

**Port of Port Townsend:
Strategic Planning Community Advisory Committee
Wednesday February 18, 2009, 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Port Commission Room – Point Hudson**

DRAFT MEETING #6 SUMMARY

Prepared by Eric Toews of CASCADIA

Meeting Attendance

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE			
Last Name	First Name	Representing	In Attendance?
Aase	Larry	Port Employees	Yes
Baisch	Joe	South County	Yes
Cronkite	Kaci	Non-Profit Orgs.	Yes
Hallinan	BJ	Airport Users	No
Hero	David	At Large - District #1	Yes
King	David	Marine Trades	Yes
Lawrence	Bob	Educational	No
Levy Sullivan (Alternate)	Bertram Karen	Moorage Tenants Moorage Tenants	Yes Yes
Little	Bob	Local Businesses	No
La Roche	Gabrielle	Environmental	No - excused
Pike	Ted	At Large – District #2	Yes
Rossov	Gary	Moorage Tenants	No – excused
Scalf	Al	Jefferson County	No – excused
Schnick	Les	Marine Trades	Yes
Sepler	Rick	City of Port Townsend	Yes
Shively	Steve	Fort Worden State Park	Yes
Tucker	Steve	Small Boaters	Yes
PROJECT TEAM			
Robison	Dave	CASCADIA	No
Toews	Eric	CASCADIA	Yes
Wise	Bill	W.H. Wise & Assoc.	Yes
PORT TEAM & PORT COMMISSIONERS			
Beck	Herb	Commissioner – Dist. #3	No
Collins	John	Commissioner – Dist. #1	Yes
Thompson	David	Commissioner – Dist. #2	No
Crockett	Larry	Executive Director	No
Pivarnik	Jim	Deputy Director	Yes

Meeting Summary

This was the sixth meeting of the Strategic Planning Community Advisory Committee (CAC). Lead facilitator Bill Wise welcomed the Committee and reviewed the agenda and obtained agreement from the CAC as to the order of business.

The majority of the meeting was devoted to presentations by CAC members on their proposed top “action item” priorities for the Port (i.e., policies, programs and projects).

Bertram Levy commented on the Values, Mission & Vision, asking for an explanation of how the vision would get “traction” – in other words, how will the vision meaningfully influence the Port Commission moving forward?

Discussion by the CAC suggested that the underlying concern is this: How will the input of the CAC meaningfully influence a Port Commission majority and Port management staff that do not share their view?

Mr. Levy asked whether the term “affordable” had been eliminated from the vision with the assent of the CAC – he did not remember it so. The CAC agreed that “affordable” had been dropped.

Presentation of “Top 10” Priority Policies, Programs & Projects

Lead facilitator Bill Wise asked each individual to provide a brief presentation on their “top 10” priorities. None of the CAC representatives had prepared a “top 10” list, per se. What followed was a wide-ranging presentation of individual’s “top priorities” for the Port.

David Hero identified three priorities for the Port, as follows:

- Address the issue of the shortage of available land for business development – at the Boat Haven, vacation of rights-of-way and resolving the status of Kah Tai Nature Park properties are key;
- The Port needs to serve the entire Jefferson County community – so projects shouldn’t be entirely focused on Port Townsend; and
- The status of Port owned lands surrounding the JCIA must be resolved – a forward-looking plan is needed in order to make good long-term use of these properties to promote economic development.

David King identified the following questions and priorities:

- Budgetary/financial policies – how is overhead to be allocated? What about the cost of moorage? The Port needs to prepare summary budget information for the public that is transparent, understandable and verifiable by the public;
- He echoed David Hero’s comments with regard to the shortage of available land for business development and the need to pursue a process for the Boat Haven to more wisely use the available land base;
- Mr. King asked whether or not notions of expanding the Boat Haven were grounded in reality;
- BSP process for the Boat Haven; and
- Clearer policy direction on land use – specifically: clarity on the allocation of land within the Boat Haven for long-term land leases vs. yard space.

Steve Tucker identified community-wide access to the water as his top priority. He stated that Port lands are the junction between the land and water. In the recent past, Port lands offered eight (8) lanes of access to the water for small boat owners (i.e., with trailer-able craft); now, with the remodel of Point Hudson, there are only five (5). Affordable access to the water via boat ramps must be a higher priority. The meeting materials fail to identify the need to develop and maintain boat ramp access on Port lands. Beyond Port lands, there is a need for the Port to commit at a policy level to working with other entities (e.g. Fort Worden State Park) to obtain and maintain boat ramp access. The consultant team committed to recrafting the project narrative and matrix to include this as a priority.

Ted Pike identified the following top priorities:

- Transparency, clarity and verifiability of accounting practices;
- Further development of the JCIA as a potential source of revenue to fund other Port operations;
- Resolution of environmental issues at the Boat Haven Boat Yard:
 - The need to develop other revenue sources in order to be able to afford environmental upgrades that will be necessary in future (e.g., sand blast containment, paving, etc.)
 - The need for the Port to ascertain why boats that have been regular customers to the Boat Haven in the past are hauling out in other Puget Sound yards (e.g., Seattle) – he committed to helping gather this information.

Mr. Levy offered the suggestion that the Port should commit to being the “cheapest” yard in the Sound, in order to support local marine trades industries.

Kaci Cronkite offered the following two priorities:

- Support for sustainable economic development efforts; and
- A/B dock renovation.

Larry Asse identified the following observations:

- There is a need for a clear Economic Development Policy that describes the role of the Port in facilitating local economic development efforts;
- Dissention in the community about what the Port’s priorities should be is a huge problem that has not yet been addressed; and
- He agrees with Steve Tucker that the Port needs to do more to maintain and expand boat ramps.

Steve Shively’s top three priorities were as follows:

- Support for sustainable economic development;
- Need to make better use of the Boat Haven property – BSP process should be pursued; and
- The need to build on the community’s traditional culture and core marine trades through its policies and programs.

Rick Sepler had the following comments:

- Resolving Boat Haven/Kah Tai issues should be a top priority;
- He expressed concerns about expanded industrial uses at the airport – particularly those that are non-aviation-related;

- He stated that more information is needed to prioritize and select programs and policies to pursue, as follows:
 - A clearer and expanded description of each action is needed to better understand what each is;
 - An estimation of the level of effort needed to accomplish each action should be provided (i.e., budget rough order of magnitude estimate, along with an estimate of the necessary commitment of staff resources); and finally,
 - An estimation of the likelihood of success of each – is it a “winner”?

Les Schnick had the following observations:

- Resolving the environmental issues at the Boat Yard must be a top priority (e.g., filtration, boat yard paving, etc.);
- As Rick stated, more information is needed to assess the other potential action items;
- Mr. Schnick agreed with Steve Tucker that more points of access to the water are needed for owners of small boats
- Greater clarity is needed on the future of the Sperry Buildings at the Boat Yard – are they to be moved?
- He indicated that there was too much uncertainty concerning the menu of potential actions to provide guidance – more information is needed for the CAC to provide meaningful help.

Bertram Levy made the following comments:

- He feels the existing budget is fairly transparent – that’s not really the issue – instead, the problem is what’s in the budget;
- The Port needs to follow a rigorous cost-center approach to budgeting in order to be more fair;
- The Port needs to be less concerned with “outreach” and more concerned with “inreach” – in other words: the Port needs more input from the community; the community does not need more output from the Port – a regularized process for obtaining meaningful public input before decisions is needed;
- A new budget process must be established – one that involves stakeholders;
- RCW Title 53 really needs to be changed – it relates to large jurisdictions like Seattle – but offers little applicable guidance for small Ports like Port Townsend;
- The Port should consider a rail/haul-out and trailer option to take boats to upland areas (e.g., Glen Cove) to be worked on – thus avoiding the environmental issues at the Boat Yard.

Karen Sullivan had the following observations:

- As a CAC, we need to resolve two questions:
 - What do we want the Port to do?
 - What do we need to get there?
- The Port needs to develop a land use plan and a budget that implements the plan;
- It also needs to be transparent in its operations and management – heretofore, the Port’s decision-making processes have not been;
- The Port needs to get better at listening to its stakeholders and the community – and employ a clear and transparent decision-making process based upon stakeholder/public input;

- The Port must prioritize affordable access to the water; and
- Port decision-making must validate and acknowledge stakeholder/public input:
 - Either make decisions consistent with the input; or
 - Clearly explain why an alternative course of action is being pursued.

Joe Baisch stated that there is one entity in Jefferson County charged with facilitating economic development – the Port. The Port should ask itself each week: “what did we do this week to create jobs in Jefferson County? How many have we created.”

There was general agreement amongst CAC members on the need to develop a Maritime Heritage Action Plan.

Kaci indicated her agreement with Les Schnick that the Port must focus on “green boat yard” practices. Bertram suggested that the Port develop a “convert to green” program.

David Hero restated his opinion that the Port needs to expand its potential development area by pursuing a land use plan/binding site plan process for its properties at the Boat Yard and Kah Tai. It also needs to be clear, at a policy level, as to how much of the Boat Yard should be devoted to traditional marine trades, versus new non-traditional ventures.

Ted Pike stated that the Port must develop a simple and effective marketing plan – if we’re a “green yard” then market that! If we’re a “working waterfront” – market that! There must be a greater emphasis on marketing and branding.

Rick Sepler stated that the entire discussion revolves around an inherent tension – finding the balance between the economic bottom-line and preserving those things that are essential to our community character. What do we really value? What we really value may not be the most profitable.

Karen Sullivan explained why she believes the cost center accounting approach to be central to this decision-making: because it would allow stakeholders and the community more clearly understand what projects outside each center should be invested in – even if they’re not profitable.

Larry Asse stated that the Port’s accounting and fiscal practices already accomplish this.

David Hero stated that there is a whole lot of money involved in Port operations that are not generated by the cost centers themselves: namely – taxpayer funding of Port operations. Shouldn’t taxpayer money go to fund projects and programs that cannot otherwise pay their own way initially, but that could be “incubated” into profitable economic development opportunities in future?

Bill Wise suggested that the CAC could benefit from a budget presentation at the March meeting.

Bertram Levy cautioned again that the Port must not “kill the goose that lays the golden egg” (i.e., Boat Haven moorage tenants).

Kaci Cronkite offered the observation that the CAC needs to provide guidance to the Port as to: how to reduce costs; and raise revenues.

A 15 to 20 minute discussion of the public outreach process followed – with concern being expressed that it was going to be very difficult to obtain meaningful public involvement.

Bertram Levy offered to observation that the public has little interest in the Port or Port operations.

Summary of Next Steps:

1. Develop additional informational materials for the menu of potential actions – as suggested by Rick Sepler;
2. Develop process options/recommendations for how the remainder of the Strategic Planning Process should play out;
3. Prepare a proposed approach to solicit meaningful public participation and input in the Strategic Planning process.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.