

Joanna Sanders

From: etbjtb@broadstripe.net
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 12:49 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Moorage Increase

Dear Port of PT,

I would like to voice my support for maintaining a steady 3% rate increase (if you must) for the next five years instead of being jerked around every year because of random fluctuations in the CPI.
Thank you.

Jack & Elizabeth Becker
D Dock

From: [sheri smith-suryan](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Airport hangar lease increase
Date: Monday, October 9, 2023 6:14:41 AM

Please consider a \$.06 per square foot increase rather than the higher \$.08 per square foot increase. Thank you.

With much appreciation.
Sheri Smith Suryan
Hangar C Association

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Joanna Sanders

From: wrnles777@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, October 8, 2023 12:38 PM
To: Public Comments; Eron Berg
Cc: Carol Hasse; Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke
Subject: Land lease Rate Increase at Jefferson County Airport

To: Port Director and Port Commissioners of Port Townsend:

I have been renting a hanger at the Jefferson County airport for the past 4 years and have become concerned about your proposed rate increase.

Currently, the actual rates being paid by the leaseholders average out at 5.9 cents per sq foot per month. This proposed 8 cent rate is an increase of 35.6% over that, which I feel is excessive, especially when the Port has said that for the 2024 budget they will hold rate increases across the port to 4.6%. This will affect hangar renters as well as hangar owners, since the increased costs will be passed along in higher rents.

I suggested that as part of the 2024 budget planning process, the Port should establish the lease rate at 6.2 cents per sq foot per month. This is about a 5.1% increase over the average now being paid. This 5.1% is more than the 4.6% increase you are planning for the rest of the Port, but it's a compromise I think both we and the Port can live with.

The Port feels a need to see more revenue from the airport, which I can understand. But the increased rate should be reasonable and in line with what other airports are charging. A long time hanger owner did a recent informal comparison of land lease rates from 7 local airports, with the rates averaging out at about 6 cents, so a 6.2 cent rate is certainly in the right ballpark.

I think \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high a percentage rate increase for the airport land leases to impose in 1 year. On average, this represents a 35.6% increase for hangar owners. I suggest that \$.062/square foot

rate would be a more appropriate step increase. This is still a 5.1% rate increase (on average). This would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonably impacting hangar owners.

Thank you for your consideration.

Warren Leslie

Joanna Sanders

From: Richard Grandy <richard@grandymarble.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 8, 2023 9:51 AM
To: Public Comments
Subject: I agree with Eric Taylor , lease rate increase Port Townsend International Airport .

Sent from my iPhone

Joanna Sanders

From: Pam Petranek
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 12:27 PM
To: Joanna Sanders
Cc: Eron Berg
Subject: FW: Moorage rate increases

Public comment

From: Charley Kanieski <kanieskicharley@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 7, 2023 4:09 PM
To: Carol Hasse <Carol@portofpt.com>; Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Pete Hanke <phanke@portofpt.com>
Subject: Moorage rate increases

Dear Commissioners Hasse, Petranek and Hanke,
I understand that the moorage rates are under discussion (and vote?) at your next meeting.
I've done a lot of research and found that that CPI over the last 40 years or so has been 3.16%. There are of course high increases some years and minimal others. That is the problem with going with just CPI, the fluctuation.
If you went with a straight 3% per year it would be a lot easier on the moorage tenants (I no longer am one, so no personal benefit) per year, knowing what their cost of keeping their boat will be, and the Port would average about the same income.
One of your missions is to take care of the citizens of the community which this would accomplish and without hurting the Port long term.
Best of both worlds!
Thanks for listening,
Charley Kanieski, concerned citizen.

Follow my adventures on my blog posts at <https://adventuresofcharley.com/>

Joanna Sanders

From: Eron Berg
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 12:30 PM
To: Joanna Sanders
Subject: Fwd: Jefferson County Airport Lease Rate

From: michaelpayne@olypen.com <michaelpayne@olypen.com>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 11:15:32 AM
To: Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>
Cc: Carol Hasse <Carol@portofpt.com>; Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Pete Hanke <phanke@portofpt.com>; spamcan57@gmail.com <spamcan57@gmail.com>
Subject: Jefferson County Airport Lease Rate

To Whom It May Concern,

In my opinion, and in the opinion of every airport property lease holder with whom I have spoken, your 2023 proposed lease rate increase to \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high of a percentage increase for any single year rate increase at the Jefferson County Airport. At the proposed rate of \$.08 per sq ft, it would result in an average rate increase of 36% for hangar owners. I am suggesting a rate of \$.065 per sq ft for all airplane hangar leased property. This would be a much more appropriate increase for a single year lease rate increase. A \$.065 rate increase equates to a 10% (on average) increase to the lease holders at the Jefferson County Airport. This would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonably impacting hangar owners.

Sincerely,

Mike Payne
Director
Port Townsend Aero Museum

From: [Eron Berg](#)
To: [Joanna Sanders](#); [Eric Toews](#)
Subject: Fwd: Airport Lease Rates
Date: Monday, October 9, 2023 12:28:43 PM

From: John S Oliveira <jsoliveira@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 12:22:52 PM
To: Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>
Subject: Airport Lease Rates

My name is John Oliveira, I am the Treasurer of “Jefferson Hangar Associates” which leases the space that Hangar group I occupies.

I am very concerned about the 2024 budget that includes a raise in the base hangar rate to \$ 0.08 per square foot. While our lease has another three years to run as it has a five year term and was effective December 1 2021, it includes a provision for CPI (consumer price index) adjustments which should be adequate. A combination of CPI adjustments and arbitrary step function increases seems very unreasonable.

When our lease was negotiated in 2021 the increase was approximately 84%. We understand reason and are now paying for years of neglected lease management by the Port. In the second or current year of our lease the CPI adjustment was 4.6%. We are now paying \$ 0.0626 per square foot per month. If the CPI adjustments were to continue at 4.6% per year, we would be paying \$0.0705 per square foot, and increase of 19.5% in 4 years. In light of the CPI increases the the Jump to a rate of \$0.08 per square foot is unreasonable. As hangar owners we have no idea what your plans might be for future base rates.

While I have heard the claim that these rates are comparable to other port properties, a true analysis of comparable airport properties has not been conducted since 2001.

Please reconsider the exorbitant increase you are considering.

John Oliveira
Treasurer
Jefferson Hangar Associates.
Hangar Condo I

From: [Glen Simecek](#)
To: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed lease rate increase at Jefferson County Int'l Airport
Date: Monday, October 9, 2023 5:34:17 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed lease rates at Jefferson County International Airport. I own two hangars at the airport and am the President of the K Hangar Association. I was disappointed to hear of the proposed increase in our annual lease rate which would raise our rate from the current 5.9 cents per square foot to 8 cents per square foot. While I recognize that inflation is affecting the cost of running the airport, this would amount to 36% increase. This is particularly concerning as it appears higher than comparable airports nearby and we have no assurance that we won't face similar increases in the future. Furthermore, I understand the K Hangar Association's rent is on par with the average rate on the field but that rates vary.

I strongly recommend that rate increases be limited to no more than 10% which would suggest a rate of approximately 6.5% and that rates be harmonized across the different tenants so that we all pay a proportionate share to operate the airport.

As I said, I will be unable to attend the meeting as I will traveling for work but am available to discuss my concerns via email or phone.

Thanks for considering my concerns,

-Glen

Glen D. Simecek
glensimecek@yahoo.com
206.295.0155

Joanna Sanders

From: Sebastian Eggert <seb@spectrumanalytics.net>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 10:33 PM
To: Public Comments
Cc: Eron Berg; Pete Hanke; Pam Petranek; Carol Hasse
Subject: Rate Increase

Der Friends,

I have been a recreational pilot flying from Jefferson County International Airport since 1977, forty six years. I own a small airplane and a hangar space, C-10. I have owned the hangar for about seven years.

The Port now proposes a rent increase, trying to justify it by asking the airport to cover its own cost of operation. It is understandable and somewhat reasonable to ask for a periodic increase to follow the cost of living index, but the increase proposed feels punitive and reactionary. We know not what has prompted this extraordinary jump in the ground rent. Please explain.

The Port is obligated by the FAA to perform certain maintenance duties and follow guidelines from them in return for the generous funding they have granted to pay for the recent and current airfield improvements. These add to the functionality and commercial advantage of the airport. The quality of the airport facility has the potential to bring more business and more jobs to our community.

We experienced a small earthquake yesterday. If there was a significantly larger one that created a tsunami the Port would be wrecked, along with the ferry system and maybe even the Hood Canal Bridge. The remaining link to the mainland would be through the airport. Volunteers have practiced the logistics of bringing critical supplies such as medicines, food and other supplies to Port Townsend in the event of natural disaster such as this. And the ramp outside the Port Townsend Aero Museum is commonly used for the medvac helicopter service to quickly move critically ill patients to Harborview Medical Center for life-saving treatments.

I suggest that as the buildup of hangars and the possible industrial development south of the runway continues the increased revenue would be larger than the cost to maintain. The very fact that this airport is so much busier than ever is a testimony to its important and value to the community.

We ask the recreational boat owners to pay their fair share, as we do the resident airplane owners, but unlike the airport, the commercial uses of the Boat Haven carry the weight of the budget of the Port. Not so the airport, but the Port's plans may help change this.

The Port has done a few minor fixes but promises things like a pilot lounge, a trifle that may be nice but really isn't that necessary. (Personally, I'd rather keep my rent down than have a lounge. That's what the Spruce Goose is!) The Port recently settled a dispute with my hangar condominium association and rather than ask for a huge refund of many years of overpayments to the Port we accepted a very reasonable extension of our lease, but now the Port is asking for a huge increase in the ground rent. This seems patently unfair, especially all at once.

It would be far more acceptable to all of us that contribute to the activities and the spirit of the aviation community to have a more gradually stepped increase in the ground lease rate. Let us acclimate to the increase a bit at a time. Perhaps as these costs are balanced by the development of new commercial and industrial facilities the increase might not need to be so high, and we can still be at par with other similar airports.

Do not drive us away; we are your best lifeline in case of a disaster. The airport has “PORT” in its name, and we are a critical part of your infrastructure. Please understand that the fire department does not make money, the highway department does not make money, and the police and sheriff are not out to make money. They are all considered important public resources available to everyone, paid for by all the taxpayers. They are there if and when they need them. It is not essential for the airport to break even, as much as that reads well in the press. Just make sure it is run well, that maintenance takes care of the facility (paint the rusty hangar roofs, please!) and that it is there for anyone and everyone when they need it.

Sincerely,

Sebastian Eggert
Port Townsend

From: [Linda L.](#)
To: [Carol Hasse](#); [Pam Petranek](#); [Pete Hanke](#); [Eron Berg](#)
Cc: [Public Comments](#)
Subject: Hangar Lease Rates Out of Control
Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 9:29:41 AM

Jefferson County Airport is not the place to be raising rates to levels that simply add up to being too high for many people to afford, especially younger people looking to get into aviation as a hobby or as a profession. The airport is an educational resource for many pilots, young and old.

Many pilots are barely able to afford flying in the first place, and those looking to build hours toward a flying career are often better off trying to buy and maintain an airplane to build time, rather than renting. Adding up the costs of hangar lease, hangar maintenance, hangar insurance, and hangar taxes, It costs a LOT of money to be involved at our airport before you even buy a plane and try to maintain and fly it. Obviously, we have pilots locally to whom money is no object, some have gobs of it, but those pilots are not the majority, and certainly not the ones being hurt by your aggressive rate increases. Leaving an airplane outside, although much less expensive, causes rapid deterioration and often leads to other damage. Hangars are essential to aircraft owners.

For an airport that has little or no transportation available to town, no place for pilots to get out of the weather, no bathroom facilities for pilots and passengers needing relief or a sink to wash up (or clean up a mess after having a sick passenger), your lease rate increase is just too high. If anything you should LOWER the standard rate until such time that the Port deals with the issues mentioned, so that the airport becomes an even greater asset to the community and visiting pilots.

Tom and Linda Lemanski

Joanna Sanders

From: etbjtb@broadstripe.net
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 12:21 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Moorage Rate Comment

Hi Pam,

After our phone conversation yesterday I was working in my shop, and my mind kept mulling over our conversation. The more I thought about the proposed "3% for 5 years" idea, the more it seemed like a no-brainer, a win-win for everyone. Not only would the tenants appreciate the stability, but the Port would also be able to more accurately predict their income several years in advance. It would also save the staff the time spent researching the issue every single year, time that could be better spent, perhaps, by cleaning up the rate fiasco at the airport, as one example.

FYI, the proposed 3% rate is higher than the latest 20 year CPI (2.58%), so the Port is still coming out ahead. I don't see any reason why the Port should not accept this proposal.

Thanks for your time.

Jack Becker

Joanna Sanders

From: Skip Forster <skipforster@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 12:28 PM
To: Carol Hasse; Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke; Eron Berg; Public Comments
Subject: Land lease rate increases

Hello,

My wife and I own a single-engine Mooney airplane that we keep in a rented hangar at Jefferson County airport. I understand that as part of the 2024 budgeting process, the Port is proposing to increase land lease rates which will have the effect of increasing hangar rent. I understand that the Port needs sources of revenue, and I have no objection to paying my fair share. However, the proposed increases seem excessive.

I would like assurance that any increase is based on an analysis of what is customary at other similar airports in western Washington state. I believe that the Port should justify any increase by publishing the results of its analysis before an increase is enacted. Otherwise, it just appears that the Port is trying to obtain whatever the traffic will bear which does not seem appropriate for a government entity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Skip Forster

Joanna Sanders

From: David Carbaugh <dccarbaugh@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 4:45 PM
To: Carol Hasse; Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke; Eron Berg; Public Comments
Subject: Rate increases

Hello,

As a hanger owner at Jefferson County airport I think \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high a percentage rate increase for the airport land leases to impose in 1 year. On average, this represents about a 36% increase for hangar owners. I suggest that \$.065/square foot rate would be a more appropriate step increase. This is still a 10% rate increase (on average). This would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonably impacting hangar owners.

I will be attending the next meeting and look forward to you addressing this issue.

Thanks,

Dave Carbaugh L-9

Joanna Sanders

From: Pam Petranek
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 7:40 AM
To: Joanna Sanders
Subject: FW: Hangar land lease

public

-----Original Message-----

From: c.malcolm mckinnon <macairinc@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 4:28 PM
To: Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>
Subject: Hangar land lease

I am a pilot and although not a hangar owner at Jefferson County I do rent space for aviation activities. A look at some of the comparable in the area suggest that the Ports rate increase at this time is not reasonable...a rate increase more in line with the CPI would seem acceptable to all parties Thank you C. Malcolm McKinnon

Joanna Sanders

From: Pam Petranek
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 7:38 AM
To: Joanna Sanders
Subject: FW: Rate increase

Public comment

-----Original Message-----

From: jtpt@olypen.com <jtpt@olypen.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 3:10 PM
To: Carol Hasse <Carol@portofpt.com>; Pete Hanke <phanke@portofpt.com>; Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>
Subject: Rate increase

Dear Carol, Pam, Pete, and Eron,

I feel that \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high a percentage rate increase for the airport land leases to impose in 1 year.

On average, this represents about a 36% increase for hangar owners. I suggest the \$.065/square foot rate would be a more appropriate step increase.

This is still a 10% rate increase (on average). This would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonable impacting hangar owners.

Hangar owners have continued to have a yearly CPI rate increase every year for as long as I can remember.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Peggy Thuotte
Treasurer for G and K Hangar Associations

Joanna Sanders

From: Eron Berg
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 8:09 AM
To: Joanna Sanders
Subject: Fwd: Jeffco rate increase

From: Gary Peterson <gepeterson55@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 7:51:03 AM
To: Pam Petranek <Pam@portofpt.com>; Pete Hanke <phanke@portofpt.com>
Cc: Carol Hasse <Carol@portofpt.com>; Eron Berg <Eron@portofpt.com>
Subject: Jeffco rate increase

I am a retired person who purchased my hangar as a post retirement activity. The increases being looked at are way above inflation increases and are pricing me out of a hobby I have enjoyed for 40 years. General Aviation is no longer affordable and will slowly become non existent with increases such as this. You already collect taxes when I purchase fuel.

I think \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high a percentage rate increase for the airport land leases to impose in 1 year. On average, this represents about a 36% increase for hangar owners. I suggest that \$.065/square foot rate would be a more appropriate step increase. This is still a 10% rate increase (on average). This would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonably impacting hangar owners. Or, roll back the taxes collected on fuel.

Gary Peterson
612-810-5161

Joanna Sanders

From: Russell and Kristen Ackland <russandkristen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:39 PM
To: Public Comments; Eron Berg; Pete Hanke; Pam Petranek; Carol Hasse
Subject: Jefferson County Airport Land Lease Rates

Hello

I am the owner of Hangar B-15 {1600sq ft} and am writing to add my concern over the large lease rate increase. MANY {other} costs are on the rise, and although \$33 extra per month may not seem a lot, when combined with other price increases associated with inflation/hangar ownership, the increase **IS** asymmetrically significant. For this reason I think \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high a percentage rate increase for the airport land leases to impose in **1 year**. On average this represents about a **36% increase** for hangar owners, therefore I suggest that **\$.065/square foot** rate would be a more appropriate step increase. .065 is still a 10% rate increase and would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonably impacting hangar owners.

Russell Ackland
Hangar B-15

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Joanna Sanders

From: Dennis Lenton <lenton@waypt.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 5:27 PM
To: Carol Hasse
Cc: Pam Petranek; Pete Hanke; Eron Berg; Public Comments
Subject: Hangar Ground Lease

Dear Port Commissioners,

I think \$.08 per sq foot per month is too high a percentage rate increase for the airport land leases to impose in 1 year. On average, this represents about a 36% increase for hangar owners.

I suggest that \$.065/square foot rate would be a more appropriate step increase. This is still a 10% rate increase (on average). This would significantly increase the revenue collected by the port without unreasonably impacting hangar owners.

Thank you for your consideration

Dennis Lenton G4

Joanna Sanders

From: Todd Uecker <cgmwster@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 11:02 AM
To: Eron Berg; Pam Petranek; Carol Hasse; Pete Hanke
Cc: Public Comments
Subject: Airport lease rate increase

Hello all,

I am sending this email to support Eric Taylor's study and assessment of the proposed 2024 lease rate increase for airport leaseholders. I agree that an intermediate step of \$.065 per square foot is more in line with the surrounding airports as well as more inline with other port properties. As a participant in both arenas it seems more like fair play for all involved.

Sincerely,

Todd Uecker
President
Cape George Marine Works, Inc.
1924 Cape George Rd.
Port Townsend, WA 98368
www.capecutters.com