

PORT OF BELLINGHAM

**MAC (MARINA ADVISORY COMMITTEE) MEETING
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2010
SQUALICUM HARBOR OFFICE
BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON**

Minutes

Committee Members Present:

Peter Border
Jeff Hegedus
Ryan Kapp
Ron Kleinknecht
Paul Lavelle
Tim Mumford
Joe Orem
Brian Pemberton
Jim Splaine
Doug Sterrett
Jerry Writer
Jim Young

Committee Members Absent:

Cliff Cultee

Port Representatives Present:

Dan Stahl
Mike Endsley
Pam Taft
Andy Peterson

Committee Members Excused:

City of Bellingham representative

Visitors/ Guests:

Roll Call

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

November 9, 2010 Minutes

The November 9, 2010 minutes were reviewed. A motion was made by Doug Sterrett to approve the minutes as written. This was seconded by Jerry Writer and passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Brian Pemberton, on behalf of Dean Ouilette, made a comment about a safety concern about in his moorage area on Gate 10. Mike Endsley, Squalicum Harbormaster, responded that he was aware of the situation and that the docks are scheduled for a significant overhaul later this year.

Recap of December 7, 2010

Dan Stahl provided an update to the MAC of the moorage model discussion that took place at the December 7, 2010 Port Commission meeting. His stated purpose in providing this update to the MAC was to insure that the entire MAC received feedback on the Commission's deliberations. A number of the MAC members were in attendance at the Port Commission meeting but not all and it was important to make sure that the entire MAC was dealing with the same facts regarding the Commission deliberations. At the Commission meeting on December 7th, the Commission took additional public comment from one boathouse owner and the newly formed CFA (Commercial Fishermens Association of Whatcom County), listened to Dan's presentation and then deliberated on Resolution No. 1258. The Commission was unable to make a clear decision on Resolution No. 1258, but did take action to put their decision off until the February 15 commission meeting. Dan said that it was possible that the Port Commission might entertain this issue at the January work study but that decision had not been made at the present time.

Dan then proceeded to review with the MAC and the public in attendance the powerpoint that was presented at the December 7 commission meeting. With that review completed, the floor was opened for public comment. A wide ranging discussion ensued between the public in attendance and the MAC members. The discussion covered such topics as the operation and financing of the Port of Seattle's Fishermens Terminal, the history of cost reductions initiated by the MAC and supported by the staff in 2010 and carried into 2011, the fair share of overhead covered by the Port's marina operations and the nature of the survey that was conducted by Port staff of other marina rates.

At the end of this discussion, the MAC turned toward their calendars and decided to move their January meeting from January 11 to January 25. This was done with the intent that if the Commission discussed the moorage model on January 18 that the MAC would have an opportunity to consider that discussion after the Port commission meeting.

With the moorage model issue covered for the agenda, Jim Splaine asked for the floor. He stated that it had been his pleasure to serve on the MAC since 2003; he had enjoyed his time on the MAC but that it was time to move on and tendered his resignation. Several MAC members jested with Mr. Splaine that his resignation would not be accepted and, after everyone had a good laugh, a wide round of applause was expressed for Jim's public service.

As it was nearly 8:00, the MAC Chair decided to review one additional item before adjourning and we moved to Item 6b – the dock box update. Mike Endsley reviewed, as a follow up to the prior meeting on dock boxes, further program refinement to the dock box program (see attached 2 page sheet). Having put additional detail to two scenarios and discussing them thoroughly, the MAC gave direction to Mr. Endsley to proceed with further refinement of Scenario 2 where dock boxes would be charged ala carte with an "opt-out" provision. Mike was asked to bring this at a subsequent MAC meeting for further discussion.

Having used our time for the evening the MAC was adjourned at 8:35 pm.

Dock Box Update:
Marina Advisory Committee
December 14, 2010

Assumptions:

- 10 year replacement program
- need for phasing regardless of scenario
- the boater is responsible for damage
- Port boxes only
- no storage on fingers in lieu of dock box

Scenario 1 – Everyone pays, everyone gets a dock box

Pros:

1. Easy to administer
2. Develops a predictable funding mechanism
3. Maintaining boxes vs. Installing boxes per customer request
4. Quicker, more predictable for new customer

Cons:

1. Phased approach to get to “clean slate”
2. added expense to boater experience
3. Large, in-field inventory that needs eventual replacement

Scenario 2 – You want a dock box, you pay for it with an opt out

Paying for a box:

Pros:

1. Provides a funding mechanism
2. Offers the boater a means to manage expenses

Cons:

1. Administrative component

Opting out - Leave the box in the field with a Port lock in place

Pros:

1. Easier to administer
2. Quick turnaround for new customer

Cons:

1. Still have inventory in field not receiving funding for replacement
2. Damage still a possibility (customer and / or normal wear and tear)
3. Cost of locks

Opting out – Remove the box

Pros:

1. Reduces inventory of unfunded boxes in field
2. Increases early inventory for replacement

Cons:

1. Unpredictable replacement reserve
2. Labor intensive
3. Potentially slow turnaround for new customer

Pricing Scenarios: