

**PORT OF NEWPORT
MINUTES
November 19, 2009
SPECIAL MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Commission President Ginny Goblirsch brought the special meeting of the Port of Newport Board of Commissioners to order on Thursday, November 19, 2009, at 6:00 p.m., in the Oregon Coast Community College Central County Campus Community Room, 400 SE College Way, Newport, OR, the same being within the boundaries of the Port District.

The purpose of the special meeting was to review the 40% design as presented by KPFF Consulting Engineers and provide clear direction to the project team for advancing the project to final design and construction documents.

Commissioners Present: Ginny Goblirsch, President; Dean Fleck, Vice-President; JoAnn Barton, Secretary; Don Mathews, Treasurer; David Jincks, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer.

Terminal Renovation Project Steering Committee: Yale Fogarty, Wayne Hoffman, Hal Pritchett, Joe Rock, Bridget Wolfe.

Port of Newport Management and Staff: Don Mann, General Manager; Patti Britton, Director of Finance; Pete Dale, Project Manager; Kent Gibson, Port Operations; Maureen Keeler, Special Projects Manager; and Patty Benjamin, Administrative Assistant.

Others: Dan Avery and Doug Cottam, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife; Frank Berg, Mike Day, and Joshua Dodson, Day CPM; Keith and Dora Ann Dodson, Beaverton residents; Tracy Burchett, Rob Halverson, Pat Ruddiman, Jennifer Sargent, Barrett Tower, and Rod Worman, ILWU Local 53; Pat Dougherty and Mike Goff, TCB Productions; Lee Fries, CM/GC Selection Committee; Pete Gintner, Port legal counsel; Chris Jain, Tommi Rutherford, Mike Schmid, and Craig Totten, KPFF Consulting Engineers; Pat O'Connor, Oregon Coast Community College; Dr. Hal Pritchett, Facility Use & Design and Terminal Steering Committees; Sara and John Skamser, Foulweather Trawl; John van Staveren, Pacific Habitat Services; Steve Warren, Newport Diesel.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

III. TERMINAL RENOVATION PROJECT

A. Introduction. Terminal Renovation Project Manager Joshua Dodson served as facilitator for the discussion. He provided a summary and update on the project, which, Dodson said, was moving forward as quickly as possible. He said the goal of the special meeting was to review the engineers' 40% construction documents and the budgets and schedules associated with the project, and to receive input on the design from the commission, steering committee, and public. He added that an ultimate goal would be a consensus that evening on the plan moving forward, but he realized that might not happen. Dodson explained that the project had about \$15.2 million to move forward, with \$12.5 million of that amount dedicated to direct construction. He said the overall plan was to remove both the Pasley and Hennebique, build east and west piers for cargo and the fishing fleet, and complete the upland work. He said the Port and the project team were aware that \$15.2 million would not be enough to get everything done so due diligence had been done to determine how much could be accomplished with the amount of money available, and the project would be completed in two phases.

B. Project Overview and Future Design. Mike Schmid, KPFF Consulting Engineers, presented the project overview. He explained that two 40% designs had been produced, one for the full build out and one for a potential Phase 1 of the project. The design for the full build out was projected onto a screen. The design included removal of both ships and the terminal office and warehouse, construction of a cargo pier and a fishing pier, and underground utility lines to service the buildings. Schmid discussed the design schedule and said the first milestone, 40% construction documents by October 30, 2009, had been met. He said the next milestone, 90% construction documents by January 29, 2010, was critical, and he asked for input, feedback, and direction from the commission and steering committee, so the engineers could move forward to a final design that met needs and expectations by March 9, 2010.

C. Presentation of Full Project. Craig Totten, KPFF Consulting Engineers, itemized the components of the full build out, which included removal of both ships, relocation of the terminal office and warehouse, and removal of the ro-ro dock and a triangular portion of the current fishing dock. Using a projected drawing, he described how the base of the new cargo wharf would be moved back 25-30 feet and said the fishing dock (Berth 2) would be constructed out of concrete poured on top of the existing wooden dock. The end result would be 475 feet of cargo dock (Berth 1) and 371 feet of fishing dock, along with a mooring dolphin on the west side. He noted that the cargo dock would be available to fishing vessels when there was no cargo operation in progress. He said the Natt McDougall Company (NMC) was working on a full removal plan for the Pasley and details of that operation were not finalized yet. The current thinking was to put a temporary sheet pile wall around the hull of the ship, which would be braced

back to another sheet pile wall that would be anchored into solid material with tie back anchors and be part of the permanent construction. Totten said the area around the Pasley would be de-watered and the ship would be broken up and removed. He said small portions of the fishing dock would be removed to allow driving piles through the dock and a new concrete surface would be poured, which would be supported by the new piles. Doing that, Totten said, would be a more economical way to build the dock. There would be a rip-rap slope and a concrete dock to replace the wooden one that is there now, and access on the east and west ends would be significantly widened.

Mike Schmid, KPFF, addressed the cost estimate. He noted that the demolition removal costs were "plug numbers" that were provided by NMC in early 2009, so they were not the same numbers NMC is working with now in their investigation of demolition and removal costs. Schmid said he believed those numbers would come down, but the total for utilities and site work, dock construction, demolition and removal was estimated at \$28 million in 2010 dollars. He said a 10% contingency and a 10% mobilization charge had been built into the estimate. Project Manager Joshua Dodson pointed out that the number Schmid presented represented construction costs only. Full budget costs would be more.

D. Questions/Answers.

Joe Rock, Steering Committee: Will it be possible to remove the outside sheet pile and the Pasley in the same in-water work window?

Craig Totten, KPFF: No.

Rock: Can construction be built while you're waiting to do the in-water work?

Totten: All of the construction will take place outside of the in-water work window.

Rock: When you move the wall in to the new piling line, are you going to have to dredge?

Totten: Yes.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: If you're working behind the sheet pile wall, won't you be excavating instead of dredging?

Mike Schmid, KPFF: Within the enclosure, it's excavation. There is some dredging that will be required to the east of the temporary sheet pile wall.

Commissioner JoAnn Barton: How many wooden piles are going to be removed and how many will be installed, and what is the construction material?

Totten: We're not planning to remove any of the creosote timber piles. The new piles will be steel and there will be 68-70 of them.

Barton: Weren't we at some point talking about removing creosote piles or cutting them off at the mud line?

Totten: It was discussed but that is difficult to do safely under a concrete dock.

Commissioner David Jincks: On the Phase 2 removal of Hennebique, are you going to cofferdam that the same as the Pasley?

Totten: Similar. It's shallower excavation than the Pasley.

Jincks: When you place the sheet pile between the Hennebique and the dock, are you going to be dragging that sheet pile close to the side of the Hennebique or is there going to be a gap there, when you build out the new dock?

Totten: There is an issue there because of where the edge of the hull is versus how much you can pour. Currently we are holding the edge back 5 feet from the face of the ship to allow the sheet pile to be driven. Once that sheet pile is removed, the dock will be cantilevered back.

Jincks: So what is the width of the dock?

Totten: 40 feet.

Jincks: Minus 5?

Totten: In the end it will be 40 feet; in the temporary condition it will be 35.

Jincks: Does that leave you room to remove the rip-rap at the base of the Hennebique?

Totten: When divers went down, they looked for that rip-rap and the only area where they found any was a very small area at the stern.

Commissioner Don Mathews: What's the load on the fishing dock?

Totten: It is 400 pounds per square foot (psf) for the dock, plus the crane and semi trucks. Where it overlaps with the cargo dock, it is 750 pounds psf and there will be a 100 foot section designated for 1,000 pounds psf for heavy lifts.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: Where are the current Port property lines?

Don Mann, General Manager: pointed out property lines on a map.

Hoffman: So the intent is to build entirely on Port property? There will be no need for acquisition or an extended lease?

Mann: That's correct.

Hoffman: In the discussion about the Port office, are you going to move the entire Port office to the terminal?

Mann: No, that office will just be for the terminal operation.

Hoffman: In pouring the new concrete dock on top of the existing wooden fishing dock, are there concerns about the life span of the wooden dock under there? Is this something we're going to have to come back in and remedy?

Totten: It will be monitored and, yes, it will eventually come out in pieces. The weak link will be the timber piles below the water line.

Hoffman: Do you have an estimate on its life span going forward?

Totten: We have not done a life cycle projection on it.

Hoffman: Can we expect in the next phase an estimate of what the eventual cost in 2010 dollars might be for that removal when it becomes necessary?

Totten: We can certainly put that into an option for Phase II, or Phase I as well.

Hoffman: It doesn't necessarily have to happen right now but I think in going forward we need to know about the obligations down the road that the Port is going to be taking on.

Hoffman: The last time I was at a Port meeting, you were in discussions with the Natt McDougall Company (NMC) about their role going forward. Is there new information on that?

Joshua Dodson, Day CPM: NMC's original pre-construction contract has been reinstated and executed based on the same dollars and their obligations are set forth in that agreement. Those obligations include giving us cost estimates and demolition and removal plans so we can submit our biological assessment with the Joint Permit Application (JPA).

Hoffman: Once that contract is completed, are they obligated to be the contractor for construction? If they want to be the contractor, do they have first refusal?

Dodson: Pre-construction is to work towards a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) to do the work, whether that's Phase 1, or Phase 1 with a future Phase 2. We don't know if they're going to give us a GMP to be the CM/GC. Right now the most critical piece is their fulfilling that obligation, whether they reach a GMP for us or not. Whether it is NMC moving forward or somebody else, we have lots of positive options.

Commissioner David Jincks: About the life span of the fishing pier under reconstruction, are you saying that you can't determine the life span of the reconstructed dock or you can't determine the life span of the dock underneath?

Totten: We can do both, we just haven't done it yet.

Jinks: For permitting purposes, aren't you going to have to show a life span and maintenance plan for that dock?

Totten: It's a 50 year + life span for the fishing dock.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: If in 20 years it is determined that there has to be substantial maintenance or removal of some of the wood, is that potential something that has to be discussed in the documents you're preparing now?

John Van Staveren, Pacific Habitat Services: I would say yes, because the agencies want to know what they're permitting so that needs to be assessed.

Commission President Ginny Goblirsch: How strong will the fishermen's dock be if all the wood rots away?

Totten: It will still be 400 pounds per square foot. The timber dock does nothing to support the concrete weight.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: Have you gotten to the point of thinking about staging during construction? How much of the time will the facility be available for use and how much of the time will it be completely shut down?

Totten: We have a staging system worked out. The critical thing is to get the piling in during the in-water work window. Our initial thought is to drive the piles from east to west, so the fishing fleet will be moved away from one area while the piles get to a certain point where they can be covered up with steel plates, and then the fleet will move over to the other side while the pile driving continues to the end. We'll do that same staging pouring the concrete dock.

Hoffman: So you will do the two lifts on the one end before you start doing anything on the other?

Totten: Yes, basically finish one before the other.

Joe Rock, Steering Committee: Is that piling going to be sand and concrete filled or no fill at all?

Totten: No fill at all; just steel cans.

Hoffman: The same question on staging—how about provisions for other uses of the facility, like net business? Will that be continuously available or closed down for a period of time?

Dodson: We haven't gotten our contractor's input on the means and methods of construction, but our intent would be to keep people operating at the maximum with as little interruption as possible.

Commissioner JoAnn Barton: After the Hennebique is removed, I assume we're going to fill that area?

Totten: The section where the Hennebique was will be filled and then rip-rapped.

Commissioner Don Mathews: Is the \$8.2 million for dock construction based on the new 40% design?

Schmid: Yes, the numbers were developed based on our 40% design and unit prices and unit quantities.

Commissioner Jincks: Following up on that, does the demolition cost of \$15.4 million include the cofferdam and remediation.

Schmid: Yes.

Commission President Goblirsch: Do we know anything about recycling the concrete from the ships?

Totten: We have not looked into that at this point.

Commissioner Barton: Is there any expectation that we might be able to save any of that material and use it somewhere in the project?

Dodson: If it breaks up enough, we might be able to use it on the shoreline but we haven't looked into that yet.

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: Does it really make sense that if they're making you take it completely out, you could use it some place else? If they want it gone, they want it gone.

Commissioner David Jincks: Along with the 40% design, have we moved forward with the piling protection plan as to what we're planning on using?

Totten: Some of the agencies have expressed concern about cathodic protection and we're trying to get that resolved right now.

E. Presentation of Phase One Project

Using drawings projected on a screen, Mike Schmid, KPFF, presented an overview of the Phase 1 general dock layout and the Phase 1 utility plan. Schmid said the major difference between the Phase 1 project and a full build out is that the Pasley would be remediated and removed but the Hennebique would be left in place, as would the warehouse and terminal office building. He said the utilities would be minimized. There would be some asphalt work to be done because the elevation of the existing wooden dock would be raised, and the storm drainage system would have to be improved substantially in order to get the project permitted. He pointed out a gap that would exist between the cargo dock and new fishing dock because, by leaving the Hennebique in place, the dock structure could not be completed in that area.

Craig Totten, KPFF, provided details of the Phase 1 plan, starting with the components that would not be included: removal of the Hennebique; a 95'-6" gap in cargo dock length; a loss of 5' in width of the fishing dock; increased access at the east end of the fishing dock; removal of terminal office and warehouse; construction of upland buildings and most utilities; and mooring dolphin and aluminum walkway. Totten went on to explain why those components could not be included in the Phase 1 construction. He discussed the 95'-6" gap between the two docks, citing concern that dredging to accommodate larger vessels at the dock would create a wash of material behind the Hennebique's bow, causing it to destabilize like the stern of the Pasley has done. He said the gap area was "an expensive piece of real estate to construct" because of the difficulty of getting the bow of the Hennebique out of there or to dredge in front of it. He said it would add approximately \$4 million to the Phase 1 construction.

F. Presentation of Phase One Project Cost Estimate

Mike Schmid, KPFF, reviewed the engineers' estimate of probable construction costs. He said a 10% contingency cost and a 10% mobilization cost had been included in the figures, and that contingency was likely to shrink going forward. Based on an assumption of doing the full build in five years, a 3% inflation rate on construction dollars was used. He said the total project cost, because of the fact that it would have to be done in two phases over time, was estimated at \$30.5 million.

G. Review of Preliminary Master Schedule dated November 12, 2009

Mike Day, Day CPM, asked what the milestone was for submitting the permit and Joshua Dodson answered that it was mid to late February

Bridget Wolfe, Steering Committee, asked when the numbers were expected from NMC, and Dodson answered that they were expected in mid-December. He added that the numbers would be submitted for a peer review by another firm. Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee, commented that some of the savings being sought might come from those numbers.

Joshua Dodson, Day CPM: We're looking at the same time line as our NOAA project, with permit approval in June or July 2010 so we're ready for the in-water window in the fall.

Don Mann, General Manager: The normal minimum permitting process for a project of this size is a year but we are trying to compress a one year review process into 6 or 8 months.

H. Final Phase of Full Project Discussion

Commissioner Dean Fleck: Will the 95'-6" gap have an effect on the load bearing capability of the dock?

Totten: No.

Commissioner David Jincks: If we can find some savings in removing the Pasley, is there a plan for removal of the Hennebique's bow? Then we could fill that gap.

Totten: There is a middle alternative where the gap is filled, but our estimates on that and reconstruction and demo are in the order of \$4 million, in addition to the Phase 1 costs.

Commissioner JoAnn Barton: What would that do to future costs of the complete removal of the Hennebique? Would it create any offset or would it cause the cost of the removal of the remainder of the Hennebique to go up?

Totten: It will cost more in the long run to remove the ship in two pieces versus taking it out all at once. The \$4 million essentially buys you this gap filled with some structure.

Barton: What are the hazards associated with this 95' gap to the fishing fleet, cargo ships, or other business?

Totten: Caution will be required in terms of usable berthage for smaller vessels but big vessels would have bumpers and fenders on each side, irrespective of the gap.

Commissioner Dean Fleck: That gap would not be usable for any commercial vessel of any kind?

Totten: There has been some discussion of that but anything you do is going to be torn out in the future and would increase the end number.

Commissioner JoAnn Barton: Without the 95 feet, we're still looking at 380 feet of usable dock at berth 1?

Totten: Yes. Access would be where it is right now between the office and warehouse.

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: The stern part of the dock is accessible by the dock side to bring cargo there, but the cranes aren't positioned there on the ships. So by taking a chunk out of the middle of the dock, you are greatly limiting the dock and you're removing the bollards so you have no place to tie a larger ship. It would greatly restrict the dock as a cargo dock and would limit its marketability, and it would be unsafe to use in some circumstances on some cargos. A gap on one end or the other would be livable, knowing that the dock would be extended in the future, but a gap in the center is taking the gut out of the usability of that project. That's where the ships work. They don't work in the bow or stern; they work in the middle. The taxpayers voted for a bond measure that creates jobs, and this does not meet the needs of a cargo dock or what the bond measure clearly stated.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: How much are you saving by leaving off the dolphin?

Joshua Dodson, Day CPM: About \$285,000

Hoffman: If you put that back into Phase 1, it seems like you'd have a little more leeway to berth a somewhat larger vessel and have somewhat more ability to work a ship on the existing dock, even with the gap.

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: Obviously it would make it easier to berth the ship but it still doesn't do anything for the work area.

Hoffman: What it does is move the bow of the ship further west so you can get the middle of the ship on the dock.

Fogarty: But then you have the crane on the bow of the ship. The ships are 600 feet long, so the bow and stern are going to stick out beyond the dock. You can work one or two hatches and then the ship will have to shut down its operation and shift. And if there is a problem with shifting because of the current, they'll have to hire a tug because they don't want to fire their main engines for a short period of time just to move. The shipping company isn't going to go for that.

Commission President Goblirsch: The fishermen feel the same way. They don't want that gap there. The priority would be to fill in that gap if we can find enough savings; otherwise, I don't see a whole lot of choice.

Fogarty: To a certain point the bond measure requires you to do something.

Joe Rock, Steering Committee: When you drive the sheet piling in Phase 1, are you still going to drive it full length, so that once you've got it in you can work from the bank and won't have to wait for November?

Totten: You mean contain the Hennebique in this current phase? The stability question aside, I don't know how that would work in terms of whether we would be allowed to put in a curtain and then come back in a couple of years and finish the curtain.

Doug Cottam, ODFW: Work outside the in-water window? I'd need more detail.

Don Mann, General Manager: For the most part, are the ships 3-hatch ships?

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: Most vessels hauling break bulk cargo are 5-hatch ships.

Mann: What is the minimum amount of space between those 5 hatches?

Fogarty: Continual front dock working space of 350 feet would give us enough area to load a cargo ship.

Pointing to the drawing of the end of the cargo dock, Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: What's this dimension right here?

Fogarty: About 300 feet.

Craig Totten, KPFF: Yesterday we got together as a group and heard your concerns and tried to figure how we could get 350 feet in Phase 1 and there isn't a straight way to give it to you within the same budget.

Referring to the drawing on the screen, Totten explained that one option that "needs to be explored some more" was chopping off a triangular area shown on the fishing dock and building another 60 feet onto the west end. He said the down side would be that it would require more fill. He estimated that would add another \$500,000 to the project. Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee, said that seemed "doable with some tweaking" and General Manager Don Mann commented that, in a project the size of the terminal renovation, it should be possible to find \$500,000 to make an adjustment that would gain work area now and bring in decent sized ships. Fogarty noted that it was the cargo dock that would be reduced in size during Phase 1, and suggested that some of the funds going into the fishing pier be directed to the cargo dock to build it out. He said cargo had great potential for revenue, and revenue would benefit everyone, including the port, the community, and the fishermen.

Commissioner JoAnn Barton addressed her comment and question to John van Staveren, Pacific Habitat Services.

Commissioner Barton: An enormous amount of work has gone into what you have modeled so far for potential habitat loss based on what you've been working from in terms of the location of both of these docks. It's not just an additional cost of materials and construction, but won't there be other costs as well?

van Staveren: There will be other costs. A model is being made now so we can add areas if there are changes like that. It will be an issue with the agencies. We are in constant contact with the agencies and I presented the plans this week as they are now. If we do extend it I would have to go back to them, which is fine. We've made a good enough case for the need for that as far as creating jobs and the potential impact to the habitat is part of the alternatives analysis.

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: You would still have a net gain of deep water habitat over what's there now.

van Staveren: It is going to be a net gain and that's part of the discussion. They know it's only 40% design and it's going to be changing.

Mike Day, Day CPM, asked Totten to elaborate on why filling in the gap would add an estimated \$4 million to the Phase 1 budget. Totten said containment would have to be created on both sides of the ship in order to de-water the area, so the extra costs would be in new structure cost, creating the cofferdam, and removal of the ship. Joshua Dodson said that adding 60 feet to extend the cargo dock to the west could be an additive alternate if it was accepted, but \$500,000 would be added to the overall budget unless something were taken away. Day said that if phasing became an issue, there might be a way to address it in the short term. Commissioner Goblirsch noted that the agencies wanted to see a comparison of the cost of completing only Phase 1, rather than building the cofferdams and taking both ships out at the same time, and she felt the agencies would place more emphasis on removing the ships than on building the docks. Commissioner Jincks said economics always played a part in projects. He cited an economic impact study done four years ago that showed the fishing fleet brought \$19 million annually into the local economy. He said if there were a way to extend the dock and create jobs and bring revenue into the community, he was in favor of doing it; and, if during that same time, \$4 million was found to plug the hole, he was favor of doing that too.

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: Is there a significant difference between the cost of constructing the 750 psf dock and the 1,000 psf dock?

Craig Totten, KPFF: I can't tell you off the top of my head but it's not insignificant. A lot of it is in piling.

Fogarty: The heavy lift portion was based on "what if". The 750 psf dock was based on "what's needed". I think at this point the "what ifs" are gone, so if there is significant savings between those two, perhaps we can save \$500,000 right there.

Commissioner JoAnn Barton: I recall a conference call not very long ago, when I asked the same question and was told that the difference was insignificant.

Totten: That was probably me and I spoke out of turn. It doesn't make much difference in the superstructure cost itself but makes a difference in the piling.

Mike Schmid, KPFF: We will specifically identify the difference between the 1,000 and 750 psf.

Joshua Dodson, Day CPM: If that produces significant enough savings and we can add 60 feet to the west side of the cargo dock, then we will have taken care of our cargo needs and the needs of the fishing fleet in Phase 1.

Barton: I'm not there yet, and I'm not sure we can get the agencies there either.

Commissioner Ginny Goblirsch: I don't have a problem with adding to the end of the dock but I don't think we can move forward with that until John has ample opportunity to run that by the permitting agencies because this is new and they haven't talked about it yet. So I don't think we can say this is what we're going to do.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee: Where are we on finding funding for Phase 2?

Commissioner David Jincks: We have been told several times that our biological assessment and permit application will have to include a time line, costs, removal plans, and a means of financing, so the port has an obligation to come up with a funding plan. There are more dollars out there now and will be over the next few years than there ever has been in the past for habitat and mitigation and removal of these structures, so I feel comfortable with it.

Don Mann, General Manager: When we're talking about adding 60 feet to the end of the dock, that still puts us within the footprint of the old Pasley, so we're not taking any more deep water. It takes us almost to the end of where the Pasley is now. And as far as economic conditions, I think David said it well. Economic conditions are different than they have been over the last decade, and there is a lot of interest in moving cargo out of Newport, which presents a significant potential for income.

Bridget Wolfe, Steering Committee: The last JPA required more than one preferred plan. What's being done to have alternative plans available to the agencies?

Mike Schmid, KPFF: I believe we will present the conceptual/preliminary plan that was used for the NOAA restoration grant, our full build out alternative, and a "no action".

A short discussion followed about what sort of penalty might be involved if the agencies permitted the project and then funding could not be found for Phase 2, or the agencies would permit only removing the ships.

Wayne Hoffman and Commissioner Barton asked about contaminants in the Hennebique. Project Manager Pete Dale said 75%-80% of the ship had been examined and there was very little in the way of contaminants. Commissioner Jincks referenced the remediation plan Kennedy-Jenks had produced as a good source of information about the level of contaminants in the ship.

In answer to a question from Commissioner Jincks, Mike Schmid said he could have drawings for adding 60 feet to the dock in a couple of weeks, and Jincks said that was an area that needed more work and the team should move forward with it. Project Manager Joshua Dodson said a tentative decision to look at adding 60 feet to the dock did not necessarily mean the dock would be extended, but if costs could be refined, or load capabilities changed, or contracts brought in to produce a revenue stream to offset the cost, it might be possible.

I. Tentative Decision Regarding Clear Direction for Project Team to Complete Construction Documents

Project Manager Joshua Dodson summarized what he understood as the commission and steering committee's direction:

- Look into building an additional 60 feet on the west side of the cargo dock.

- The money for the additional 60 feet would come from refining numbers and “moving things around”.
- The project team would get back to the steering committee and commission in the next week or two with the changes to Phase 1.

Wayne Hoffman, Steering Committee, said he felt it was appropriate to run the numbers and talk to the agencies about adding 60 feet to the dock, but felt the project team should come back to the commission and steering committee with what they had found before proceeding to the 90% level. Joshua Dodson agreed, as did Mike Schmid, who added that they would need to do that “sooner than later”.

Commission President Goblirsch: We’ll talk again in two or three weeks about whether we can move forward with Phase 1 as we’re hearing right now.

Joe Rock, Steering Committee: You are really asking for two decisions. You are asking us to look at this and decide whether we can add the 60 feet or not; but if we can’t, do we approve Phase 1 as it stands?

Joshua Dodson, Day CPM: That’s the hard one.

Commissioner Barton: What we have found in this project is that expecting to hear a straight “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” in two weeks is asking too much. There is going to be a lot more in terms of cost versus benefit, rather than a “thumbs up or down”.

Yale Fogarty, Steering Committee: I understand the importance of moving forward and that speed is of the essence, but we also owe it to ourselves to make sure that it is done right and will meet needs and expectations of the users and the community.

J. Questions/Answers

Craig Totten asked about lopping off the triangular portion on the east end. Commissioner Barton asked if there was structure where the triangular portion was now and Totten said yes, and the plan had been to remove that structure, or part of it, in Phase 1.

In answer to a question from steering committee member Bridget Wolfe, John van Staveren, Pacific Habitat Services, summarized his involvement, interaction, and discussions with the agencies and said the agencies were committed to giving the project direction. He also described the potential cumulative environmental impact and effects on the bay of the parallel Terminal Renovation and NOAA MOC-P Homeport projects.

Commissioner Jincks asked for comments from Doug Cottam and Dan Avery, ODFW. Cottam said the discussion was exactly what they wanted to hear as far as open communication but had more to do with economics and engineering than biological issues so he and Avery didn’t have anything to add.

IV. OTHER

There was nothing under Other Business.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Sara Skamsner, Foulweather Trawl, said it was encouraging to see such a high level of cooperation, because the terminal was a multi-use facility, and she felt the discussion had been refreshing and positive.

VI. UPCOMING MEETINGS/EVENTS

- Fishermen’s Appreciation Day, November 20, 8:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m.
- Port Commission Work Session and Regular Meeting, YBYC Clubhouse, November 24, 6:00 p.m.
- Thanksgiving Holiday, November 26-27 (Port office closed)

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Special Meeting of the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

ATTEST

Ginny Goblirsch, President

JoAnn Barton, Secretary