

**Port of Port Townsend**  
**Boat Haven Renovation Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting #3 - Minutes**  
**October 10, 2007, 6:00 – 8:00 PM**  
**Port of Port Townsend Commission Chambers**

**Team Members Present:** Jon Keiser, Project Manager, PND Engineers; Paul Sorensen, Economist, BST Associates; Julie Bassuk, Makers Architecture

**Port Staff Present:** Larry Crockett - Executive Director; Jim Pivarnik - Deputy Director; Ken Radon - Director of Marine Facilities, (Commissioner Dave Thompson, Commission Candidate Forrest Rambo)

**Advisory Committee Members Present:** Judy Surber (City Rep), Leif Erickson (Marine Trades), Jeff Jackson (Coast Guard), Barbara Nightingale (Environmental), Frank Fletcher (Commercial Fisherman), Al Hightower (Commercial Fisherman subbing for Davis Barrett), Scott Kimmel (New Day Fisheries), Chelcie Liu (Small Boats), Sandy Oen (Taxpayer), Tike Hillman (Citizen) – arrived at 7:55 PM

**Absent:** Dave Weeding (Yacht Club), Mark Jochems (Marine Trades), Mike Thornburgh (Fuel Ops), Susan Moffat (Liveaboard)

**Larry Crockett**, in a quick briefing, advised all of the importance of this meeting, with the presentation of Marine and Upland drawing options. Comments will be heard on what is liked and disliked about the options. The issues will be weighed.

**Julie Bassuk** introduced members present for this “task force Meeting”. Open Public meeting scheduled for October 25. Briefed members on tonight’s agenda: Review; interactive discussions; updates to Market Analysis including Concept Design Alternatives and next steps; Project Goals-safety/maintenance; support for marine trades/fisherman/economic development; repositioning of facility options to correspond with today’s and future demands; financial and economic feasibility; designing & planning in phases, with tonight’s focus on the Commercial Basin and A/B docks.

Last meeting discussions took place on geotechnical, hydrographics and facility conditions. Limited dredging necessary, nothing out of ordinary geotechnically. The big issue - a 1960’s marina in need of rebuilding, focusing on commercial basin, A/B docks and timber travel lift in need of repairs.

Mr. Sorensen presented the Market Analysis - existing and productive conditions; slip layout options. Data presented did not include detailed info on monthly guest moorage – this info updated and will be included in this presentation.

Ms. Bassuk also reminded of Committee input from previous meeting: Safety issues including slip overhang, congested fairways and fuel and pump-out area congestion; needs of small boats; boat launching; parking issues; protection from displacement of Marine Trades and room for future growth; consideration of the long-range future expansion of the marina, maximizing in-water access.

Comments from committee: **Barbara Nightingale** informed all that she brought historical documents on the Kah Tai, showing chronological support from the community.

**Paul Sorensen** reviewed Market Analysis, focusing on existing conditions; the Boat Haven oriented more towards sailboats (61% occupied by sailboats); 85% of BH tenants being from Jefferson County; utilization of slip rates in that small slip usage is very seasonal and in the winter, this space not very well utilized. The Port does accommodate large boats in these slips, causing overhang. Mr. Sorensen advised the group there are approximately 222 boaters on Port waitlist, with 26'-45' being the most desired slips, this showing future demands of boaters at BH. Mr. Sorensen discussed Utilization Trends as shown in Power Point presentation. Two targets being focused on; Target-1 a demand for 26'-30'ers and 36'-40'ers and Target 2-more of a demand for 36'-40' boats. He reminded all of making optimal use of slip distribution in the fixed marina footprint.

**Chelcie Liu** asked for clarification of Target 1 group being Jefferson County residents' demands and Target 2 being the greater Puget Sound area demands.

Mr. Sorensen added that their recommendations are: to allow more recreational boats in the commercial basin and; for boats 30' & under to use linear moorage, "infill spaces" and dry stack storage. For the boats 30' space provided based on demands of waitlists and future demands.

**Judy Surber** asked if this information is based on commercial or recreational boats. Mr. Sorensen replied recreational, with demand analysis for commercial to be provided later.

**Al Hightower** added it looks like commercial space is being phased out. Other ports provide designated commercial areas. **Julie Bassuk** responded no one is advocating replacing commercial space with recreational. **Jon Keiser** added that space needs to be flexible to accommodate all and to not let spaces go vacant. Mr. Sorensen added that studies are not seeing demands increase for commercial boats. Mr. Hightower replied that prices are too high here and this is reason for fewer commercial boats in Puget Sound. Mr. Keiser sees many fishers keeping their boats nearer their fishing grounds due to high fuel prices. **Frank Fletcher** asks that we don't disregard commercial fishers; it is possible there will be a surge. Ms. Bassuk stated the need to fully utilize the space and to continue to provide for purpose of economic development. Ms. Surber reminded all that the Shoreline Plan is to preserve the economy and family-wage jobs indicating the need to accommodate the commercial industry. Mr. Hightower agreed, adding the need for flexible space for the marine trades and commercial fisherman. Mr. Keiser responded that how the slip space is designated is an operational decision. Purpose now is to work on slip sizes, ease of entering and leaving slips, etc. Ms. Surber added that the marine trades cannot compete with tourist industry, the boaters who are willing to pay the higher rates. Mr. Keiser repeated the key is flexibility in operations. **Jim Pivarnik** informed that the Port does subsidize rates for commercial fisherman.

**Mr. Keiser** presented Concept Designs. Showed that existing conditions have slips in traditional "Christmas tree design" (grid sizes cut up) which leaves a lot of unused space. Spoke of fairway widths and how they have decreased in size, over time, due to overhanging of larger boats in smaller slips.

Option 1: Full Benedict Spit.

- Single-lane boat launch

- Fuel float moved to commercial basin
- Coast Guard building relocating to marina entrance
- New work pier in commercial basin.
- Total slips: 360. Total moorage: 13,335 LF. (Today, 380 existing slips and 12,875 LF.)

**Leif Erickson** asked if existing ship dock and linear would go away. Answer is “no”.

**Chelcie Liu** asked the draft of the 375’ of linear moorage and the ease of maneuvering in this area. Reply was still tight area, but dredging will allow for deeper draft.

Mr. Hightower asked where money will come from. Also said in the past there were issues of moving the fuel dock, is it doable now?

**Scott Kimmel** added that if CG building moved as shown; there is no room in this area- already congested with trucks, fork lifts, totes. Parking is an issue. Mr. Fletcher stated the need for space to load & unload gear and product for fishers.

#### Option 2: Full Benedict Spit & Sheet Pile.

- Sheet pile installed around commercial basin allowing for deeper moorage
- Increase linear moorage
- Two-lane boat launch
- Fuel float relocate to commercial entrance side
- Relocation of fuel tanks
- CG building rebuilt on Benedict Spit
- CG float on west side of Benedict Spit
- New sheet pile bulkhead work pier with fenders in commercial basin

Mr. Hightower asked when using sheet pile, is a 45degree angle still required. **Larry Crockett** answered no, a 90 degree angle. Reason this wasn’t done on Hudson Point Marina project was due to Fish & Wildlife regs. and the cost. Mr. Keiser added that using a sheet pile wall allows for fendering right next to wall and docks able to be built tight up to this area.

Mr. Crockett added that with this plan, we would need to look at a new storage area for larger fuel tanks-across street from commercial basin? This would free up space in yard where tanks are currently stored.

Mr. Liu responded he prefers the 2<sup>nd</sup> lane in launch area and the functionality of the sheet pile.

- Total slips: 370. Total moorage: 13, 735 LF.

Mr. Crockett stated sheet piles allow for much more space in marina.

Mr. Hightower asked for approximate cost of this project. Mr. Crockett responded depending on project, maybe \$8-12M.

#### Option 3: Half Benedict Spit

- Half of spit removed
- Two-lane boat launch
- Fuel float moved south of Benedict Spit
- CG building rebuilt on Spit
- CG float located south of Spit
- New work pier in commercial basin
- Total slips: 359. Total moorage: 13, 360 LF.

Mr. Hightower wondered who is building CG building. Mr. Crockett replied, the CG.

Mr. Keiser added that this option provides more linear moorage for commercial area. Mr. Liu wondered if fuel dock congestion would remain as is now in Options 3 & 4. Mr. Pivarnik replied that the dock would be double-sided with extra pumps. Mr. Liu was concerned that boats would prefer to use outside fuel area, but answer to this is with opening up of Spit area, this allows for more water space. Mr. Fletcher asked if wind and swell conditions have been considered. Mr. Keiser responded these docks are broadside to wind. Mr. Fletcher stated the fuel dock would be safer moved inside.

Option 4: Half Benedict Spit & Sheet Pile

- Sheet pile installed around commercial basin
- Increase linear foot moorage
- Two-lane boat launch w/center boarding float
- Fuel float located south of Spit
- CG building rebuilt on Spit
- CG float located south of Spit
- New sheet pile bulkhead work pier with fenders in commercial basin
- Total slips: 359. Total moorage: 13,360 LF.

Mr. Crockett said we might add to the list, space for multi-hulled boats.

Ms. Surber asked how total number of slips is figured. Mr. Keiser replied the total length of linear moorage divided by 30' plus all the available slips, comes up to the total number of slips figured. He also added that our marina currently has one of the narrowest entrances he's seen in a marina. Using sheet pile would maximize entryway space.

**Jeff Jackson** asked if sheet metal would influence amount of material build-up. Due to variation of flows, there will always be build-up.

Mr. Liu added anytime you disturb the flow, there will always be a problem.

Upland Options-Commercial Basin, summarized:

Option 1: Using existing bulkhead wall, defined parking stalls and increasing width of sidewalks to 9'6".

Option 2: New sheet pile wall, defined parking, 12' wide sidewalk.

Option 3: New sheet pile wall, 35' wide flexible market area (for fish vendors, charter boat vendor space, etc), defined parking, 12' wide sidewalk, sidewalk elevation increases by 7". Julie added that this plan would take up space in the in-water area but would provide market space for vendors. This space would be allowable in Shoreline Plan as long as water-related business.

Upland Options-Recreational Basin, summarized:

Option 1: New bulkhead wall; 12' sidewalk w/guardrail; bumpouts; defined parking; grade & elevation changes.

Option 2: New bulkhead wall; 12' sidewalk w/guardrail; bumpouts; defined parking; grade & elevation changes.

Option 3: Fill; new bulkhead wall; 12' sidewalk w/o guardrail; bumpouts, defined parking; grade & elevation changes.

Option 4: Dock; new pile-supported timber walkway; 12' sidewalk w/guardrail; bumpouts; defined parking; grade & elevation changes.

Ms. Bassuk asked committee to provide feedback on alternatives. Reminded all that many elements are interchangeable. Mr. Keiser discussed some pros and cons.

Mr. Hightower wants a commitment from Port that commercial moorage will stay and then they will be happy to provide input. He's heard a lot of talk in the past, with no action. Ms. Surber reminded that a good example of Port progress is the rebuild of the Hudson Point Marina.

Mr. Erickson asked what cost difference is between sheet pile and sloped. Mr. Keiser replied that sheet pile would add approximately, an additional \$3.5-4M around Benedict Spit. Sheet pile will be less expensive than a pier. Mr. Erickson asked cost to remove Spit. Mr. Keiser replied: \$4-4.5M to remove full spit and \$2-2.5M to remove half.

Boat launch options: Single lane; two-lane with center boarding floats; two-lanes with outside boarding floats.

Mr. Erickson asked if there was cost to eliminate Spit. Mr. Crockett said this not an option=CG located there. These facilities important – keeps the politicians eyes on our area.

Fuel Float location possibilities:

- Commercial basin-end of moorage slips
- Entrance side of commercial basin
- South end of Benedict Spit at end of linear moorage
- Present location

Mr. Hightower commented that it gets very rough near entrance, making it unsafe for fuel dock. Asking for trouble if place in commercial basin area.

Ms. Surber suggested finding the priorities; expense is an important issue – good idea to redesign survey sheet handed out, reflecting these issues.

Mr. Erickson agreed that finances will be most important part of redesigning marina.

Ms. Bassuk asked all to talk with constituents and get their feedback. Communicate these ideas to Port staff. Public meeting to be held October 25, after which the Committee will look at public input as well as Committee input.

Question came up of whether or not the Port would need to complete an EIS. Ms. Surber stated that may not be necessary, however and Environmental Review will be required. Mr. Crockett added that environmental and cost issues will be big determining factors in options chosen.

Ms. Bassuk informed of the next steps:

- Evaluation of designs

- Public Meeting October 25
- Identify Design Concept preferences
- Preliminary design
- Environmental permitting
- Design phase
- Bidding phase
- Construction phase

Meeting adjourned.

**Next meeting: Public Meeting October 25, 2007. Next Committee meeting TBA.**

**Important websites:**

**Port of Port Townsend website: [www.portofpt.com](http://www.portofpt.com)**

**City of Port Townsend website: [www.cityofpt.us](http://www.cityofpt.us)**