

DOCK REDESIGN COSTS PREPARED

16 — Anchorage Daily News, Thursday, June 1, 1967

City Plans To Demolish New Dock

By JANET ARCHIBALD
Daily News Staff Writer

Demolition of the Port of Anchorage's ice-damaged Terminal No. 2 could begin Monday following Anchorage City Council selection of a firm to do the work.

THE COUNCIL, meeting in special session yesterday afternoon, agreed to accept the proposal of Swalling-General to remove the unfinished dock facility at a cost not to exceed \$225,000.

This is the same firm that constructed the 140 feet of dock that must come down.

The council also approved a proposal from Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton to design a new dock facility and supervise its construction. TAMS has set a fee of \$100,000 for the design work. Costs of supervising the construction would be \$3,200 a month.

THE ANCHORAGE Port Commission, meeting earlier in the day, had recommended that the design work be awarded to TAMS.

Just what the new facility would cost to build must await preparation of new design plans, the council was told.

Figures made available to the council indicate that less than a third of the original nearly \$4 million in bond funds earmarked for the terminal addition will remain after demolition and redesign charges are paid.

THIS \$1,264,081 bond fund balance is subject to contractor claims for delays and standby time, the council was told.

Councilman George Sullivan wanted to know just how

with the money it now has for this purpose.

Completion of the design work would answer this question, City Manager Ben Marsh replied.

THE CITY manager listed several possible sources from which additional money for the port facility might be obtained. These include seeking federal loans or grants, possible recovery of funds through legal action, asking the voters to approve an additional bond authorization for this purpose or building a shorter dock.

"We should ask them (TAMS) to design a 600-foot dock even if we build less," the city manager explained.

MARSH WAS instructed to immediately make application to the Economic Development Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to determine what federal funds could be available to the city.

It is estimated that redesign of the port facility would take three months to complete and that construction could begin this summer.

Approximately \$520,000 worth of material that might be used in the redesigned dock is available to the city, Port Director Russ Painter pointed out.

Marsh was asked to obtain prices on piling that will be required for the new facility.

THE COUNCIL heard Albert Swalling detail how Swalling-General proposed to take down the damaged facility and dispose of the material.

Steel piles will be cut off at ground line and attempts will be made to pull out concrete piles. A maximum of three hours will be spent attempting to pull each concrete pile. If this is unsuccessful, the pile will be cut or broken off at the ground line. Swalling told the council.

TAMS has requested that all stubs possible be removed from the dock area, according to Marsh.

THE CITY will provide equipment to move the broken material from the dock area to a nearby location where it will be used for rip rap.

Swalling-General's engineer has asked the Coast Guard approval be sought to dispose of eight 42-inch steel sheaths—weighing approximately 60 tons—in deep water offshore.

Anchorage Daily News, Wednesday, May 17, 1967 — 3

Council Fires Designer Of Ice Damaged Dock

By CAMERON EDMONDSON
Daily News Staff Writer

After weeks of indecision and soul-searching, the City Council last night voted to fire the engineering firm of Lounsbury-Sleavin-Kelley, designers of the north extension to the city dock.

THE COUNCILMEN, in voting 8-1 for the firing as proposed in a package recommendation by the city attorney, indicated the city will seek a new design by another firm to build the extension using steel instead of concrete piles.

In the special council meeting the members acted after having received earlier in the day a report by the New York firm of Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton, condemning the use of concrete piling in this particular environment.

During testimony before the council last night, George Treadwell and Zusse Levinton of TAMS made statements that caused some observers to believe they expect to be hired to do the redesign work.

THE FIRM designed and supervised construction of the first two phases of the city's marine terminal.

In a verbal report last night a second consulting firm of Swan-Wooster concurred with the TAMS criticism of concrete piling as "inadequate for the various ice conditions" here.

Orville Kofoid, of S-W, had earlier endorsed a redesign using the approximately \$1 million worth of concrete products on hand but the endorsement was with reservations.

After his first real opportunity for a close examination of the piling, in a 14-foot section installed before work was stopped, he changed his mind, Kofoid said.

KOFOID SAID the surface erosion to the concrete piles is greater than he first suspected and it is for this reason he has rejected their use.

TAMS, in rejecting prestressed concrete piles, said they will deteriorate rapidly in this climate. It is possible, the engineers added, that the precast concrete decking already fabricated can be used with steel piling, however.

The engineering firm did not answer the city's question as to whether the damage to the 140-foot section that occurred during spring breakup was "design error," miscalculation or unforeseeable catastrophe.

After voting to fire L-S-K, the council also voted for second and third recommendations in the city attorney's package—to seek port trustee approval of a change of consulting engineers, a position presently held by L-S-K, and to negotiate for another engineering firm to produce a new design for the dock extension.

THEY ALSO voted to authorize the city attorney to take all necessary legal steps to protect the city's position against financial loss.

The council did not act, however, on a recommendation to negotiate a change order with Swalling-General, the contractor, to remove the damaged portion now in place.

This decision was based, apparently, on the feeling that a figure of \$350,000 quoted by Swalling-General was too high. The meeting was recessed to give the administration time to try and get a better price from the contractor.

NO OVERALL cost figures for the new approach were mentioned by the city, but David Fritz of L-S-K estimated that the total cancellation cost will come to a little more than \$1 million.

Nearly \$2 million of the \$3 million bond issue have been spent to date on the project and so, if Fritz's estimate is correct, nothing will be left to pay for construction of a new facility.

The council, after agreeing to have the administration try to negotiate a lower price for demolishing the damaged 140 feet of new dock, recessed the special meeting to await a report on the results of negotiations.

Anchorage Daily News, Saturday, June 10, 1967

COUNCIL

Citizens Urge Dock Salvage

A delegation of Anchorage citizens, meeting Thursday night with the Anchorage City Council, urged that all efforts be made to salvage as much as possible from the North Dock extension at the Port of Anchorage.

THE COUNCIL has approved demolition of the first section of the new construction, damaged by last winter's ice.

A total of 154 persons had petitioned the council for a hearing on its decisions on the port. Approximately 25 met with the council.

Hugh Wade, attorney for the group, told the council that many were convinced that the dock could be salvaged.

MAYOR Elmer Rasmuson outlined in detail the steps the council had taken in arriving at its decisions to discharge the original dock extension engineers, demolish the damaged structure and contract with a second engineering firm for a new dock design.

ANCHORAGE DAILY NEWS, Thursday, May 25, 1967 —

Council Sets Meeting Friday on Port Problem

The city council Tuesday night passed over action in a revised contractor proposal for removal of the partially finished, damaged addition to the city wharf, and instead agreed to a special meeting on Friday.

TO BE considered is the problem of negotiating the cost with the contractor and, if the proposals arrive in time, new design plans from two engineering firms for a new dock extension.

Swalling-General, the contractor, originally estimated a cost of \$350,000 to remove 140 feet of damaged prestressed concrete dock.

After being asked by the city council to review the estimate more closely, the contractor has submitted five al-

ternate proposals ranging from \$327,734 for complete removal and dumping of the material to \$223,298 for removal of deck- ing, blasting of the piles at the mudline and letting the city haul away the debris.

THE NEW estimates are based on 40 to 50 days of eight hours each for completion of the job.

Robert A. Crook, engineer for the contractor, also recommended to the city that it accept the proposal of Concrete Technology Corp. for delivery of most of the remainder of the building material for the dock as formerly designed. Fabricated in Tacoma, Wash., 903 tons of precast sections are now awaiting shipment here.

Concrete Technology notified the city that the material is to be delivered as part of a package freight material and if a delay in delivery is required by the city, there will be storage and increased freight costs which would greatly increase the expense to the city.

ONE OTHER development—or rather, non-development—in the port situation is a report from U.S. Representative Howard Pollock to the effect that there appears no hope of getting disaster aid from the federal government for the project.

Pollock suggested the Economic Development Administration as the most likely source of the needed funds.

14 Anchorage Daily Times Tuesday, June 13, 1967



DEMOLITION TURNS DAMAGED DOCK INTO DEBRIS

City residents who want to view the much-acclaimed city dock extension that was extensively damaged by ice action last winter had better hurry down to the Port of Anchorage soon because workmen began demolishing the structure early today. Here a workman uses a jackhammer to cut one of the reinforced steel joints that holds the concrete deck panels together. The demolition job is estimated to take at least two weeks and is being done

by Swalling-General at a cost of \$225,000 to the city. Both the city and the contractor, however, have been careful to reserve their legal rights and it's possible the city eventually will sue the contractor to recover the demolition costs. Debris from the structure will be used as rip-rap and fill material for the port's industrial park expansion area, according to Russ Painter, port director.

City To Look At Proposals Of Two Firms

Blueprints Tagged At Over \$100,000; Other Work Studied

By BOB MILLER
Times Staff Writer

It's going to cost between \$100,000 and \$120,000 to redesign the north extension to the city dock at the Port of Anchorage if the City Council decides favorably on one of the two newest engineering proposals for the job.

Swan-Wooster Engineers of Portland, Ore., and Tippetts, Abbott, McCarthy, Stratton of New York and Seattle have submitted proposals that will be considered by the council in a special meeting at 4 p.m. Wednesday. The meeting will be held in the council chambers at Loussac Library.

Prior to the meeting, the Port Commission is expected to review the proposals and come up with a recommendation for the City Council.

At the same time the councilmen will review Swalling-General's latest estimate that it will cost about \$225,000 to demolish the ice-damaged portion that was built last year.

The joint firm, which has the contract for construction of a dock extension, will be doing the demolition at no profit and the city hall will haul the rubble to a disposal site if the proposal is approved by the council.

Swan-Wooster has estimated the total cost for a preliminary study and final design of the extension will be "less than \$120,000." The fee for a full time resident engineer on the job will be \$3,000 a month, according to the proposal.

TAMS has estimated the redesign cost to be about \$100,000 and the monthly fee for a resident engineer on the job at \$3,200.

Both redesign proposals feature the use of steel piles instead of prestressed concrete piles such as the ones used in the original design by Lounsbury, Sleavin and Kelly, a joint engineering firm that was dismissed by the council earlier this month.

LSK has submitted a request for payment of \$9,733 that it feels the city owes it for work that has been done in the past. The total contract price, according to City Manager Ben Marsh, was \$272,000 and to date LSK has been paid about \$191,355.

Swalling-General also has submitted a request for payment for work done during April on the trestle that is designed to eventually connect the end of the dock extension with Ocean Dock Road. The request is for \$39,620, according to Marsh.

Both Swan-Wooster and TAMS served as consultants to the city council when it was pondering what to do about the severely damaged dock extension. TAMS, a firm that served as engineering consultant to the port for several years, designed the old dock and the POL facility.

Thane Brown, vice president and manager of Swan-Wooster, has been assisting the city in its claim against insurance carriers to get additional funds for the earthquake damage to the old dock.