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: November 17, 2026

From: Commissioner Kathryn Thomas & Port Staff

RE: Commissioner Questions & Staff Responses – Regular Session

---

1. **Minutes - Page 7 - BUILD Grant**
   - What is the status of the federal debrief request for the BUILD grant?
     - Have we received the debrief?
     - If not, when do we expect it?
     - When will the Commission receive the feedback?

   The debrief with USDOT was on October 20, 2026, and a brief verbal update was provided as part of the Executive Director Report at the October 20, 2026 Commission meeting. The Phase I, 2nd/Riverside Roundabout (capital construction) and Phase II, 1st St Realignment (planning) applications both received "Recommended" ratings (ratings are: Not Recommended, Recommended, Highly Recommended). Feedback emphasized strengthening the Phase I application with more robust data and quantification of benefits, specifically safety. For Phase II, the feedback was to have more information on project-specific improvements.

2. **Master Fee Schedule - Pages 15-17 - Parking / Toll Fees**
   - For the electronic parking passes, can staff walk through exactly what the customer will see and pay at checkout? *The customer will see: 1) the Port's parking pass fee and 2) the Passport service fee. For example, for 2027, the customer will see the following for the Annual Parking Pass (Regular): $365 (Port parking pass fee) + $5 (Passport service fee) = $370 (total)*
   - Are the third-party processing fees included in the rates shown? *For the annual parking passes, yes, the Master Fee Schedule includes the third-party fee.*
   - Will there be any additional fee at checkout beyond the published rate? *For 2027, no, the customer will not see any additional fee at checkout beyond what is published in the 2027 Master Fee Schedule.*
   - Can we make sure third-party fees are clearly identified to customers before they purchase? *Third-party fees are clearly stated on all screens before requesting payment details.*
   - For the new $3 second-invoice toll fee:
     - How will the customer know that the additional fee has been assessed? *On the second invoice it is clearly stated.*

- Will the invoice clearly distinguish between the original toll, second-invoice fee, and any subsequent late fee? *Yes, all are listed on the invoices.*

3. **Pages 18-19 - Bridge Violations**
   - Who has the authority to issue these bridge violations and fines? *The Port's Executive Director or designee.*
   - What is the process for documenting and issuing these violations? Not sure, perhaps state statute? *Sec. 33-35 of Ord. 30 states the process.*
     - Is there an appeal process? *Yes.*
4. **Marina East Administrative Building - Page 21 - Facility Relocation**
   - Is staff recommending Marina East as the preferred location over Wasco at this point?
     - If so, what changed in the comparison that gives staff confidence Marina East is now the better option?

     Marina East is already commercially zoned, with a layout suitable for public access. Wasco is a light industrial building with a largely unfinished interior that would require additional buildout to accommodate a public-facing use.

   - We have already spent $23,492 on the Wasco design.
     - Is any of that work transferable to Marina East? *No, the work completed for Wasco cannot be transferred to Marina East. However, it remains valuable to Wasco by informing future tenant improvements and identifying what would be needed if the building is used for a public-facing purpose.*

5. **Pages 23-28 - Proposed Layout**
   - Which of the two layouts is staff recommending? *Staff does not yet have a recommendation on the initial draft floor plans as these were created first to confirm feasibility of needed space. Pending Commission direction on next steps, staff would work with SUM Design to discuss both options and develop a preferred option for the schematic design phase.*
   - Does the preferred layout provide enough flexibility for:
     - Future staffing?
     - Commission meetings?
     - Public meetings?
     - Future changes in how the Port uses the building?

     The initial floor plans provided similar spacing as to what was programmed in the Wasco Building. The initial floor plans show space for a Commission meeting room, management offices, and staff work stations to meet Port business needs. While the space is limited, the initial floor plans show room for extra work stations and huddle/conference room spaces beyond what exists today to accommodate potential future changes.

6. **Pages 30-31 - Meetings / Coordination**
   - Are the number of meetings included in the scope sufficient for a project of this complexity?
     - What happens if additional staff or Commission meetings are needed?

   Yes, staff believes the number of meetings is sufficient for the scope. This is consistent with the scope for the prior Wasco Building design development, for which the defined number of meetings was sufficient. If additional meetings are needed, staff will work with the consultant to first see if other efficiencies in the budget can be used to cover the needed meetings. Should the needed number of meetings substantially increase, an amendment may be required.

   - Is the City coordination identified in the scope sufficient?
     - Is Hood River County coordination also needed?

   Yes, staff believes the City coordination is sufficient. The scope includes early agency consultation and opportunity for expedited permitting. If desired, Task 2.4 could be revised to explicitly name the County for any needed permitting as well.

   - Are there other agencies or utilities we should coordinate with now rather than risk a schedule issue later? *Because this would be a remodel of an existing building with established utility services, staff does not anticipate extensive coordination with outside agencies or utility providers. The Work Order states "Consultant shall coordinate with Port staff and other agencies, consultants, utilities, or stakeholders as reasonably necessary to complete the authorized scope."*

7. **Pages 31-32 - Permitting**
   - What permits do we actually anticipate needing to move this project forward? *The proposed Work Order under consideration is intended, in part, to help staff answer this pending the preferred schematic design (first task in the Work Order). Because this is a remodel of an existing building, staff anticipates permitting to be focused around building, mechanical, electrical and plumbing. Staff would work early with SUM Design to confirm if any additional land use approvals or permits would be needed.*
   - The proposal assumes no jurisdictional design review will be required.
     - What is that assumption based on?
     - Has that been confirmed with the City?

   This is based on the project being primarily an interior remodel of an existing building, with no expansion of the building footprint and continued use of the building as office space. Staff would confirm this with the City early in the Schematic Design phase, including whether the proposed Commission meeting space or potential coffee shop would trigger additional land use review.

   - If jurisdictional design review is required, what is the potential impact on:
     - Cost?
     - Schedule?
     - September 2027 occupancy?

If additional review is required, there could be additional costs (e.g., costs related to application fees, consultant services, and design modifications). Staff intends to confirm these requirements early in design and minimize potential impacts, understanding the September 2027 occupancy need by the Bridge Replacement.

8. **Page 32 - Schedule**
   - Is March 31, 2027 a realistic date for completed construction documents?
     - How much contingency is built into that schedule?

   This is a tight schedule, with no contingency. The schedule is based on a 16-20 week design phase (November 18 – March10/April 7), an assumed 4-6 week contractor procurement (April 1 – May 12) and a 14-16 week construction phase (May 13 – September 1), with relocation happening the month of September.

   - Does March 31 give us enough time to bid, permit, and construct the project and still meet the September 2027 occupancy requirement?
     - Does the September 2027 date align with the Bridge Authority's timeline and requirements?

   Design completion by March 31 provides a tight schedule for bidding, permitting and construction. Meeting this deadline will require concurrent permitting and procurement activities where feasible, timely decision making and minimal delays. The September 2027 occupancy date is based on the anticipated timeline for the Bridge Replacement Project. Staff will continue to coordinate with the Bridge Authority to confirm relocation requirements and timelines as the project progresses.

9. **Page 33 - Reimbursable Expenses**
   - Reimbursable expenses are allowed up to $2,200.
     - Is that within the normal range for a project and contract of this size? *The reimbursable expenses are about 2% of the total Work Order value and will only be reimbursed if incurred. Staff believes this is reasonable.*
   - Are we planning to use virtual meetings whenever in-person attendance is not necessary? *Yes*.
   - Is there any markup on reimbursable or travel expenses? *There is not a markup on reimbursable expenses (which includes travel). The 10% administrative fee is limited to management of the subconsultant.*

10. **Pages 36 / 40-41 - Costs and Exclusions**
    - What is staff's best estimate of the costs that are not included in the $116,789 work order? *Staff has not developed a cost estimate for services excluded, as the cost proposal is consistent with the scope. Certain excluded costs, including mechanical and AV are anticipated to be addressed as part of the construction contract.*
    - What is our potential financial exposure if some or all of the excluded services ultimately become necessary? *The financial exposure cannot be quantified at this time. Should additional services be necessary, staff will first look for opportunity for efficiencies within the existing scope and budget,*

and any necessary Work Order amendments would be brought forward to the Commission prior to approval.

11. Marina Boathouse Removal - Pages 43-44 - Cost / Owners

- Have the seven participating boathouse owners been given their final estimated share based on the $358,110 contract?
    - Have all seven owners agreed to the 50/50 cost-sharing arrangement?

The participating owners have been provided estimates based on HME's original proposal. Final individual cost-sharing amounts will be based on the Commission-approved HME contract total. The agreement between the Port and participating owners includes the 50/50 cost-sharing arrangement.

- What happens financially if an owner backs out before removal? *Should an owner back out, the terms of their existing boathouse lease will apply, under which the owner is solely responsible for arranging and paying for the removal of their boathouse by December 31, 2026. The Port's contract with HME includes a provision for a deductive change order should the number of participating boathouses decrease.*
- Have we had contact with the owner of the boathouse that was sold for $1? *Yes. Staff have been in communication with the new owner regarding the applicable Marina Rules and Regulations, insurance and title documentation requirements, and the December 31, 2026 removal deadline. The new owners have indicated they are aware of the removal deadline.*

12. Page 45 - Schedule

- The contract runs through June 30, 2027, although completion is anticipated in March.
    - What happens if permitting or regulatory approvals push the project past June 30? *The June contract completion date is provided to allow for schedule contingency (e.g., permitting, regulatory or other unforeseen delays), and also to provide time for final payments and administrative closeout. Should the project extend beyond June 2027, a contract extension would be needed.*
    - Does an extension expose the Port to additional costs? *An extension has the potential to result in additional costs, depending on the nature of the delay. An extension of the contract does not, in and of itself, authorize additional compensation.*
    - At what point would staff need to return to the Commission? *Staff would return to the Commission if a contract amendment required additional compensation beyond the authorized expenditure authority.*

13. Page 46 - Funding

- The Port's 50% contribution is coming from FY27 contingency.
    - How much of our contingency will this project use? *Staff will likely recommend using $190,000 from contingency to cover the Port's 50% of the project.*
    - What does that leave available for other unforeseen needs? *That will leave $360,000 available for other uses. The Port also has almost $11.5M available in "reserve for future*

expenditure" if "unforeseen needs" exceed $360,000. This will be the first time the Port has used its contingency in sometime.

- If costs approach the $393,921 maximum authorization, where does the additional Port share come from? *Staff anticipates the full amount of the Port's share coming from contingency.*
- Is there a maximum amount of financial exposure for the Port under the 50/50 arrangement? *The 50/50 cost-sharing arrangement does not currently include a cap.*

14. Marina Basin Master Plan - Pages 61-77

- By adopting the Master Plan, are we adopting a planning framework or making any commitment to fund or construct the projects identified in it? *The Master Plan is intended to serve as a planning guide and framework for future improvements, not a commitment to fund or construct all identified projects. Implementation will be considered over time based on available funding, project feasibility, community needs, and Commission direction.*
- Does adoption of the plan limit the Commission's ability to reprioritize projects later based on funding or changing community needs? *No, adoption of the Master Plan does not limit the Commission's ability to reprioritize projects as circumstances change. The plan reflects current community input and priorities but is intended to remain a flexible framework that can adapt to available funding, evolving community needs, and future Commission direction.*

15. Economic Impact Analysis - Page 79

- What would happen if the Commission did not accept the Economic Impact Analysis today? There would be no immediate operational or financial consequence. However, staff would be more reluctant to rely on the analysis in grant applications, marketing materials, and public communications without formal Commission acceptance. Acceptance demonstrates that the Commission recognizes the analysis as a useful planning and communication resource. It does not mean the Commission is independently certifying every estimate.
- How will this analysis be used moving forward?
    - Grant applications? Yes. It provides quantitative support for the Port's regional economic development role.
    - Funding decisions? Potentially. It can help demonstrate broader economic benefits, but should not replace project-specific financial analysis.
    - Development decisions? To some extent. It provides economic context but does not establish whether a particular development will generate an adequate return for the Port.
    - Public communications? Yes. It helps explain the Port's economic contribution to the community.
- What level of confidence should the Commission place in the figures when we use them externally? *The Commission should have reasonable confidence in the analysis as a professionally prepared estimate of the Port's economic contribution, while recognizing that economic impact modeling is not an exact accounting exercise. The figures are based on economic assumptions and multiplier effects, so they should be presented as estimates rather than precise measurements. Staff should consistently attribute the results to Points Consulting and describe them as the study's*

findings. The analysis is particularly useful for demonstrating the scale and breadth of the Port's economic contribution, but it should not be interpreted as a measure of the Port's profitability or the financial return on individual projects.

16. Wasco Building Lease - Page 83

- Does staff have any concerns about moving forward with this lease before the Marina East relocation decision and schedule are fully settled? *Yes. Staff would not recommend executing a lease at Wasco until the Commission is confident that the building will not be needed as the Port's future administrative offices. That decision should account for the Marina East relocation plan and schedule, as well as final confirmation of the bridge's BIP grant funding. Lease discussions can continue, but execution should follow the Commission's determination of the Port's facility needs.*

- What lease term is staff recommending:
    - Two years?
    - Three years?
    - Five years?

  From a leasing and economic development perspective, staff generally favors a longer commitment because it provides greater revenue stability and supports longer-term tenant investment. Of the options presented, staff would favor five years if the Commission determines that Wasco will not be needed for Port offices during that period. A two- or three-year term may be more appropriate if the Port needs to preserve flexibility while its future administrative location is resolved.

- The memo references approximately $1.50/SF and $7,458 per month, while the draft lease shows $1.55/SF and $7,706.60 per month.
    - Which rate are we actually approving?
    - Can the documents be made consistent before execution?

  The memo's reference to approximately $1.50 per square foot per month establishes a minimum baseline for discussion. Staff recommends the draft lease rate of $1.55 per square foot per month, or $7,706.60 per month for 4,972 square feet, plus tenant-paid expenses as outlined in the lease. The final rate remains subject to Commission approval. The documents will be made consistent before execution. The lease included in the packet is a draft for consideration and does not represent a final agreement. Following Commission direction, staff will revise the documents to reflect the approved rate, term, and other conditions before presenting the lease for signature.

17. Waterfront Changing Station - Pages 101-105

- I want to confirm that the proposed design is consistent with the Commission's previous discussion.
    - I thought we were talking about a changing facility that maintained an open component rather than a fully enclosed structure. Has the concept changed?

The design included was the original proposed design from the Foundation, but can be altered to have the open component if that is what the Commission prefers.

- What exactly are we approving today:
    - Location? *Yes*
    - General concept? *Yes*
    - Specific design shown in the packet? *Yes. The Commission can modify as desired.*
- How are we addressing:
    - Security and visibility? *The final design will consider both user privacy and visibility to discourage inappropriate activity. The changing station will include a gap at the bottom of the stall, allowing the public to see whether the facility is occupied without compromising the user's privacy.*
    - Maintenance? *The Port will be responsible for maintaining any new changing stations, consistent with current practices for the changing stations at The Spit and The Hook. Historically, maintenance at both locations has been minimal and relatively low cost.*
    - Cleaning? *The Port will be responsible for routine cleaning as part of its ongoing facility maintenance.*
    - Vandalism? *The Port will be responsible for addressing any vandalism and completing necessary repairs as part of its ongoing facility maintenance.*
    - Accessibility? *The changing station will be open to the public, and the design will consider accessibility for users of varying abilities. Final design will need to account for applicable accessibility requirements.*
- The approximately $1,000 capital cost is being funded by the Foundation, but what ongoing maintenance responsibility is the Port accepting? *The Port will be responsible for maintaining any new changing stations, consistent with current practices for the changing stations at The Spit and The Hook. Historically, maintenance at both locations has been minimal and relatively low cost.*
- If additional changing stations are proposed later, will those locations and designs come back to the Commission? *Yes, any future changing station locations and their designs will be presented to the Commission for feedback and approval.*

-###-