

From: Ernie Baird <erniebaird@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2020 9:02 AM
To: PPT Info <info@portofpt.com>
Subject: New position of Port Engineer

Honorable commissioners,

Creating a new highly compensated staff position during a period of economic distress is surprising. In light of the necessity and cost of the capital projects facing the Port I believe the new position makes sense. Perhaps the new Port Engineer will create grant and loan proposals that are ready for submission when funds become available. If so, the money spent on the new position seems like a prudent gamble. It's clear the Port will only be able to bear the cost of its capital projects with funding from outside sources. That said, I believe the Commission should add some requirements for hiring and review of the new position.

The Port Engineer should be hired through a competitive process. The new position should be widely advertised with a job description. The job description should not be limited to persons who have an engineering degree or an engineering license. Persons with equivalent experience in project management should be considered. Likewise, the Port could consider advertising a range of compensation rather than specifying \$108,000 for part time work.

The position of Port Engineer could be reviewed 3 years following its creation. The review would consider grant and loan funds actually received by the Port during the tenure of the Port Engineer. The review might also consider efficiencies achieved by having the manager of capital projects on staff as compared to hiring outside contractors to do that work.

Thanks to Executive Director Berg for an interesting and creative proposal.

Respectfully, Ernie Baird

From: Phil Pilgrim <phil@buenosystems.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 11:25 AM
To: Karen Erickson <karen@portofpt.com>
Subject: Public comment for tomorrow's meeting.

Hi Karen,

Here's a copy of the comment that I would like to read at tomorrow's Zoom meeting. Please make it a part of the official record.

Thanks!
-Phil

I'm a partner in a 26' Thunderbird that occupies a 30' slip on "T-bird row." We've been grandfathered in that slip since just after the A/B dock rebuild in 2011 when we were assigned to it, in place of the 25' slip we contracted for before the rebuild. We are paying \$271.66/mo. vs. the full rate of \$318.76/mo. for the 30' slip, a difference of \$565.20 per year. What we're paying is barely what we can afford as it is.

That grandfathering might be suspended is tragic news, indeed. Because of that, I would like to propose several alternatives, listed from most desirable to least desirable:

1. Keep the grandfathering provisions as they are, and let normal attrition diminish the ranks of grandfathered tenants. This may well meet the Port's objectives, assuming the attrition rate is high enough. But someone has to do the research to find out what the historical attrition rate has been in order to project it into the future. There are 70 grandfathered slips now. How many were there when grandfathering began?
2. Keep the grandfathering provisions for any tenant who is on a waiting list for a smaller slip, and eliminate the waiting list fees for that tenant. When a smaller slip becomes available, the tenant would have the option to move to the smaller slip or begin paying the full rate for the slip they currently occupy.
3. Phase in the full rate for the slip over a ten-year period, while eliminating waiting-list fees for affected tenants who want to move to a smaller slip. By the way, the six-month "phase-in" mentioned at the last meeting is more like shock and awe. It's not really a phase-in by any stretch of the word and it would create an instant and sizeable demand for smaller slips. For example, to accommodate everyone grandfathered in a 30' slip who could fit in a 27' slip would require an extra twenty-nine 27' slips to be available. Such a demand can obviously not be met in a short amount of time. That the Port would be artificially creating a demand that it cannot meet is very unfair to the affected tenants. A ten-year phase-in would be more respectful of the tenants' needs and abilities to pay.

In any event, the legal term "grandfathering," without a pre-specified time limit, implies perpetuity. For example, my garage sits on the property line. It's grandfathered in, because the city imposed setback requirements after it was built. The city will NEVER come back and impose the setbacks, requiring me to tear down my garage. The same should apply here. For that reason alone, I recommend that you give the highest consideration to option #1 above.

Thanks,
Phil Pilgrim

From: johnniethek <johnniethek@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 9:37 AM

To: PPT Info <info@portofpt.com>

Subject: Question for port commissioners...

Greetings one and all,

As a recent liveaboard tenant at Boat Haven Marina, I was SHOCKED to learn that it does not have wi-fi access. This is the 21st Century, after all, and providing your customers with reliable Internet access is a cost of doing business these days.

Further, providing public access to the Internet is now a federal, state and (should be) local imperative in this time of expanded remote work and learning. Everyone should have easy access to information they need to stay informed about the rapidly changing world we live in.

I had an enjoyable talk (and exchanged e-mails) with Eron about this issue, and learned that providing reliable internet access for your customers at Boat Haven is merely "aspirational."

Here is my question: What is it going to take to move this from being "aspirational" into a line item in your budget? It seems to me that it can be done (and is being done at places like Pleasant Harbor Marina) at a very affordable rate.

Aw, heck, here is another question: When was the last time you asked your customers about their wants and needs? Perhaps it's time to do that. Lots has changed in the world in the last few years, and keeping current with the wants/needs of your customers seems like a good business practice.

Overall, I am really enjoying my time here at Boat Haven and look forward to more in the months and years ahead.

Thanks for considering my questions, and I look forward to hearing from you.

My best,

John Knowlton
Slip 220, D Dock