approximately 43 miles on the east side of Lynn Canal with an additional 3 miles of new road construction required on the southern tip of the Chilkat Peninsula.

Although these specific road points were identified for the purpose of calculating construction estimates, the actual location of the northern terminus of the proposed road could vary. The termination of road construction and construction of shuttle facilities to Haines depends on the delineation of several factors outside of the scope of this report. Location of a suitable site for the shuttle facilities on the east side of Lynn Canal and the concomitant facilities on the southern reaches of the Chilkat Peninsula could dictate a different road configuration than that proposed here. Environmental issues could dictate extension of the east side road north as far as the Katzehin River drainage with shuttle service direct to the existing ferry terminal in Haines. Variations in cost estimates allowing for these varying possibilities, however, did not yield significant variations in total cost estimates. The reader is cautioned, though, to review this option with the understanding that the exact configuration of the road's northern terminus and shuttling to Haines cannot be resolved until after a full EIS is prepared and full design scoped.

The steep slopes and avalanche areas along this proposed route drive road construction costs higher than the less demanding terrain in the Taku River Valley and along the west side of Lynn Canal. As a result costs for avalanche control to provide all year around access along the route are also significantly higher.

This option requires the least amount of bridge construction of all access options investigated. Most bridging involve spans of 80 feet or less.

The construction of maintenance facilities are required by this, and all other road options, as the length of the proposed road does not make it feasible to maintain it from existing facilities.

Ferry costs are based on estimates for a shuttle vessel

connecting the road's end to Haines and a separate vessel maintaining access service between Haines and Skagway.

Two ferry terminals would be required to provide shuttling between the road's end and the southern tip of the Chilkat Peninsula.

As with all other road options, ferry revenue is calculated and represented as a negative number within the cost matrix to offset ferry system O&M cost projections.

O Other Considerations:

Environmentally, the most sensitive areas within the scope of this option are in the vicinity of Echo Cove, the terminus of proposed road construction at or south of the Katzehin River drainage and the southern reaches of the Chilkat Peninsula. Echo Cove is a critical habitat area as well as an area actively enjoyed for recreation purposes. The isolation of this area from direct road access is considered by many to be critical to maintaining the balance of its ecosystem.

In addition the southern terminus of the Chilkat Peninsula represents the transition of the Lynn Canal water-based ecosystem with the mainland reaches of the Peninsula north. Even if shuttling was redirected from the Mud Bay area on the southern peninsula to the existing ferry terminal in Haines, shuttling from the vicinity of the Katzehin drainage poses its own significant environmental mitigation demands.

As indicated for each option, this report assumes that these environmental issues can be mitigated. However, only a detailed Environmental Impact Statement and full project design can verify this assumption.

The slopes along Lynn Canal pose the greatest potential for encountering geotechnical complexities in the form of weak, unstable and/or seismically-sensitive soils.

All weather reliability of this option is enhanced only with the investment of avalanche controls. The capitalization of these costs are significant, as represented in the cost matrix (Table I) and discussed above. With these efforts, though, maintaining year around traffic access is feasible.

Alternate funding is possible in the form of participation from mining interests along the eastern side of Lynn Canal. While these mining efforts are only in exploratory stages, their full development could be economically enhanced by road development. However, these same mining interests have made it clear that their participation would only be offered if their mines were to be developed and if the road project had matured past EIS stages into full design.

Regional integration of northern SE Alaska is

comparatively equal across all road options considered within this report.

The east side of Lynn Canal provides good potential for joint corridor use by utilities. Extension of power from Juneau to mining development on the northern side of Berner's Bay is economically feasible with the presence of a developed access corridor. Even extension of power from Juneau to Haines becomes economically feasible.

While this road option would enhance travel time between Juneau and Haines, the savings are mitigated by the wait for shuttle service to and from the Chilkat peninsula. Some additional benefits, however, are realized by reducing the reliance on scheduling of existing ferry service. Departures to and from Juneau and Haines would only be limited by the schedule of a high frequency shuttle ferry connecting Haines to the east side of Lynn Canal.

Staged construction would provide interim benefits, primarily access to mining development and increased recreational access.

While additional traffic would be generated between Juneau and points north with the construction of this option, the extent of this induced traffic appears to be inversely proportional to the number of road interruptions for shuttling by ferry. Any shuttling system provides the potential for some bottlenecking along the corridor. For this reason, ratings for this variable are moderate. However, the reader is cautioned to remember that a full determination of induced traffic necessitates a more detailed study than any executed to date.

Some increased benefit would be realized in increasing economic and social relationships with British Columbia and Yukon Territory with the construction of this option, but these benefits would not be as great as those derived from options A and C.

As with other road options, Juneau would derive significant benefits from the execution of this option. Haines and Skagway would benefit as well, but those benefits would be mitigated by potential negative impacts. Easier access to Juneau could significantly alter existing buying patterns within each community. Also, easier access could impact the nature of the tourist industry within each community. Because of the potential for these negative impacts, ratings for this variable for each community were moderate.

OPTION C: JUNEAU-HAINES-SKAGWAY

o Capital Construction/O&M Costs:

This option replaces the ferry connection between Haines and Skagway in Option B (Juneau-Haines-East) with a hard surface road link. While several options for construction of such a road were examined, the option selected for calculation of construction estimates extends existing road surface north from Haines along the west side of Chilkoot Inlet around the Lutak Inlet and up the west side of the Ferbee River drainage. The road is connected to Skagway with 2-3 miles of tunneling.

Cost estimates for the Juneau to Haines portion of this option are the same as those provided for Option B. The additional costs are those calculated for the Haines to Skagway link.

The most significant costs associated with this option are those for tunneling. These costs are difficult to determine without extensive ground survey and other field investigations. Tunneling costs are directly proportional to the character of rock encountered. Often this rock will require reinforcement. In addition, construction underground is more expensive than construction of the same surface above ground. Drainage, ventilation, hauling, etc. require more extraordinary construction measures than surface construction. Cost estimates for this option assumed average conditions possible for tunnel construction. Even using average scenarios, tunneling costs were estimated to reach \$50 million per mile. However, without detailed field investigation, these costs are very gross estimates.

Total new road miles to be constructed by this option add approximately 24 miles to those proposed for Option B. Of these, 16 miles traverse steep topography.

Bridging and avalanche shed construction add significantly to the costs for construction of this option.

Ferry costs are reduced significantly since the shuttle ferry from the east side of Lynn Canal to Haines is the only required ferry cost associated with this option. While ferry O&M costs decrease proportionately, so do projected revenues from the shuttle system.

While construction estimates are difficult for this option, the costs for constructing the Haines to Skagway road link drive overall costs well beyond those of any other option considered. These high construction costs, alone, make this option the least feasible of those investigated.

o Other Considerations:

The differences between this option and Option B are generated by the substitution of the hard road link between

Haines and Skagway for the ferry service. Ratings across factors other than construction/O&M costs considered in this report differ from those in Option B in three major areas.

First, increased benefit would be realized in calculating time/distance impacts. With the availability of road surface connection, travel time between Haines and Skagway would be enhanced with the elimination of reliance of scheduled service between the two communities. Departure times would be at the discretion of the traveler and would not require conformance with any scheduled service, no matter how frequent.

Second, this increase in traveler discretion would increase the amount of users traveling the corridor. Induced traffic benefits would equal those of the Taku option in relative numbers. Again, the reader is cautioned that actual induced traffic projections are not possible with existing data. However, existing data do suggest that with only one shuttle leg on the entire route, induced traffic would probably equal that of an access corridor that was all hard surface.

Third, road intertie between Haines and Skagway would generate the most benefit of the economies of the two communities. While each community would likely experience significant impacts, the connection of the two economies would create opportunities both individually and in tandem that are presently unavailable to each. Haines would be able to take greater advantage of potential opportunities with its Canadian neighbors. The availability of a hard surface loop to and from Whitehorse would likely greatly increase the amount of summer RV traffic through each community as well as expanded opportunity for destination packaging for visitor traffic flowing north from the Inside Passage.

While this option generates the most positive ratings across these factors other than construction costs, these greater benefits do not offset the proportionately higher costs for construction, operation and maintenance.

OPTION D: JUNEAU-HAINES WEST

o Capital Construction/O&M Costs:

This option would connect the east and west sides of Lynn Canal with shuttle service from the vicinity of Echo Cove on the east to the vicinity of William Henry Bay on the west. From this point new road would be constructed up the west side of Lynn Canal connecting to Haines by bridge across the Chilkat River over the McClellan Flats to a point on the existing road system just north of the Haines Airport.

Total new road construction is estimated at approximately 68 miles.

This option requires more bridge construction than options up the east side of Lynn Canal, with the significant increase associated with bridging the Chilkat River. Avalanche shed construction to enable twelve month open access is the least costly of the Lynn Canal options due to the less difficult terrain along the west side of the Canal.

As with other road options, a maintenance facility is required since service would not be feasible from existing facilities in Haines and Juneau.

Two ferry vessels would be required to service this option. The first is needed to provide shuttling from Echo Cove to William Henry Bay and the second is required to provide access between Haines and Skagway. Construction of ferry terminals would be required on both ends of the Echo Bay/William Henry Bay shuttle. These are the most expensive terminal costs estimated across the options explored due to specific requirements imposed by landfall demands in the area of William Henry Bay. As with other options, projected ferry revenues are included in the cost matrix (Table I) as a negative number to offset ferry costs for O&M.

o Other Considerations:

While all road construction options are significantly environmentally sensitive, the west side of Lynn Canal appears to be more sensitive than the others. Not only do the specific terminus points of the shuttle ferry in Echo Cove and William Henry Bay pose impact issues of magnitude, but the entire length of the proposed road system traverses an area with greater flora and fauna interaction than on the east side. Bird habitat is more abundant and eagle nesting is significant, especially on the northern end of the route. This difference is considered worth noting and calling attention to by assigning a rating associated with a higher environmental sensitivity.

Conversely, geotechnical complexities associated with unstable, weak and seismic-sensitive soils is the least

sensitive on the west side of Lynn Canal.

While all weather reliability of the road portion of this option is as good, if not better, than other options, the shuttling across a wide stretch of Lynn Canal perpendicular to prevailing winds makes this the most difficult option to keep open across the entire year. The shuttle system would no doubt experience proportionately more down time due to weather conditions than other options investigated.

Other than some private land holdings along this route, there is little other active economic interest that would yield significant potential for alternate funding of the project.

Some joint utility corridor use could feasibly be developed along this corridor, but its potential is not as high as for east side options. Traversing Lynn Canal is an extraordinary expense to assume to access the land corridor from that point north.

Shuttling frequency would provide greater incentive for travel along this option as is the case for east side options. Like other options requiring shuttle service, benefits are realized by increased frequency of access as opposed to any significant time saved enroute.

Benefits realized from staged construction are primarily two-fold. First, private property holdings would realize benefit from greater access and, second, greater recreational access to the west side of Lynn Canal could be provided.

As with east side options, construction of this option would increase traffic along the Lynn Canal corridor. However, this induced traffic would not reach levels typically associated with a full hard surface road with no ferry shuttle interruption because there would still be the need to rely on the scheduling of ferry service. As with other options discussed, detailed induced traffic studies need to be executed before this variable can be enumerated with any confidence. Relative to other options, however, benefits would accrue to this option sufficient to warrant a moderate rating.

In evaluating impacts on socio-economic impacts with Canada, this option rated the lowest due to the greatest vulnerability to weather closures and the longest shuttling times associated with any of the other road options.

This option rated evenly with Option B (Juneau-Haines West) with respect to socio-economic impacts to Haines, Skagway and Juneau for the same reasons discussed within that option.

OPTION E: EXISTING FERRY SYSTEM

o Capital Construction/O&M Costs:

This option serves as the base option against which the other options can be compared. Capital construction and O&M costs were calculated for the maintenance of the existing ferry system that presently serves the upper Lynn Canal, linking Juneau, Haines and Skagway.

The only capital costs are those in the three columns associated with the ferry system since no new road construction would be executed.

Ferry vessel costs are those calculated by the Alaska Marine Highway System needed to keep existing vessels operational across the 25 year period identified by the parameters of this study. The \$29.5 million dollars identified would not be used to purchase any new vessels but, rather, would be used for periodic repair and reconstruction of existing vessels to keep them operational.

As with other options, ferry revenue was calculated for the same 25 year period and included as a negative number in the cost matrix (Table I) to offset O&M costs.

This report does not propose that maintenance of the existing system with no additional carrying capacity would satisfy even minimum projected user demand on Lynn Canal over this time period.

The Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan, 1986, prepared for the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, recommends the addition of high speed shuttle ferry service between Juneau, Haines and Skagway to the existing mainline vessel service now operating within the corridor. This option is reviewed in more detail and presented as the sixth option examined within this study.

Another variation on this option is the addition of a mainline vessel to service the entire system, including the provision of additional service in Lynn Canal. Capital construction costs for a Malispinia-class vessel is approximately \$59 million.

While other options have been proposed for improving existing ferry service, for purposes of maintaining consistency with previous studies, this study effort identified the high speed shuttle as the optimum alternative to examine for improved ferry access between Juneau, Haines and Skagway. The presentation of Option E, maintaining the existing ferry service, is presented to provide baseline costs against which to compare other options and is not intended to represent a viable alternative for improved access to and from Juneau.

o Other Considerations:

The analysis of the factors other than construction/O&M

costs for this option is intended to provide a similar baseline against which to compare other options.

Values displayed in Table II are ratings on a five-point scale which indicate the benefits of the existing system compared to no ferry system. Allowing for other options reviewed by this study to represent higher values on the five-point scale dictate minimum values for this option across the various categories. Again, the reader is cautioned to review the data presented in this report and summarized in Table II as relative values between the various option examined and not a presentation of absolute values for each alternative.

OPTION F: HIGH SPEED SHUTTLE FERRY

o Capital Construction/O&M Costs:

The high speed shuttle ferry option would require the construction of two new vessels which would provide daily round-trip service between Juneau, Haines and Skagway. The vessels would be large enough to accommodate approximately 40 vehicles and 200 passengers. Limited van capacity could be accommodated. Each vessel could operate at speeds more than twice that of existing vessels and each would be scheduled to provide 2-3 round-trips between Juneau, Haines and Skagway within a 16-18 hour time period, for a total of 4-6 round-trips per day.

High speed shuttle service could be initiated out of Echo Cove at the end of the current road on the east side of Lynn Canal or could be operated out of the existing facilities at Auke Bay.

Costs for a ferry terminal at Echo Cove were calculated and included for this option to allow for the execution of that alternative. The only immediate advantage for operating out of Echo Cove would be to save enough running time across the 16-18 day to complete another leg on the system.

O&M costs were calculated by AMHS to include augmentation of the high speed shuttle service with mainline vessels, primarily during peak demand in the summer. AMHS spread the capital costs for vessel repair and reconstruction across the entire system so that only a very small portion was allocated to the Lynn Canal corridor. As a result the \$26.4 million identified for capital vessel costs is primarily the cost identified for construction of the two high speed vessels.

As with all other options, ferry revenue has been estimated and displayed as a negative number to offset O&M costs for the ferry system.

⑨ Other Considerations:

The only environmentally sensitive facet of this option is the construction of a ferry terminal in Echo Cove. For this reason, the rating value assigned is lower than that for the baseline option of maintaining the existing system with no capital construction. Echo Cove is a sensitive habitat. Design and construction would have to be preceded by detailed studies of the area to make sure that construction would not cause any serious impact to the area. This study assumes that any such impacts can be mitigated but only a detailed study coupled with full design can verify that assumption.

Since the high speed shuttle vessels would be considerably smaller than existing mainline vessels, they would be more susceptible to down time caused by weather conditions in Lynn Canal. While not as reliable as the existing mainline vessels they would still provide greater reliability than the road links proposed in Options A-D.

The high speed shuttle ferry option can be implemented faster and at a lesser cost than the road options reviewed in this study. This significant increase in potential frequency for travel between Juneau, Haines and Skagway can be accomplished without altering the socio-economic base of either Haines or Skagway as road terminus communities. For these reasons, regional benefits were rated higher than other options.

Travel time and frequency of travel permitted by this option are less beneficial than for road options. However, the significant increase in frequency for travel is significantly greater than that offered by the existing ferry system. Rating values assigned within this category reflect that relationship between the proposed options.

Some limited benefit to users could be realized by adding a single high speed shuttle ferry vessel to the corridor. The benefits are primarily those associated with greater frequency of service created by the increased number of runs between the communities of Juneau, Haines and Skagway.

Induced traffic generated by this option could reach the same levels as the two proposed road-shuttle options if the system was able to provide a full six round-trips per 18 hour day. The greater all-weather reliability and the capability of some reservation scheduling would offset the risks of bottlenecks at a road shuttle point, especially during peak demand periods. However, this full 6 round-trips/day configuration is probably optimistic. For this reason, rating values for this category displayed in Table II show a slightly reduced benefit provided by this option for induced traffic.

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS
JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS
1921 - 1989

While high speed shuttle service would offer less than full benefit impacts for Juneau when compared to road construction options, this service would provide significant benefit to Haines and Skagway. Each community would retain their socio-economic structure as a road terminus community and increases in the economic sectors associated with ferry traffic without altering the physical and social structure within the communities. The latter was a fear expressed by many residents of both communities during the public hearing process of this study effort.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS - JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS

PROVIDED BY SENATOR JIM DUNCAN, JANUARY 20, 1989


- 1921 TAKU VALLEY RECON. REPORT PREPARED FOR THE ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION - TIDEWATER TO THE CANADIAN BORDER.
- 1951-52 RECONNAISSANCE REPORT ON PROPOSED TAKU RIVER ROUTE AND PHOTO RECON. REPORT FOR THE BPR.
- 1954 DECEMBER - RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY OF THE TAKU ROUTE FOR THE ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION.
- 1963 TAKU GLACIER EVALUATION STUDY BY MAYNARD MILLER FOR THE ALASKA DEPT. HIGHWAYS AND BPR - INDICATED UNSTABLE SITUATION.
- 1964 NOVEMBER - RECONNAISSANCE REPORT FOR PROPOSED FOREST HIGHWAY DONE FOR THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE. ACCESS TO TIMBER AND THE GLACIER BAY NATIONAL MONUMENT THE GOAL.
- 1967 APRIL - RECONNAISSANCE REPORT ON THE CHILKAT RIVER CROSSING BY DOT/PF - TO PICK CROSSING LOCATION. ASSUMES A WEST SIDE ROUTE.
- 1970 STATE DEPT OF. HIGHWAYS DEVELOPS PLANS FOR CHILKAT RIVER CROSSING BUT FINDS RIGHT OF WAY PROBLEMS WITH INDIAN RESERVATION, ALSO ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ARISE.
- 1974 SEPTEMBER - LYNN CANAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY.
- 1974 OCTOBER - ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS PREPARES A COST ESTIMATE ON THE JUNEAU TO SKAGWAY ROUTE.
- 1975 LYNN CANAL TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR PUBLIC HEARING BROCHURE PREPARED BY THE DEPT. OF HIGHWAYS. CONCENTRATED PRIMARILY ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION, TRANSPORTATION COSTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS
JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS
1/20/89
PAGE 2**

- 1979 **SOUTHEAST TRANSPORTATION PLAN BY WILBUR SMITH & ASSOC. EXAMINES TAKU ROUTE AND ROUTES TO HAINES AND SKAGWAY.**
- 1980 **COST ESTIMATES PREPARED ON JUNEAU TO HAINES ROUTE BY DOT/PF**
- 1981 **JANUARY - JUNEAU TO HAINES LOCATION INVESTIGATION DONE BY R&M FOR THE SENATE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.**
- 1986 **EVALUATION OF CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES BY ACRES INTERNATIONAL FOR DOT/PF**
- 1987 **MARCH - GREATER JUNEAU CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE PREPARES AN EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS STATING THE ACRES REPORT DID NOT INCLUDE IMPORTANT ECONOMIC FACTORS.**
- 1987 **MAY - SENATOR DUNCAN APPROPRIATES \$100,000 TO DETERMINE THE ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF ROAD ACCESS TO JUNEAU.**
- 1988 **MARCH - THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION INDICATES THE NEXT STEP IN THE PROCESS SHOULD BE AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR A HIGHWAY CONNECTION BETWEEN JUNEAU, HAINES AND SKAGWAY. THE FHWA WOULD REQUIRE A COMMITMENT ON THE PART OF THE DEPARTMENT TO BUILD IN ORDER TO PROCEED.**
- 1988 **AUGUST - MAYNARD MILLER RELEASES INFORMATION STATING THE TAKU GLACIER WAS ADVANCING AT AN ACCELERATING RATE AND COULD DAM THE RIVER IN SIX TO 10 YEARS.**
- 1988 **SEPTEMBER 15 - MAYNARD MILLER RETRACTS HIS PREVIOUS STATEMENT SAYING AN ASSISTANT HAD CONFUSED FEET WITH METERS.**
- 1988 **SEPTEMBER - SENATOR DUNCAN ASKS DNR, FISH AND GAME AND THE U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE INFORMATION ON THE GLACIAL PROBLEMS ON THE TAKU ROUTE WAS CORRECT.**
- 1988 **SEPTEMBER - SENATOR DUNCAN ASKS THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL TO TAKE THE LEAD IN PULLING TOGETHER A COMMUNITY CONSENSUS ON A ROAD OPTION.**

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS
JUNEAU ROAD ACCESS
1/20/89
PAGE 3**

- 1988** **NOVEMBER - SENATOR COGHILL ASKS FOR AND RECEIVES A \$6,000 GRANT FROM THE SENATE LEADERSHIP FUNDS FOR RED SWANSON.**
- 1989** **JANUARY 18 - SENATOR COGHILL INTRODUCES SB 124 AND SB 125 WHICH WOULD AUTHORIZE DOT/PF TO CONSTRUCT THE LYNN CANAL HIGHWAY PROJECT AND APPROPRIATE \$102.0 MILLION IN FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS.**
- 1989** **DUE MARCH 1 TO SENATOR DUNCAN, A REPORT FROM THE JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL EVALUATING ALTERNATIVE ACCESS ROUTES WITH SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO LEGISLATIVE ACTION REQUIRED.**



THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENT HAS
NOT BEEN FILMED BUT IS
AVAILABLE IN THE ORIGINAL
FILE

LYNN CANAL HIGHWAY PROJECT

APRIL 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page	1	Senate Bill 124
	7	Senate Bill 125
	9	Sectional Analysis
	11	Senate Joint Resolution
	14	Information Sheet
	15	Juneau Access Corridors
	16	Estimated Annual Maintenance Costs
	17	Shuttle Ferry Information
	18	Employment Breakdown from Mining in Berners Bay
	19	Estimated Returns from Mines in Berners Bay
	20	Shuttle Ferry Annual Operating & Revenue Projections
	21	Letter from Ministry of Transportation and Highways/Canada
	22	Public Support
	23	Map
	24	List of Key Background Reports

1 IN THE SENATE

BY COGHILL

2

SENATE BILL NO. 124

3

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4

SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5

A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act authorizing the Department of Transportation
7 and Public Facilities to construct the Lynn Canal
8 Highway Project, consisting of roads and of vessels
9 and ferry terminals for the Alaska marine highway
10 system, serving the principal communities of northern
11 Lynn Canal; relating to the disposition of certain
12 claims and actions arising from the state's activ-
13 ities in completing that project; changing Rules 79
14 and 82, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and provid-
15 ing for an effective date."

16 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

17 * Section 1. FINDINGS. The legislature finds that

18 (1) lack of direct road access between communities in the Rail-
19 belt and the state capital at Juneau has been a source of unhappiness among
20 residents of all areas of the state;

21 (2) within the last decade, road connections to ports situated
22 along northern Lynn Canal have been significantly improved:

23 (A) the state Department of Transportation and Public
24 Facilities and agencies having similar functions in British Columbia
25 and Yukon have planned and carried out improvements to the highway
26 between Haines Junction and the port of Haines; the road remains the
27 principal access route between the state's population centers in
28 western Alaska and the state capital;

29 (B) the agencies also have completed construction of the

1 pipeline interties between Haines and Skagway, opening land adjacent to the
2 new highways to recreation and mineral exploration, and expanding employ-
3 ment opportunities in both communities;

4 (6) completion of the Lynn Canal Highway Project would material-
5 ly change existing transportation patterns affecting the communities of
6 northern Lynn Canal, allowing the Alaska marine highway system to terminate
7 mainline marine services for Southeast Alaska at its Juneau/Auke Bay
8 terminal, and permitting the system to reschedule existing vessels in use
9 on mainline routes to improve service for residents of other communities in
10 Southeast Alaska;

11 (7) because of the interrelated effects on the communities of
12 northern Lynn Canal, the proposed transportation links constitute a single
13 project, and the Lynn Canal Highway Project should be authorized, designed,
14 and completed as a unit; and

15 (8) because improvement of the public's access to the state
16 capital is a matter of common interest to the whole state, the Department
17 of Transportation and Public Facilities should give priority to prompt
18 construction of the Lynn Canal Highway Project.

19 * Sec. 2. PURPOSE. It is the purpose of this Act

20 (1) to authorize the Department of Transportation and Public
21 Facilities to construct the Lynn Canal Highway Project and its related
22 facilities as described;

23 (2) to give the department specific directions regarding how the
24 Lynn Canal Highway Project is to be completed; and

25 (3) to provide certain safeguards pertaining to the project's
26 construction.

27 * Sec. 3. AS 19.65 is amended by adding a new section to read:

28 ARTICLE 2. VESSEL OPERATIONS.

29 Sec. 19.65.100. SHUTTLE SERVICE ACROSS NORTHERN LYNN CANAL.

1 23 U.S.C. 109.

2 * Sec. 5. LIMITATIONS. (a) Notwithstanding AS 19.10.170(b), in the
3 preparation of plans for construction of roads authorized by this Act, the
4 Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

5 (1) shall prepare the initial design of the Lynn Canal Highway
6 Project through the use of aerial surveying methods, to the maximum extent
7 possible;

8 (2) may not contract for surveying, mapping, and engineering and
9 design services; the department shall perform all work relating to roads
10 for the Lynn Canal Highway Project prior to their actual construction using
11 personnel employed by the department.

12 (b) To meet costs of preparation incurred under (a) of this section,
13 the charges made by the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
14 against amounts appropriated for the Lynn Canal Highway Project adminis-
15 tration may not exceed 15 percent of the estimated actual cost of the
16 project's construction.

17 (c) The Department of Transportation and Public Facilities shall
18 include construction of ferry landings, ramps, vehicle staging areas, and
19 breakwaters as an integral part of the general contract for construction of
20 the highway. When constructing ferry facilities for the Lynn Canal Highway
21 Project, the department shall, to the maximum extent possible, use the
22 design and engineering done for the ferry ramp in Ketchikan for the MV
23 Chilkat.

24 * Sec. 6. CLAIMS. In a claim or other legal action against the state
25 arising from the state's activities in completing the Lynn Canal Highway
26 Project, if the state is the prevailing party, the party or parties that
27 brought the claim or maintained the action shall pay or reimburse

28 (1) all costs, including attorney fees, and expenses of prepara-
29 tion, trial, and appeal incurred by the state in defending against the

Funding Information
General Fund \$ 8,827,325
Other Funds 93,222,675
\$102,050,000

1 IN THE SENATE

BY COGHILL

2

SENATE BILL NO. 125

3

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4

SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5

A BILL

6 For an Act entitled: "An Act making a special appropriation for construc-
7 tion of roads and for construction of vessels and
8 ferry terminals of the Alaska marine highway system
9 for the Lynn Canal Highway Project; and providing for
10 an effective date."

11 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

12 * Section 1. The sum of \$8,827,325 is appropriated from the general
13 fund and the sum of \$93,222,675 is appropriated from federal funds for
14 construction of roads and for construction of vessels and ferry terminals
15 for the Alaska marine highway system for the Lynn Canal Highway Project, to
16 be allocated as follows:

- 17 (1) road construction and reconstruction, from present northern
18 end of Alaska Highway 7 (Glacier Highway) at Echo Cove to the vicinity of a
19 point nine miles north of Comet \$41,000,000
20 (2) road construction and reconstruction from Haines to the
21 south end of the Chilkat Peninsula \$ 5,100,000
22 (3) construction of ferry ramps, vehicle staging areas, and
23 breakwaters at a point approximately nine miles north of Comet and near the
24 south end of Chilkat Peninsula \$ 1,200,000
25 (4) construction of two shuttle ferries \$12,000,000
26 (5) road construction and reconstruction from present end of
27 road at north end of Lutak Inlet, around Sanka Point and north via the
28 Ferebee River valley \$16,000,000
29 (6) tunnel construction through Halutu Ridge \$22,750,000

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

SB 124 "An Act authorizing the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to construct the Lynn Canal Highway Project, consisting of roads and of vessels and ferry terminals for the Alaska marine highway system, serving the principal communities of northern Lynn Canal; relating to disposition of certain claims and actions arising from the state's activities in completing that project; changing Rules 79 and 82, Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure; and providing for an effective date."

Sec.1. Provides findings that justify the project:

1. that the lack of access to the capitol is a source of unhappiness for Alaskan residents;
2. that road connections northward out of Haines and Skagway have been greatly improved in the last decade;
3. that linking Juneau to the roads out of Haines and Skagway would accomodate international and intrastate traffic;
4. that the most reasonable, expeditious and cost effective route, given the topography in the Juneau area, is the one proposed by the bill;
5. that the highway would serve to diversify and integrate the economies of the communities it served, would allow power transmission and pipeline interties, would open land along its corridor to recreation and mineral exploration, and would expand employment opportunities;
6. that completion of the highway would allow the marine highway system to terminate in Juneau, thus allowing better service to other communities in the rest of Southeast;
7. that the Lynn Canal Highway Project should be authorized, designed and completed as a single, integrated project;
8. that DOT/PF should give high priority to the project, because it is a matter of common interest to the whole state.

Sec. 2. Explains that the purpose of the Act is to authorize and direct construction of the project, and to provide certain safeguards relating to the project's construction.

Sec. 3. Amends Title 19, Chapter 65 (Alaska Marine Highway System) to direct DOT/PF to provide cross-channel ferry service between the two ferry terminals included in the project. This directive is included because this type of service (a point-to-point, continuously running shuttle as a link in a highway) is different from the type of service currently provided by the marine highway.

Sec. 4. (a) Authorizes the project, and directs DOT/PF to build it as described: (1) a road from Echo Cove to about 9 miles north of Comet; (2) a ferry landing at that point; (3) a road from Haines to the southern end of Chilkat Peninsula; (4) a ferry landing at that point; (5) shuttle ferries of a

capacity to handle traffic between the two ferry landings; (6) a highway connecting Haines and Skagway, from Lutak Inlet, around Sanka Point, north up the Ferebee River valley, through a tunnel under Halutu Ridge, and north along Taiya Inlet to Dyea.

Sec. 4. (b) Directs that the road be built to Federal specifications for a "primary system" highway.

Sec. 5. (a) Directs DOT/PF to (1) use aerial surveying as much as possible in the initial design stage, and (2) to perform all work on the project, up to the construction phase, using only department personnel.

Sec. 5. (b) Limits the amount of administrative costs to 15% of the estimated cost of the project's construction.

Sec. 5. (c) Requires DOT/PF to include the construction of the ferry landing facilities as part of the contract for the construction of the road. This section also directs DOT/PF, in building these ferry terminals, to make maximum use of design and engineering done for the MV Chilkat ramp in Ketchikan.

Sec. 6. Requires that any party who sues to stop construction of the project will be held financially responsible for the costs incurred, if the state prevails in the action. This would cover (1) costs of the action, including attorney's fees, as well as (2) any financial losses determined to be attributable to construction delays resulting from the legal action.

Sec. 7. Changes Rules 79 and 82, Alaska Code of Civil Procedure, to reflect the financial responsibility provision of section 6. The court would be limited in its discretion to award costs and attorney fees.

Sec. 8. Provides an effective date for section 3, the operation of the shuttle ferries by the marine highway system. This would become effective only upon completion of the project.

Sec. 9. Provides an immediate effective date for the remainder of the bill.

ESTIMATED RETURNS FROM MINING INDUSTRY IN BERNERS BAY AREA

Kensington (Echo Bay).....\$17,000,000 Goods & Services
10,000,000 Payroll

Estimated annual wages & services \$ 27,000,000
Estimated 10 year wages & services \$270,000,000

Jualin (Curator American).....\$ 5,000,000 Goods & Services
\$ 6,500,000 Payroll

Estimated annual wages & services \$ 11,500,000
Estimated 10 year wages & services \$115,000,000

Difficult access (No road access currently available).

1 IN THE SENATE

BY COGHILL

2

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 36

3

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

4

SIXTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

5

Requesting the Congress to reserve a

6

highway corridor or setback along the

7

east shoreline of Lynn Canal.

8

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

9

WHEREAS, of all the continental states of the United States, Alaska's
10 capital, Juneau, is the only one that is not connected by highway to the
11 rest of the state, denying most Alaskans direct land access to the seat of
12 government; and

13

WHEREAS there is currently pending in the Alaska State Legislature
14 legislation that would authorize and appropriate money for the construction
15 of the Lynn Canal Highway Project, consisting of a highway and shuttle
16 ferry facilities, linking Juneau with Haines and Skagway; and

17

WHEREAS, in addition to improving direct land access to the seat of
18 government, the Lynn Canal Highway Project is important to the economies of
19 the communities of Lynn Canal because it would enhance diversity of the
20 economies of these communities; and

21

WHEREAS the proposed highway would pass through highly mineralized
22 areas that are currently being developed into operating mines; and

23

WHEREAS it is estimated that opening the Lynn Canal Highway would
24 precipitate a four-fold increase in visitor traffic between Juneau and the
25 communities of Upper Lynn Canal; and

26

WHEREAS completion of the Lynn Canal Highway Project would allow the
27 Alaska Marine Highway System to terminate its mainline ferries at Juneau
28 and thereby allow for improved ferry services to the remaining communities
29 served by ferry in Southeastern Alaska; and

1 Wright, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable George
2 J. Mitchell, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Samuel K.
3 Skinner, U.S. Secretary of Transportation; the Honorable Robert A.
4 Mosbacher, U.S. Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Clayton K. Yeutter,
5 U.S. Secretary of Agriculture; and the Honorable Manuel Lujan, Jr., U.S.
6 Secretary of the Interior; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honor-
7 able Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S.
8 Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

INFORMATION SHEET

- 1) TOP PRIORITY IS TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE CAPITOL.
- 2) Of all the continental states of the United States, Alaska's capital, Juneau, is the only one that is not connected by highway to the rest of the state, denying most Alaskans direct land access to the seat of government.
- 3) Connects Juneau with two year-round transportation routes through both Haines and Skagway.
- 4) Provides a very broad spectrum of increased recreation opportunities.
- 5) Would accommodate and encourage future growth in the tourist industry.
- 6) Provides opportunities for businessmen and entrepreneurs.
- 7) The highway passes through highly mineralized areas.
- 8) The land is primarily federally and state owned.
- 9) Provides daily service by truck or bus to both Skagway and Haines.
- 10) By using the federal matching funds, construction could begin in 2 years upon completion of the Economic Impact Statement. Actual construction time of the job itself would be approximately 3 years.
- 11) The highway and it's right of way between Juneau, Haines, and Skagway will provide a corridor for pipelines and hydro-electric transmission lines.
- 12) The road would enable Alaska Marine Highways to turn the ferries around at Juneau/Auke Bay, thus allowing an approximate 20% increase in ferry service to the rest of Southeast Alaska.
- 13) Due to greater convenience and the decreased cost of travelling, traffic on the Lynn Canal Highway is estimated to increase a minimum of 400% over current ferry travel.

JUNEAU ACCESS CORRIDORS

ROUTE DESCRIPTION	COST IN MILLIONS
A. Continue Existing System	\$ 68.7*
B. Eastside Road/Chilkoot Inlet Bridge	337.7
C. Eastside Road/Haines-Skagway Road	291.2
D. Westside Road via St. James Bay	222.5
E. Westside Road via WM. Henry Bay	172.4
F. Shuttle to Sullivan Is./Road to Haines	141.6
G. Eastside Road to Katzehin R./Shuttle Haines/Sgy	223.7
H. Eastside Road to Skagway/Shuttle to Haines	236.7
I. High Speed Ferries	104.6
J. Taku Inlet Route with Bridge	202.5
K. Taku Inlet Route with Ferry	143.0
L. S.B. 124 Route with Ferry to Chilkat Peninsula, and road connecting Haines and Skagway	102.1

*Figures taken from Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan,
Evaluation of Corridor Alternatives, Juneau Access
(Lynn/Taku Corridors), page 3-7.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COSTS

District 4 - 32 miles new construction

District 2 - 33 miles new construction
14 miles re-construction

A total of 8 maintenance personnel would be required. The cost of this personnell is included in the figure below.

Total estimated annual road maintenance cost is: \$1,200,000

SHUTTLE FERRY INFORMATION

COST: \$ 6,000,000 per shuttle ferry
\$ 25,000 annual maintenance per shuttle ferry

DIMENSIONS: 200 ft. x 50 ft.

SPEED: 12 m.p.h.

ENGINE: Diesel power

WEIGHT: Maximum gross capacity 100 tons

EMPLOYMENT BREAKDOWN FROM MINING IN BERNERS BAY

	<u>Kensington</u>	<u>Jualin</u>
Management	29	14
Maintenance	11	6
Engineers	8	4
Geologists	4	2
Underground	71	35
Mechanics	50	25
Electricians	10	5
Samplers	3	1
Surveyors	6	3
Clerks	5	3
Metallurgist	3	1
Environmental Tech.	2	1
Assayer	7	3
Laborer	8	4
Bucker	2	1
Refiner	4	2
Secretaries	5	3
Security	4	2
Safety	2	1
Nurse	2	1
Cooks	16	8
Janitorial	4	2
Plumber	2	1
Carpenter	2	1
Accounting	8	4
Personnel	2	1
Purchasing	2	1
Operators	48	24
TOTAL	320	159

SHUTTLE FERRY ANNUAL OPERATING AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS

2 Captains	18(26.49)	=	\$476.82
2 Engineers	18(24.64)	=	443.52
4 Deck Hands	36(16.24)	=	584.64

TOTAL PER DAY	\$	1504.98
TOTAL PER YEAR		\$549,317.70

Fuel cost estimates based on \$1.40 per gallon
 18 hours at 65 gallons per hour = 1170 gallons per day.

TOTAL PER DAY	\$	1638.00
TOTAL PER YEAR		\$597,870.00

WAGES	\$549,317.70
FUEL	597,870.00
MAINTENANCE	25,000.00

TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING	\$1,172,187.70
ANNUAL OPERATING FOR 2 FERRIES	\$2,344,375.40

TOTAL VEHICLE PROJECTIONS: 172,300
 75% = 129,225 19 ft. vehicles at \$ 9.08 = \$1,173,363
 25% = 43,075 30 ft. vehicles at \$20.72 = 892,514

3 people per vehicle = 516,900 at \$4.38 = \$2,264,022

TOTAL REVENUE PROJECTIONS	\$4,329,899
---------------------------	-------------

Less operating costs	(2,344,375)
----------------------	-------------

NET PROFIT	\$1,985,524
------------	-------------



Province of
British Columbia

OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY MINISTER

Ministry of
Transportation
and Highways

940 Blanshard Street
Victoria
British Columbia
V8W 3E6
Phone: 387-3280

YOUR FILE:

OUR FILE 53-20-00

October 20, 1988

Mr. Leslie E. Swanson
113 West 5th Street
Juneau, Alaska
U.S.A., 99801

Dear Mr. Swanson:

Reference is made to your telephone conversation with Mr. P. J. Bonser, Acting Director, Traffic and Design, on Friday, October 7, 1988, concerning a road connection between Atlin, British Columbia and Juneau, Alaska via the Taku Valley.

I advise you that this Ministry has no plans at this time to make this connection and has not carried out any preliminary studies or design.

Yours truly,

M. V. Collins
Acting Deputy Minister

PUBLIC SUPPORT

Signatures on petitions: More than 6000.

Capital City Weekly Poll results: In favor - 74%
Opposed - 26%


Representative Ulmers Survey results: "Four times as many
residents in favor as opposed. Pro = 90 Con = 20.

THIS PROJECT WOULD BE AUTHORIZED BY SB 124
 AND FUNDED UNDER SB 125 - SPONSORED BY SENATOR JACK COGHILL
 FUNDING AND CONSTRUCTION WOULD TAKE PLACE
 OVER A FIVE YEAR PERIOD

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION = \$102,050,000
 FEDERAL SHARE = \$ 93,222,675
 STATE SHARE = \$ 8,827,325

LYNN CANAL HIGHWAY PROJECT

"ROAD TO JUNEAU"



LIST OF KEY BACKGROUND REPORTS

- 1) A Delphi Forecast of Alaska's Development to the Year 2000 & Beyond, Alaska Department of Commerce & Economic Development, June 1983.
- 2) Alaska Economic Trends, Turbulent Times in Alaska's Financial Industry. November 1988.
- 3) Alaska Economic Trends, Winter Tourism is Alaska - Not an Anomaly, Alaska Department of Labor, December 1988.
- 4) Alaska Marine Highway Draft System Plan, November 1986.
- 5) Alaska Marine Highway System - The Community Perspective, Ayers & Associates, April 1987.
- 6) Alaska's Mineral Industry 1987, Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys Special Report 41.
- 7) Alaska Transportation Recap 1988, The Alaska Public Affairs Journal, Fall 1988.
- 8) Alaska Visitors Statistics Program, Alaska Visitor Arrivals Fall/Winter/Spring 1987-1988, Dept of Commerce & Economic Development Division of Tourism.
- 9) Annual Traffic Volume Report, Alaska Marine Highways System, 1977 - 1987.
- 10) Echo Bay Mines Annual Report 1987, Echo Bay Mines.
- 11) Evaluation of Corridor Alternatives - Juneau Access (Lynn/Taku Corridors), Acres International Corporation, March 1986.
- 12) Gold - Copper Mineralization of the Chilkat Peninsula & Islands, United States Dept. of the Interior.
- 13) Jualin Mine Access, Exploration, & Bulk Sampling, Revised 3/29/88. Environmental Assessment Juneau Ranger District Tongass National Forest Alaska Region.
- 14) Population Estimates and Projections for Alaska 1980 - 1991, Alaska Department of Labor.
- 15) Record of Community Response, Acres International Corporation, June 1986.

- 16) Report by the Alaska Legislative Economic Recovery Team, Republican House of Representatives, February 1988.
- 17) Report of Investigation 88-8, Preliminary Geology of the Northern Chilkat Range, Southeastern AK, W.G. Gilbert.
- 18) Southeast Alaska Transmission Inter tie, Alaska Power Authority, August 1987.
- 19) Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan, Acres International Corporation, April 1986.
- 20) Southeast Alaska Transportation Plan, Acres International Corporation, June 1986.
- 21) Technology Evaluation, Acres International Corporation, September 1985.
- 22) Tourism in Alaska, A Report by the House Finance Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce and Economic Development Division of Tourism, January 1986.
- 23) Transportation Requirements for the Growth of Northwest North America, 87th Congress, 1st Session House Document No. 176, Volume 3 May 25, 1961.