Port of HOOD RIVER

Providing for the region's economic future.

INDUSTRIAL/COMMERCIAL FACILITIES • AIRPORT • INTERSTATE BRIDGE • MARINA

1000 E. Port Marina Dr. • Hood River, OR 97031 • (541) 386-1645 • Fax: (541) 386-1395 • portofhoodriver.com • Email: info@portofhoodriver.com

Date: October 20, 2026

From: Commissioner Kathryn Thomas & Port Staff

RE: Commissioner Questions & Staff Responses

---

1. Public Comment – Hood River Outrigger Canoe Club / Megan

- What is the Commission's role with respect to the Hood River Outrigger Canoe Club's request? Is the Commission being asked to provide policy direction, approve a future lease or use arrangement, or simply receive the information?

  The Hood River Outrigger Canoe Club (HROCC) leases Port property in Nichols Basin. The Port issues a seasonal Concession Permit to HROCC, from April to October each year. This is consistent with the other concessions and non-profits that operate at Nichols Basin and the Event Site. The HROCC met with staff last week to share their vision for a semi-permanent/moveable, year-round storage and fenced area at Nichols Basin. The public comment requests future Commission consideration of this proposal rather than immediate approval.

- Since the Club is asking to create a potentially movable, year-round facility on Port property, what approvals would ultimately be required before something like this could move forward?

  Port Resolution No 2023-24-18 currently states that "No new business development or new Concession permits issued for the Nichols Basin area until the traffic circle/parking plan has been decided that will help to determine the development of North 1st St. that will provide new access points and upland accommodations." The Commission would need to consider this policy before this request could advance. The Port would also need to evaluate a longer-term use arrangement, including equitable treatment of other waterfront concessions and non-profits. The Port would need to approve such an agreement, and City of Hood River land use approval would also likely be required.

2. Consent Agenda – Minutes: Real Estate Inventory / Amanda

- Are we still on track for the Commission to receive the broader inventory of Port real estate, including encumbrances and potential future interests, at Fall Planning?

  Yes, this is correct.

3. Consent Agenda – Executive Director Employment Agreement / Jana

- Cost-of-Living Adjustment: What specifically is used to determine the annual COLA for regular Port employees? Is there a defined index or methodology, or is the percentage determined annually through the budget process?

The Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) for regular Port employees is determined through the annual budget process. The Port uses the Consumer Price Index (CPI) published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, specifically the CPI for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), West Region. The CPI is reviewed annually to help determine the proposed COLA.

4. Hood River Rotary Expenses – Jana & Kevin

- What level of annual expense do we anticipate for the Rotary provision?

  Approximately $2,500, primarily for Rotary meals, dues, and scholarship fundraising activities.

- Are meals, travel, and lodging expected to stay within normal government per diem or travel limits, or could reimbursement exceed those amounts?

  No travel or lodging expenses are anticipated. Meal costs are well below applicable government per diem rates.

- Since the language covers dues, registration, meals, travel, lodging, and other expenses, should we establish an annual cap or clearer reimbursement parameters?

  While anticipated expenses are approximately $2,500, the Commission could establish a $5,000 annual reimbursement cap to provide flexibility while maintaining appropriate spending limits.

5. Consent Agenda – Bridge Property Resolution - will be pulling from consent for discussion / Kevin

- What exactly constitutes the project reaching appropriate funding and construction milestones and who makes that determination?

  The two primary milestones would be securing the necessary project financing and reaching construction mobilization. The policy intentionally does not establish specific dates or thresholds because the Bridge Authority's funding and construction schedule continues to evolve. The Authority would identify when property is needed, and the Port Commission would determine whether the circumstances warrant a conveyance. This resolution is intended to express the Port's overarching support for the project rather than establish specific conditions for transferring property.

- Would every actual conveyance return to the Commission for approval?

  Yes. All conveyances of Port-owned property or property rights would return to the Commission for consideration and approval. This resolution establishes policy direction only; it does not authorize any specific property transaction.

6. Marina Restroom Repair / Megan

- Are the combined cleaning and repair costs more or less than staff originally expected after the fire?

  The level of repairs and cost are similar to staff's initial expectations. Staff anticipated that the costs would exceed the Port's insurance $10,000 deductible. The combined cleaning and repair costs were generally in line with the assumptions from the Port's insurance adjuster, and both quotes from Adams Restoration were reviewed and further negotiated with the insurance adjuster.

- What will the Port's actual net cost be after insurance reimbursement and the deductible?

  The Port is responsible for the $10,000 insurance deductible only.

- Does the insurance reimbursement fully account for both Phase One and Phase Two expenses?

The insurance reimbursement accounts for both Phase One (cleaning) and Phase Two (repair).

- Phase One cost $8,600.61 and Phase Two is $25,681.14, or approximately $34,282 combined. The memo states that the Port would receive $23,718.02 in insurance reimbursement after the $10,000 deductible. Can staff walk through that calculation and clarify the portion that will ultimately fall to the Port?

  Phase One (cleaning) costs ended up being less than the original quote, at $8,036.88. This, plus Phase Two (repair) at $25,681.14 is $33,718.02. The Port pays the $10,000 deductible, with an insurance reimbursement of $23,718.02. If there are hidden damages that result in increased cost during the repair, those costs would be covered by insurance.

7. Boathouse Removal / Megan

- Who were the members who served as evaluators?

  Four Port staff evaluated the proposals – Megan Channell, Amanda Rose, Debbie Smith-Wagar and Emily Curtis.

- Can staff walk us through the actual scoring methodology? Specifically, how was the price component, which represented 70% of the score, calculated?

  Each evaluator followed the evaluation criteria from the RFP. The Cost Proposal (70 points/70% of total score) was evaluated based on the total proposed contract price, as well as completeness of the cost proposal, overall value to the Port, and proposed approach to quantity adjustments. The RFP also requested that the proposal describe how the proposed contract price would be adjusted if fewer than nine boathouses require removal, including identification of any fixed, shared, or project-wide costs that would not be reduced proportionately. Evaluators considered whether and how this was accounted for in each cost proposal.

- Was the lowest price automatically awarded the full 70 points and other prices proportionally scored, or was another calculation used?

  No, the lowest cost was not automatically awarded the full 70 points. The total cost was one of the evaluation considerations for the "Cost Proposal" category. Evaluators also considered the other RFP metrics, including overall value, completeness, and approach to quantity adjustments.

- Where did HME rank strictly on price compared with the other eight responsive proposals?

  HME Construction Inc was the third lowest cost of all proposers.

8. North Apron Project / Jeff

- Are we simply replacing obsolete helicopter parking or helipad markings on the north apron, or are we eliminating helicopter markings and parking at the airport more broadly?

  We aren't getting the helicopter traffic that we originally planned for. On the other hand, we have an immediate need for fixed wing tie-downs. We are eliminating the helicopter markings in exchange for the creation of ten new tie-downs.

- If helicopter operations continue, where will helicopter parking be accommodated after this project?

  The ramp between the tie-downs and the future terminal building will still be available for LifeFlight and other helicopter usage.

- The memo states that the approved Phase I budget is $94,850, while the task order is $89,850. What specifically is the remaining $5,000 intended to cover?

If there are additional funds remaining, the balance will be carried over for future projects. The project is starting out under budget.

9. Financial Report

- **Lower Hanel Mill:** What is the current status of the Lower Hanel Mill sale? The budget originally assumed a June 30 closing, while the current report assumes a fall sale and the Executive Director work plan targets December 31, 2026. What remains outstanding before closing?

  Amanda - Lower Hanel Mill is in the Buyers due diligence stage which ends October 26th. At which time the Buyer will elect to either walk away or proceed with closing. Up until this point, the Buyer has been very communicative and did not object to any title issues. There is no reason to think the Buyer will not elect to proceed to close. The buyer has until December 1, 2026 to do that.

- **General Fund personal services:** $25,266, or 46% of the $55,000 annual budget, has been spent after two months. The footnote identifies parking enforcement and a former waterfront manager's final paycheck. Will this normalize during the remainder of FY27?

  Jana - Yes, expenditures are anticipated to normalize as we progress through the fiscal year. We will continue to monitor this budget line and make adjustments at a later date, if necessary.

- **Waterfront operating revenue:** $39,492 against a $36,500 annual budget, or 108% after two months. Is this a sustainable revenue increase that should influence future forecasting?

  Jana - The increase is primarily due to additional waterfront activities this year. While this is a positive trend, we will continue to monitor revenue throughout the fiscal year to determine whether it should be considered in future budget forecasts.

- **Marina revenue:** $240,820 against a $498,300 annual budget, or 48%, largely because of the billing cycle. Does the timing make the percentage misleading for assessing performance?

  Jana - The 48% is accurate but reflects the timing of the annual marina billing cycle. We monitor expenses against the annual budget throughout the fiscal year to evaluate financial performance. We also consider other measures, such as occupancy rates, seasonal activity, and year-over-year comparisons, to assess overall marina performance.

- **Administration Non-Departmental materials and services:** approximately 35% of the annual budget has been used after 16.67% of the year. What is driving the early spending, and are these front-loaded expenditures?

  Jana - Expenses are higher due to annual service contract renewals paid early in the fiscal year. We expect spending to level out as the year progresses.

10. Bridge Replacement, Section 6(f), and Test Pile Program / Kevin & Amanda

- What are staff's remaining concerns with the proposed Section 6(f) conversion approach?

  Our primary concerns are the ultimate ownership of the replacement recreational property and any associated long-term operations and maintenance responsibilities. If replacement property is located outside Port ownership, the Port's role would primarily be facilitating the conversion, including the potential pass-through of proceeds.

- What is the largest unresolved risk for the Port: replacement property, valuation, permanent right-of-way, maintenance obligations, or regulatory approval?

  The location of the replacement recreational property and the associated long-term maintenance obligations are the two largest unresolved risks.

- Where is replacement recreational property expected to come from? <-- this may come from the brief tomorrow?

  The project team is evaluating Port-owned property east of the existing toll plaza, which will be relocated west during construction. This property is outside the existing Section 6(f) boundary and may be a viable replacement site. The team has also evaluated approximately a dozen other locations throughout the Mid-Columbia region but keeping project costs down is key. No final mitigation site has been selected.

- Section 6(f) concurrence: What specifically happens if the Port does not concur tonight? Does non-concurrence stop submission to OPRD and NPS, delay it, or simply require additional coordination? Is tonight's action only concurrence with the approach for regulatory review, rather than approval of a final property transaction?

  Concurrence demonstrates to the state and federal agencies that the Port Commission supports advancing the proposed approach for regulatory review. Without concurrence, additional coordination would likely be necessary, potentially delaying that review. Tonight's action does not approve a property transfer. If the agencies accept the proposed approach and determine that the identified replacement property is suitable, staff would return to the Commission for formal consideration of any necessary property transaction.

- Test Pile IGA: Are we technically approving the test pile program, or only approving access to the existing Port bridge for inspection, baselining, monitoring, and related activities? If the Port does not approve this IGA, what specifically cannot happen? The agreement runs through December 31, 2032. Why does an agreement associated with the test pile program need a term extending that far?

  The IGA authorizes limited access to the existing Port-owned bridge for inspections, baseline surveys, monitoring equipment, drone operations, and related activities. It does not constitute Port approval of the test pile construction program itself, which is the Bridge Authority's responsibility. Without the IGA, HNTB and its contractors would not have the contractual authorization needed to perform these activities on Port property, potentially delaying the planned November inspections and subsequent monitoring. The original draft extended through December 31, 2032. Staff revised the term to December 31, 2027, which more appropriately reflects the anticipated test pile activities while allowing time for follow-up monitoring and equipment removal. Any extension would require written agreement by both parties.

11. ODOT Bridge Inspection / Amanda

- What is the current 0-to-100 number being presented for the bridge, if any?

  Amanda/Kevin - FHWA has discontinued the historical 0–100 sufficiency rating as part of its transition to updated National Bridge Inventory reporting standards. Consequently, the 2026 inspection does not provide a new 0–100 sufficiency score.

  The former fracture-critical inspection, now called the Nonredundant Steel Tension Member (NSTM) inspection, is one of several specialized inspections used to evaluate the bridge's condition. These

inspections contribute information to the broader bridge assessment, but no single inspection independently determines the bridge's overall federal condition classification.

Under the current system, the bridge is classified as Fair, based on its deck rating of 6, superstructure rating of 6, and substructure rating of 5.

As Will Strehler will explain tonight, the evolution of federal bridge reporting also reflects a greater emphasis on detailed condition assessments, proactive maintenance, and long-term asset management rather than relying primarily on a single composite score. The Port's 12-year Capital Improvement and Inspection & Maintenance Plan is intended to support that approach.

- What has materially changed since the prior inspection?

  The most substantial rating change is the substructure improving from 4–Poor to 5–Fair, with Pier 6 spall repairs cited as the reason. That changes the overall classification from Poor to Fair. The deck and superstructure remain at 6. The report also notes that annual deck welding has significantly reduced cracked welds, although defects remain. Channel and scour ratings increased, but the report references the October 2024 underwater inspection for those changes.

- $13.445 Million Capital Improvement and Maintenance Plan: Am I reading the plan correctly that $13.445 million represents the total short-term bridge capital, inspection, and maintenance program? Is the Port expected to pay the full $13.445 million? Which portion is already funded or committed? Does the $13.445 million include inflation, escalation, and contingency, or is it stated in current dollars?

  Amanda/Kevin - Yes. The $13.445 million represents the estimated cost of capital improvements, inspections, and maintenance through 2037. Although labeled "Short Term," it covers the full 12-year planning period. This is a planning estimate, not an approved expenditure. Individual projects are prioritized, budgeted, and brought to the Commission for approval as appropriate. The plan does not distinguish funded from unfunded projects or identify future funding sources. Estimates are stated in current dollars, without separately identified inflation, escalation, or contingency. HDR is reviewing the plan against the 2026 inspection findings, with potential updates anticipated in November.

- How much of the planned superstructure and paint-system work has been completed as of today?

  The Port completed a substantial lower-chord painting project in 2011–2012. The records confirm preparation and recoating of lower chords and selected transverse members across much of the bridge. This was targeted preservation work, rather than a complete repainting of the entire superstructure. Otherwise, the work pending with AHBE & Svoboda will be the 100% complete by the end of December 2026. Painting under the current Abhe & Svoboda project will focus on deteriorated steel members and gusset plates in Span 12, with the specific areas confirmed in the field by the engineer. Additional coating work will occur at steel repair locations, including a stringer and adjoining lateral bracing in the lift span (Span 11), bottom-chord repairs in Spans 4 and 7, and bearing anchor-link repairs in Spans 3, 14, 15, and 19. This is targeted maintenance painting to protect affected steel and repaired areas, rather than a full repainting of the bridge. One of the plans is to use this section being painted to get a better handle on the potential overall costs of painting for the remainder of the substructure.

- Does the TODAY marker show that we are current with the planned maintenance program, or are any essential or priority items behind schedule?

  With the WJE work completed and Task Order 15 expected to reach substantial completion by the end of December, the remaining items are engineering for the south-abutment embankment sloughing which are

being talked about actively with HDR to determine what work if any needs to be completed, the ODOT underwater inspection, and any needed bolt and guardrail segment replacements.

12. Marina Basin Master Plan / Megan

- How is the draft Master Plan being coordinated with the Section 6(f) process and future bridge right-of-way so we do not plan improvements within areas whose long-term availability is uncertain?

  The Marina Basin Master Plan excludes the area that will be affected by the Bridge Replacement Project (and the associated Section 6(f) process).

- What portions of this concept are realistic in the next three to five years versus truly long-range ideas?

  There are several elements that would make sense for early prioritization, including reconfiguration of the boathouse dock area and potentially expanding the existing A and B docks for added moorage slips. Upland, refurbishing the picnic shelter would be another near-term opportunity. Long-term elements include new docks, landscaping upgrades to Marina Green, and commercial jetty improvements.

- Which elements generate revenue, and which require ongoing Port subsidy?

  This will be further evaluated and identified in the Master Plan. Key revenue-generating elements include the extended or new docks for additional moorage slips, refurbishing the picnic shelter pavilion for improved rentable space, and expanded small vessel/dinghy storage areas (either on the docks or upland).

- Before adoption, will we see rough-order-of-magnitude costs and a prioritization or phasing strategy?

  This phase of the Marina Basin Master Plan, as an extension of the Strategic Business Plan, includes a master plan map and supporting descriptions. High level cost and prioritization considerations will be included. Yes, the Commission will see this information before adoption.

13. Executive Director Report

- Bicycle Incident and Safety: What is the Port's current policy and procedure when someone is injured on Port property? Who is notified, what documentation is created, and when is the insurer contacted? Does the Port have a consistent incident-response procedure across the waterfront, airport, and marina?

  Amanda - *When the Port receives a report that someone has been injured, staff gather as much information as possible, including the exact location, date and time, what happened, the reported injury, and any available photographs or witness information. One of the first steps is confirming whether the incident occurred on Port property, since people often assume an area belongs to the Port when it does not. Based on the location and circumstances, we contact Scott, our insurance representative, and provide the information collected. Scott reviews the incident and determines whether it should be referred to SDAO for further review and support. Recreational immunity is relevant when an injury occurs on land made available for public recreation. Oregon law provides certain liability protections for qualifying recreational use, but those protections depend on the circumstances and do not automatically apply to every injury on Port property. Any determination about recreational immunity would be made with guidance from our insurance representatives and legal counsel.*

- **Mt. Hood Meadows In-Kind Advertising:** What exactly does the in-kind advertising arrangement with Mt. Hood Meadows include? What is its estimated value to the Port? How does that value compare with what we would otherwise expect to receive for the parking use?

  Megan - The in-kind advertising would mirror what Mt. Hood Meadows provided last year. This includes posters and rotating TV screen ads that are displayed at the resort, acknowledging the Port of Hood River's support for community transportation. While Mt. Hood Meadows does not typically offer this type of

advertising and does not have a set rate, this is estimated at about a $2,000 value (based on the 2025 agreement), which covers Mt. Hood Meadow's use of a portion of the Event Site for park-and-ride parking.

- **Toll Billing Complaints:** How many toll-billing complaints do we average per month? Has that number been trending up or down? Do we have a benchmark that tells us whether our complaint rate is consistent with comparable toll systems?

  Marcela - The Hood River–White Salmon Interstate Bridge accommodates approximately 4 million vehicle crossings annually, averaging roughly 333,000 monthly and 11,000 daily. Marcela estimates receiving approximately 60–70 toll-related inquiries per business day, or 1,200–1,400 monthly. This represents roughly four customer-service inquiries for every 1,000 bridge crossings. The volume of inquiries has remained relatively consistent. Most involve disputed charges, additional fees, missing invoices, payment information, or vehicle ownership questions. Staff estimates that 80–90% of customer interactions are resolved satisfactorily. While we do not currently have comparative statistics from other tolling agencies, these estimates help illustrate the relatively small volume of customer inquiries compared with the approximately 4 million annual bridge crossings.

- **Overnight Coverage and Security:** The report states that eliminating two service contracts is offset by adding a full-time night monitor. What exactly will the night monitor's responsibilities and hours be? Does this provide equivalent or better overnight coverage than the eliminated contracts? What functions previously performed by the contractors will not be performed by the night monitor?

  Amanda - The full-time night monitor works from 9:00 p.m. to 5:30 a.m., with workdays adjusted based on operational needs. His responsibilities include interior and exterior observation of Port properties, after-hours walkthroughs of Big 7, Jensen, and Wasco to confirm the buildings are secure, locking gates and waterfront restrooms, and issuing parking citations when needed. The position also provides a more consistent Port presence overnight and is better than the previous contract. De-escalation was an area where the previous contractor's performance fell short. Our monitor is building relationships with the Hood River County Sheriff's Office, Oregon State Police, and Hood River Police Department to improve coordination, address conflicts, and provide better interactions with the public. This also gives us greater support in regard to maintenance emergencies because the Port monitor is able to assist with an emergency right away as his skills overlap with our daytime facilities crew. The discontinuation of the Hood River Security contract and the Communications/Special Projects contract more than make up for the addition of the full time monitor program.

- **SDAO Conference:** I would like to attend the SDAO conference February 4-7, 2027, in Sunriver. Do you handle my registration once I notify you, or should I register myself? *Patty - Yes, staff will take care of the registration*

- **HR Answers:** Is the HR Answers contract included in the currently approved FY27 budget, or is this an additional expense? If additional, what budget line will fund it, and is a budget adjustment necessary? What do we anticipate the annual cost being beyond the $395 setup and $129 monthly fee, given the additional $250-per-hour service charge?

  Patty - HR Answers was not specifically included in the approved FY27 budget but will be funded through savings from discontinued communications contracts. No budget adjustment is currently anticipated. The base cost is $129 monthly ($1,548 annually), plus a one-time $395 setup fee, totaling $1,943 in the first year. Additional consulting costs $250 per hour and will require Port approval. These expenses cannot be projected in advance, but any significant additional HR costs would be evaluated and funded through available budget savings or contingencies, consistent with past practice.

- **Big 7 Building:** How much leasable square footage remains at Big 7? If the prospective tenant takes all remaining leasable space, what would occupancy become and what additional annual revenue would that produce?

  Amanda - Big 7 has 10,171 square feet of leasable space remaining. At $0.50 per square foot per month, leasing that space would generate an additional $5,085.50 per month, or $61,026 annually, and bring the building to 100% occupancy of its leasable area. There is also 2,049 square feet of unleasable space, which, at the same rate, would represent potential revenue of $1,024.50 per month, or $12,294 annually, if that space could be made leasable.

- **Jensen Building:** How much leasable space is currently vacant in the Jensen Building? What is the leasing plan and timeline for that space?

  Amanda - The Jensen building is currently fully occupied. There is no leasing plan in place until we know of a vacancy coming up. However, we do have leasing signs placed and get calls weekly to lease space in the building should space become available.

- **Waterfront and Congressionally Directed Spending:** What is the latest status of the $1 million FY27 Congressionally Directed Spending request for Phase I construction? When do we expect to know whether that funding will be available? If it is unsuccessful, what is Plan B for filling that funding gap?

  Megan - The Congressionally Directed Spending request is still pending and the timing is uncertain. Staff is developing an updated funding and financing plan to be discussed at the Commission's November Fall Planning session, which would identify potential options for filling the remaining funding gap.

- **Foundation and Changing Station:** Can we get a substantive update on the changing-station project? This was initiated as a solution to the portable changing or privacy structure more than a year ago. What has happened since then?

  Megan - Over the past year, a new Foundation Board was established with initial efforts focused on governance, including getting the back-end fundraising accounts and policies in place, and identifying project priorities. This included the changing station at Frog Beach. Port staff developed cost estimates and the Foundation is responsible for fundraising to support its implementation. The Foundation Board is currently preparing marketing materials to solicit donations, with the Port ultimately responsible for reviewing and approving improvements on Port property.

- **AI Policy: Definition -** The definition says generative AI can create 'answers.' What exactly does 'answers' mean in this policy?

  Kevin/Patty - "Answers" refers to AI-generated responses to a user's questions or prompts, including explanations, summaries, instructions, recommendations, analyses, or other information. These responses are generated by the AI system and should not be presumed accurate, complete, or authoritative without appropriate human review and verification.

- **AI Policy: General Knowledge and Verification** - What constitutes general knowledge under acceptable use? How does an employee know when a question crosses from general knowledge into Port-sensitive, confidential, legally significant, or technically specialized information? Who is responsible for verifying an AI response, and what constitutes adequate verification?

Kevin/Patty - General knowledge is publicly available, low-risk information. Sensitive Port matters, legal issues, financial decisions, and technical subjects require additional caution. Employees are responsible for verifying AI-generated information against reliable, current sources and consulting appropriate professionals when necessary. AI supplements, but does not replace, professional judgment.

- **AI Policy: Internet Access and Current Information** - Do the AI systems the Port intends to approve have access to current internet information? If different approved AI systems have different access to outside or current information, should the policy or training distinguish among them? How should employees verify that information is current and authoritative?

  Kevin/Patty - Employees should not assume AI-generated information is current or accurate. Important facts, recommendations, and citations must be verified against reliable, authoritative sources, preferably original documents or official websites.

  Port training should explain the capabilities and limitations of approved AI tools, including information security. Employees remain responsible for verifying information used in official Port work.

- **AI Policy: Security**- What security requirements must an AI tool meet before it is approved? Do approved tools use Port prompts or uploaded data to train their models? What retention controls apply to prompts and uploaded information? What prevents AI tools from exposing information to users who should not have access to it?

  Kevin/Patty - AI tools must be approved through the Port's review process, with IT assistance as needed. Approval should address security, privacy, data retention, access controls, and whether Port information is used to train AI models. Employees must follow Port confidentiality policies and may only enter sensitive information into systems specifically authorized for that purpose.

- **AI Policy: Transparency** - Should we require disclosure when AI materially contributes to a Commission memo, policy, report, public communication, or other packet material? Even if a human ultimately reviews the work, should the public be able to tell where AI materially contributed to the document? Would a simple disclosure standard better support the stated goal of transparency and public trust?

  Kevin/Patty - The Commission may establish a disclosure requirement when AI materially contributes to the analysis, findings, or recommendations in official Port documents. Routine assistance with brainstorming, grammar, formatting, or editing would not generally require disclosure. Regardless of AI involvement, Port staff remain responsible for the accuracy and content of all official documents.

- **Airport:** Windsock- The windsock looks great. I drove out to see it Sunday. Thank you for getting that replaced. *Jeff - You're welcome; thank you for noticing.*

- **Airport:** Operations Count - The Airport Manager's narrative states that 2026 year-to-date operations are 9,569, while the attached Motion Info report states 9,594 operations through October 8. Which figure is correct?

  Jeff - This number changes with every flight that comes in and out. As I print a report or type it, it changes based on activity every day. As of the time of this email the count is 10,262