

# **PORT OF BELLINGHAM**

**MAC (MARINA ADVISORY COMMITTEE) MEETING  
TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009  
SQUALICUM HARBOR OFFICE  
BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON**

## **Minutes**

---

### **Committee Members Present:**

Peter Border  
Mark Gumley  
Hamilton Hayes  
Jeff Hegedus  
Ryan Kapp  
Ron Kleinknecht  
Gene Knutson  
Paul Lavelle  
Tim Mumford  
Joe Orem  
Jim Splaine  
Doug Sterrett  
Roger Van Dyken  
Jerry Writer  
Jim Young

### **Committee Members Absent:**

### **Port Representatives Present:**

Dan Stahl  
Pam Taft  
John Hergesheimer

### **Committee Members Excused:**

### **Visitors/ Guests:**

Commissioner Jim Jorgensen  
Don Oates - KPFF  
Jack DeCook

### **Roll Call**

Jeff Hegedus called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

### **February 10, 2009 Minutes**

Jim Splaine pointed out that under Visitors/Guests Commission Jim Jorgensen should be changed to Commissioner Jorgensen. Ham Hayes made a motion to approve the

February 10, 2009 minutes. The motion was seconded by Tim Mumford. The motion passed unanimously. The minutes were approved as corrected.

### **Public Comment**

Jack DeCook requested that the Port of Bellingham consider subsidizing some amount of moorage for large historical wooden boats. He suggested that this would be attractive to the community and that it would honor the Port's past as a significant maritime player. Jack described that both the Port of Port Townsend and the Port of Seattle have similar facilities. In response to Jack's comment, Jeff Hegedus commented that if there was further interest this could be brought back to the MAC and asked MAC members to bring their comments at the next meeting if there was any follow-up desired.

### **New Downtown Marina (ASB)**

Dan reviewed the process that the Port is undergoing for both the clean-up and redevelopment of the Whatcom Waterway at the GP site. It should be noted that all of the MAC members were present. Dan introduced Don Oates from KPFF Engineering. Don described KPFF's role as a subconsultant to Anchor Environmental and described how the consultant team is working with both the Port and other public agencies to implement both the clean-up plan that is part of our Consent Decree as well as the desired marina and public access improvements. Don described the decisions that the Port currently needs to make in order to move the design process forward. Don described these as first tier decisions and included such things as the opening of the ASB (size and location), location of the fish passage, orientation of the floats and the inclusion of a commercial boat launch / haul out. Don then reviewed the pros and cons for the float orientation with Option A having a central spine and laterals that run off to both the north and south and Option B with a spine that runs parallel to the I & J Waterway with laterals running toward the south in the direction of the Whatcom Waterway. A lengthy discussion ensued, which included:

- Float lay-out
- Location for fuel float
- Location for pump out float
- Interior circulation in the marina

Jim Young raised a question about whether the Port has considered covered moorage in the marina and that the Project North closest to the I and J waterway might be an interesting location for covered moorage. Dan indicated that the Port currently does not own any covered moorage structures for lease but the Port is open to suggestions on this. The additional capital costs associated with covered moorage, as well as increased maintenance costs could be a significant detriment. Don Oates also commented about the regulatory agencies' disfavor of covered moorage due to increased shading of underwater habitat. Jim also asked about the height of the southern berm that runs adjacent to and parallel with the Whatcom Waterway. This was an issue that was addressed by the recent architect's report to both the City and the Port, and is a topic that that will need to be addressed as part of the overall plan.

Don next reviewed the wind and wave analysis that was recently completed by Coast and Harbor Engineering. This included wave heights in the Whatcom Waterway and inside the marina due to different significant storm events. Most of the Port's work to date has focused on worst case scenarios (i.e. a 25 year storm event from two different directions – one from 240 degrees true that lines up with the Whatcom Waterway and another storm event from 270 degrees true that produces a maximum reflected wave from vessels that could potentially be moored at the Shipping Terminal). Significant discussion ensued about the impact that these waves would have on boater experiences that were entering and leaving the marina. Several points were emphasized during that discussion, including:

1. Size of the vessels for the ASB will be larger vessels (most greater than 40 feet).
2. No public launch will decrease the traffic, relative to the inner basin at Squalicum Harbor.
3. The boats would be recreational in nature and would not have a requirement for departing the marina during a significant storm event (i.e. Comparing to a commercial fisherman who needs to make a scheduled opening).

After discussing the two options for slip layout, Jeff Hegedus asked what the difference was in linear feet for the two options. Don Oates responded that Option B had about 1800 more lineal feet. Roger VanDyken asked what the impact is on moorage rates comparing the two options. Dan explained with the difference in billable feet, Option A would have a moorage rate approximately \$.20 /foot/month higher than Option B. The question was raised as to how the moorage rates would be charged; would everyone pay the same rate? Or would the ASB pay a higher rate? Dan stated that the Commission has not decided on how to adapt the current Moorage Resolution to include the new marina. For the purposes of the discussion this evening, staff assumed that all cleanup costs would stay in the ASB, and that the development costs would be spread over all three marinas.

After significant discussion back and forth between Options A and B Hamilton Hayes stated his opinion in favor of layout B coupled with an opening further up the waterway (location B) due to improved navigational safety and a higher customer count (i.e. additional moorage associated with layout B). Ryan Kapp, representing the commercial fishing constituency, agreed saying that layout B provided significant cost savings to the public coupled with more cost effective layout for the capital expenditures. After further discussion Jeff Hegedus, as chair, worked through the MAC's comments to formulate a potential motion. The following motion was made by Mark Gumley: The MAC expresses a preference for Layout Concept B and opening alternative B. And that the Port proceed to 30% design incorporating these features. The motion was seconded by Ham Hayes. The motion passed unanimously.

After the motion was made, the question was asked of Don Oates regarding the timing for the 30% design. Don stated the 30% design effort would be completed and delivered to the agencies sometime this fall.

Having completed the discussion on the ASB and noting that it was after 8:00 p.m. Jeff Hegedus adjourned the meeting stating that the additional agenda items from this evening would be taken up at the subsequent meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.