

From: Liz Hoenig <lizhoenig@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 12:56:29 PM

To: Bill Putney <bill@portofpt.com>; Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Pete Hanke <phanke@portofpt.com>

Cc: Charley Kanieski <kanieskicharley@gmail.com>; Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>; Eric Toews <eric@portofpt.com>; Abigail Berg <abigail@portofpt.com>

Subject: Expanded 2021 Budget Comments

Dear Commissioners,

We would like to follow-up on and expand our recent comments regarding your 2021 Operating and Capital Budget planning process, and share some perspectives we have from being deeply involved in Port financial and planning issues over the past 3 years. It has always been our goal - as stated in our [Financial Freedom Plan](#) - to help create a financially healthy and sustainable Port organization that meets our community's needs.

With that goal in mind, we would like to share the following insights and suggestions:

- Present an integrated package of operating budget, 6-year capital budget (including actual funding sources - not just a wish list), and revenues (including a proposal for IDD taxing levels). We suggest you seriously consider maximizing IDD funds over the next four years and use them to fund mission critical projects - with jetty repair at the top. There is a policy level discussion to have about when grant money versus IDD funds should be used, especially when grants may be more of a "wish" than a "promise" of funding. Let's get our critical projects "shovel-ready" and then fund them with IDD generated local dollars. Commissioners need to have an in-depth discussion about how to maximize IDD funds. Staff working on capital projects can be funded through the capital budget for as long as they are needed - but not added to operating expenses.
- Hold operating expenses to 2017 levels for five years. That was our original proposal in 2018, and the 2020 budget was the first budget adopted by our Port which actually succeeded in holding expenses. Look hard at existing organizational structure and talent. Develop a strategic plan.
- Do not use the language of "subsidizing" one service area over another. Look at our whole Port as providing services to the community. Boats/marinas can be an "operational unit". Point Hudson does not need to be self supporting - that's like saying Yellowstone Park needs to be self-supporting. All of the boating/marina facilities are inter-related and fueling the marine trades in Jefferson County.
- Keep rate increases at the CPI - not above. Stay true to that policy and commitment to tenants and patrons.
- Involve Commissioners and the community in transparent negotiations with the Teamsters union.
- Revive the recommendations from the March 2017 Marina Assessment Report - attached. Develop a plan for improved customer service and follow the very reasonable and low cost recommendations from this report.
- Have existing staff develop a preventative maintenance plan. This is really a planning function in addition to a maintenance function. Maintenance folks need a planner who can help them go through the steps, to think big picture, and develop a plan. Here's a [link](#) to an example of how to develop a plan, including how a budget is developed.

Thank you for the opportunity to be involved.

Charley Kanieski and Liz Hoenig Kanieski

From: Bertram Levy <bertramlevymusic@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 8:56 AM

To: Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>; Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Peter Hanke <petehanke@gmail.com>; Bill Putney <bill@portofpt.com>

Subject: Workshop budget comments

1. Prepay: Thanks you for considering this option: I have a few comments:
 - a. What is the percentage charge for credit card use?
 - b. What mechanism would you use to refund prepay if the slip is used for transient when the tenant is out?
 - c. If a tenant releases tenancy what would be the mechanism of refunding the balance of the year?

2. Ramp:
 - a. I agree with removing the 3 month incentive. The idea of its inception was based on a significant drop in annual pass purchase over the last 4 years and based on the annual pass running from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31. When the port went on a random 12 month system, the incentive system ceased to have any relevance.

 - b. I believe that the Port would benefit from going to a Jan. 1 to Dec. 31 system. Ramp users would get an annual sticker which they would apply to the trailer. This would allow Port staff to monitor which tenants are prepaid. The daily users would have to apply a daily sticker (barcode) to the trailer which would allow the Port to READILY monitor which users are not paying. This would identify the users that don't pay. On the latter note: there is a folk myth that the ramp is free and the users are paying for the use of the parking lot. If you observe, there are a number of trailers that are parked on the street even when the lot is empty. (Yesterday I counted 7 trailers). Those numbers represent loss revenue which adds up over a season.

 - c. Incentive programs for annual pass purchase still could be useful. The key is in the water use. As discussed with Eron, the Port needs to look at the costs of the washdown (with the water bills). It remains to be seen if this is a significant utility cost but the Port should not be gifting services. Water use could be included in the annual cards but charged extra for daily ramp users. Also there should be a 10 minute limit. Washing is for the axles, not for washing the boat or flushing the engine for long periods of time. If the time exceeds 10 minutes, the water shuts off. People who want more water should have to purchase additional water use time. Annual pass purchasers could reinsert their card for an additional 10 minutes.

3. Coupling costs to cost centers for capital improvement makes good sense. I have advocated for this for years. I will be interested to review the commission's comments on this. issue

Thank you for your consideration

Bertram Levy

From: Charley Kanieski <kanieskicharley@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 7:07 PM

To: Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Pete Hanke <phanke@portofpt.com>; Bill Putney <bill@portofpt.com>; Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>

Cc: Liz Hoenig <lizhoenig@gmail.com>

Subject: budget considerations for 2021 budget

All,

Here are some things to consider when planning your 2021 budget:

1. Make sure to get the maximum amount for the IDD for the next year. You need this money for projects and the public clearly showed that they want these projects done, so this is politically safe and necessary for our infrastructure.
2. Skip the additional person to work on grants for Point Hudson. You can subcontract out any grant writing necessary without adding an additional person you need to pay full time, give retirement and health insurance to. The reason that the budget has worked for the last two years is that expenses were held. Adding an additional person for this would violate that.
3. Skip adding someone to administer the IDD money. This seems ridiculous in that the infrastructure that it is used for will have engineering oversight attached to it. Not necessary and would again violate what got us here (not bankrupt-see no 2. above).

Thanks for listening,

Charley and Liz Kanieski

Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 2:07 PM
To: PPT Info <info@portofpt.com>
Subject: Low airplane flyovers Discovery Bay Heights

I notice that there is a Port Public Commission meeting tomorrow, August 12, 2020. I just noticed this today on the Port's web site. I mention this because, while I realize that my concerns expressed below will not be an agenda item, that there is a chance that they might be discussed without the direct mention of my name.

Two weeks ago yesterday I left a voice message with the Airport (apparently also the Port's General Administration) phone number to express some concerns regarding both the safety and noise level of extremely low flying aircraft, some on landing, but most after takeoff. Overwhelming, these are very small aircraft, some extremely loud. I find it amazing that there is a huge difference in noise level of aircraft of the same (generally quite small) approximate size. I assume that this most likely has to do with the age of the aircraft. I left my phone number and left a polite message asking for a call back. No one has ever called me back.

I am aware that there is essentially no direct control by the Port over how or where pilots fly and that the routes suggested to avoid direct flight (except in emergency or safety of course!) over the areas on the map of the airport area that are outlined by white lines (on the Port web site) are essentially only "guidelines" and are not in any way enforced by the Port. Clearly, these guidelines are not being followed by at least a significant minority of the aircraft, especially on weekends. The noise level generated by these low and directly overhead aircraft during these (mostly Saturday and Sunday) times during the summer is extremely high and extremely frequent.

I am aware that, as a resident in the Discovery Bay Heights subdivision, and, due to the location of my home near the airport, it is to be expected that there will be aircraft noise. However, and this is my point, I am questioning whether there is any training or emphasis given to pilots to be even minimally aware concerning both the safety issues relating to directly flying at low altitudes over houses near the airport and/or the extremely loud ground level noise that these aircraft may be generating. I am also questioning whether or not there is any oversight by the Port concerning FAA published minimal altitude requirements and/or noise level measurement methods and/or aircraft FAA published noise level requirements under 14 CFR Part 36.501. I will admit to a very incomplete understanding of these code regulations, for which it appears that there are many exceptions.

I want to strongly emphasize that I am in no way advocating for any discontinuation of aircraft activity at the Jefferson County Airport. At the same time, I would respectfully request that the concerns addressed above be brought to the Port's attention and that someone there have the courtesy to discuss this issue with me and to recognize that this is a legitimate concern.

I would also appreciate that my name not be announced publicly or in minutes of any official Port meetings due to the very strong feelings of some community members expressed (and I paraphrase) as "the airport was there before you or your neighborhood so you have no business complaining" or "you should have considered the airport noise before you moved there." While I acknowledge and appreciate these sentiments, I also feel that, as a resident and a taxpayer I have the right to voice my concerns that the Port's published "guidelines" for both safety and noise mitigation are not being followed by a substantial number of low flying aircraft while both taking off and landing.

Respectfully,
Discovery Bay Highland resident