**From:** Liz Hoenig
**To:** Public Comments; Pam Petranek; Carol Hasse; Pete Hanke
**Cc:** Eron Berg
**Subject:** Testimony for Today"s Public Hearing
**Date:** Wednesday, October 28, 2026 9:41:26 AM

---

Dear Commissioners -

This testimony is a follow-up to the email I sent several days ago suggesting a fresh approach for our Port. My proposal is to pause the push for an IDD levy and to prioritize work on the Affordability Threshold Policy proposal (I am happy to attend a future Port meeting to discuss that proposal in more detail). I believe our Port should take leadership on this significant regional issue of collective burden and affordability now - not focus on campaigning for a $35 million dollar levy in 2027.

The Strong Towns approach I shared is something that could be the cornerstone of our Port's way of approaching challenges - start small. We are a small community. Of course it does not preclude large capital improvement, infrastructure projects. But, nationwide, as you know, communities are struggling with the financial burdens of infrastructure construction and maintenance. My experience and point of view is that decisions on large scale, expensive infrastructure projects should be taken very slowly, and carefully considered by the entire community.

It seems as if Port staff have focused on the IDD as the primary "solution" to a capital funding challenge? The Washington legislature did not authorize formation of IDDs to bridge revenue gaps for Ports that cannot figure out a way to sustainably fund and maintain our infrastructure. IDD levies are not an opportunity to fund capital "wish lists". The intent of that legislation passed in 1955 is to give public ports the legal authority and financial tools to buy, clean up, and redevelop "marginal lands".

Is it good fiscal management to rely on a voter approved levy for critical infrastructure needs? Do you have a back up plan if the IDD levy fails? I'd be interested in seeing what that plan might look like? I question why more scenarios and options have not been presented to Commissioners and our community? Why not scale back on our Port's overall capital improvement program? Focus on the critical priorities, and those projects that are the "need to have" rather than the "nice to have"? Stretch it out over 20 or 30 years, rather than ten? What are the Costs/Benefits to our community of the single bid versus phased approach or continuing to repair rather than replace? What other funding strategies or sources have been evaluated and researched? Seems to me our community should always get to see a range of costs and scenarios associated with large scale infrastructure needs.

I took a quick look through Port capital planning documents online - and became very confused about the $35 million price tag that has been mentioned. There is not a consistent estimate for Boat Haven improvements in any of the documents. The adopted budget, capital plan for 2026 shows a total amount for the next five years as just over $16 M, for everything related to Boat Haven. The CSHI that was adopted in 2020, and is published on the website has a total of just over $20 M for Boat Haven projects over the next 20 years. I do see an amended CSHI dated for November this year - that I guess is being considered as part of the budget process, anticipating money coming from the IDD levy? That document has an estimate of just over $20 M for the next five years of Boat Haven improvements? As you know, the Washington legislature mandated the Comprehensive Scheme to act as a system of

checks and balances—ensuring that ports remain public servants who must show their work to the voters before spending public funds.

My point here is that there is not just a problem with whether our community can afford this, but there is also a problem with transparency.

Sincerely,

Liz Hoenig Kanieski
715 Taylor St
Port Townsend, WA  98368