

October 14, 2020 Port of Port Townsend Commission Meeting

Public Comments

**From:** Bertram Levy <bertramlevymusic@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 13, 2020 7:24 AM

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

**Subject:** The 34 foot not thirties

I keep trying to figure out why this reclassification of the marina bothers me so much. Certainly I no longer have any skin in the game as I have just moved from my 40 foot D dock slip to the true 35 foot slips on B dock. It is a very nice neighborhood though going from a port tie to starboard tie after 37 years takes some getting used to.

One thing that bothers me is that this "34 not 30" policy has been in effect since 2017 and I didn't know anything about it. Seems that neither did the commissioners nor administrator. Also the rate sections in the Port brochure and Website didn't appear to know either. Only last month, after 3 years with this new policy, the new blue brochure handout with the harbor layout finally changed to the new lengths.

As I stared at the newly printed brochure I was struck by how few true 30 slips are left. I counted 31 new 30's and 54 reclassified 34's. In 2018 when I studied the demography of the marina occupancy and waiting list, the locals were the greatest percentage of the 30s. I surmised that the 30 foot size was what the folks in this town felt they could afford. The size is ideal since lots of used 30 footers can be bought reasonably and be buffed up by our local marine trades. So removing 54- 30 footers from the inventory does not help the locals in this town. That bothers me.

As to the issue of fairness, it is not as if the longer older slips have been getting away with something for free. When a decade ago the rate structure was re-established based on area, Jim Pivarnik decided that the AB would pay for 1 foot less than their actual width while the CD and commercial would pay for 1 foot more in width than they actually had. For example the square foot for the B dock forty footers is 640 sq. feet while the old 42 footers of CD docks is 588 square feet.

Finally I am bothered by how easily the faith in my marina can be shattered. I have been taught that an agreement should be honored. For 37 years the port and I have agreed to rent their 40's. It doesn't matter how long they were, it's part of the marina's inventory of 40 footers. No doubt others have felt the same.

This simple rate change proposal has lifted the lid off of a Pandora's Box of policy and purpose. Let's take a breath, sit down in a workshop and explore the ramifications of this many headed hydra. Maybe by the time we figure it out the quality of the newly renovated CD docks will be improved and worth the price.

Thank you for your consideration

Bertram Levy

**From:** Donald Gibson <dbgibson@att.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 14, 2020 1:41 PM  
**To:** Karen Erickson <karen@portofpt.com>  
**Subject:** Legacy Rate Increase

Karen,

I have some questions & comments about the rate increase to be applied to the 30' slip I've had for the last 4 years.

I run the reciprocal program for the yacht club. When a visitor comes to PT to use our program with a boat 30' or under they will expect to pay no more than rent on a 30' slip. Much as I did when I signed the contract in 2016.

My questions:

1) Will the port issue a new map and update their website with the 'correct' lengths?

2) Are there any other slip sizes that will have new rates based on 'corrected' lengths, either increases or decreases? If so, what are they and when will they go into effect?

3) For my part, I wonder about legality considering I have a signed contract. Is this not 'Bait and Switch'? Has a lawyer reviewed this? I believe a fairer approach would be to keep rate the same for existing tenants and apply the revised rates to new tenants.

Thanks,

Don Gibson

1035 Holcomb Street  
Port Townsend, WA 98368  
(509) 280-9354 - cell

N O T I C E - This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information which is privileged, confidential or proprietary. When addressed to our clients, any information, drawings, opinions or advice contained in this e-mail is subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing agreements. Where no such agreement exists, the recipient shall neither rely upon nor disclose to others, such information without our written consent. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and destroy and delete the message from your computer.

**From:** Charley Kanieski <[kanieskicharley@gmail.com](mailto:kanieskicharley@gmail.com)>

**Date:** October 13, 2020 at 3:12:56 PM PDT

**To:** Pam Petranek <[Pam@portofpt.com](mailto:Pam@portofpt.com)>, Pete Hanke <[phanke@portofpt.com](mailto:phanke@portofpt.com)>, Bill Putney <[bill@portofpt.com](mailto:bill@portofpt.com)>

**Cc:** Eron Berg <[Eron@portofpt.com](mailto:Eron@portofpt.com)>, Liz Hoenig <[lizhoenig@gmail.com](mailto:lizhoenig@gmail.com)>, Eric Toews <[eric@portofpt.com](mailto:eric@portofpt.com)>, Abigail Berg <[abigail@portofpt.com](mailto:abigail@portofpt.com)>

**Subject: Comments on Draft Budget and CSHI**

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft 2021 Budget and the Comprehensive Scheme of Harbor Improvements (CSHI). We appreciate the format of the budget – moving towards a very transparent and clear presentation that members of the community can review. In particular, we appreciate seeing all the revenue and expenses in one document, including proposed rates, taxes, and fees. Following are our specific comments. We support using 1% as the base for rates – consistent with inflation.

#### DRAFT OPERATING BUDGET

We'd appreciate seeing what your operating priorities are for 2021, using the budget proposed. There are a number of work plan items, including update of the Strategic Plan, that are not identified. Two other items that we are concerned about include:

- Sea Level Rise analysis and planning. We would like to see the new Port Engineer/Director of Capital Projects, to take the lead on this. With waterfront properties being our primary asset, this is crucial to our long-term success. It would be irresponsible not to have this as one of our highest priorities – working collaboratively with the City, County and private property owners.
- In 2017, our Port commissioned a study of customer service needs for the marina facilities. It is high time that customer service be overhauled at our Port. One of the stated goals in the CSHI is "Provide Great Service: Helping people access Port facilities, services and shoreline areas with staff that are prompt, responsive and courteous, is essential." The investments will be minimal, but the payoffs will be significant. Please include a line item that reflects this priority.

#### DRAFT CAPITAL BUDGET

- Our philosophy with capital budgets is that they should be fully funded. This should not be a wish list – but a clear explanation to the community as to how the Port will be spending money in the next five years. As such, please include a back-up plan for funding these five years if grant funding is not received.
- We wholeheartedly support taking the maximum allowed per year on the IDD – taxpayers expect work to happen in the near term and at the least cost and least financing.

- For public transparency and accountability, the projects and the budgets for the near-term (1-5 years) should match in the proposed budget and the CSHI. Total budget for 1-5 years in CSHI is \$22,044,000 and the Proposed capital budget is \$24,940,000.
- Is the proposed capital budget adjusted to include the higher percentage match recently required for the jetty construction projects?
- We noticed that the cost of the jetty construction (\$14 M) and the funding sources (\$11.9 M) for the jetty do not appear to be equal. These numbers should be checked.

#### DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE SCHEME OF HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

- Make that the values are those created with the 2010 Strategic Plan adopted by Commissioners.
- We believe the future of Point Hudson needs to be considered in light of the community based goals – and that those, including the future of the RV park needs to be revisited.
  - Point Hudson does not need to be self-supporting. Other Port assets are not self-supporting – why Point Hudson?
  - As small boat users, we would like to see a specific line item that identifies the need for maintenance and development of easy access to the water for small boat users. Hand launches – pedestrian access to shorelines, small boat launches.
  - Collaboration with tribal government on future uses.
  - If you are going to study shoreline defense – need to also study sea level rise impacts and a plan for that.

Sincerely,

Liz Hoenig Kanieski and Charley Kanieski

Port Townsend, WA