AUGUST 18, 2026 COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS AND STAFF ANSWERS

Consent Agenda Item B – Organizational Restructure /Jana/Patty (Human Resources)

- I want to acknowledge the work that has gone into implementing the restructuring without increasing budget authority. Great job. The fact that the Port was able to increase staffing and realign responsibilities while remaining within existing budget constraints demonstrates initiative and an understanding of the financial realities the Port is facing. *Thank you.*
- With the staffing changes, how did the number of supervisory and management positions change, if at all? *As part of the restructuring updates, two lead positions were eliminated, one lead position was retained, and the Operations Administrator position was reclassified as a supervisor position.*
- Did the span of control and reporting relationships shift significantly as part of the restructuring? *No. The overall span of control and reporting relationships did not change significantly, but the new structure more clearly defines the chain of command.*
- Are staff receiving leadership or management training to support these increased supervisory responsibilities? *Yes. Staff have already completed online supervisory training. Cascade Employers Association will provide more in-depth training in September, with individual coaching available as needed.*
- The memo notes that staffing increased from 24 to 25 FTEs. How did the overall management structure change with the shifts we are seeing now? *The additional FTE reflects the addition of a full-time Overnight Port Monitor, which replaced contracted security services. The restructuring also streamlined the chain of command, strengthened succession planning and provided more day-to-day support in the field. This allows the Real Estate Director to focus less on daily operational matters and more on larger policy and strategic responsibilities.*

Consent Agenda Item C – Marina Boathouse Removal RFP / Megan

- May Commissioners attend the mandatory pre-proposal meeting as observers? *Yes, this is a public meeting and Commissioners are welcome to attend. Commissioners will need to be mindful of quorum requirements.*
- What will the makeup of the evaluation/review committee be? *Port staff will serve as the evaluation/selection committee, with representation from the Capital Development/Planning and Real Estate and Asset Management departments.*
- I noticed a discrepancy in the packet regarding proposal due dates/opening dates. Why are proposals opened three days after submittal rather than immediately on the due date? *This procurement is an RFP for Goods and Services, rather than an*

Invitation to Bid (ITB). Per the Port's procurement rules, proposals will not be read aloud at the time of opening. The proposals are due on a Friday, and the opening is set for Monday with the intent of providing staff time to confirm receipt and organize the submittals. Staff can shift this to have the due date and opening date align.

- I appreciate the environmental protection provisions and hazardous materials requirements included in the RFP. *Thank you.*
    - Has the Port completed any preliminary hazardous materials screening so bidders are pricing known risks rather than broad contingencies? *(see below)*
    - What level of cost exposure could exist if lead- or asbestos-containing materials are discovered? *(see below)*
    - Since cost is weighted so heavily, are we comfortable that environmental protection, methodology, and contractor capability are being appropriately accounted for? *(see next bullet)*
    - *The Port has not completed hazardous materials screening to date. Given the age of some of the boathouses, there could be lead or asbestos containing materials. The RFP requests that contractors conduct a hazardous materials assessment and abatement (as necessary) prior to any demolition. Contractors are expected to price this based on their expertise and identify their approach. The Port does not currently have enough information to quantify the cost. While cost is intentionally the primary evaluation factor, proposals also will be evaluated on methods and schedule, including hazardous materials procedures and overall feasibility of approach. The Port will be considering contractor capability in addition to price. The Port is comfortable with the current score allocation, but is open to adjust should the Commission recommend a different distribution to increase the point allocation for approach.*
- Has the Port already established any priority order for boathouse removal as referenced in the RFP? *The RFP does not dictate a priority order for boathouse removal and relies on the contractor to define the proposed removal sequencing and method. Based on the Port's initial input from the contractor community, contractor methods vary (e.g., one by one boathouse removal, demolition and disposal vs. phasing removal of all first, then demolition and disposal).*
- Can you provide a high-level overview of the grounds on which a proposer may protest under OAR 137-047-0730? *A proposer can protest anything in the RFP or request a change to a provision, specification or contract term in the RFP. For example, a proposer could raise a concern that a requirement is unnecessarily restrictive or unclear. OAR 137-047-0730 establishes the requirements for how a protest or change request must be submitted.*

- In the evaluation criteria, why is cost weighted at 80 points while past performance and similar project experience are not specifically scored criteria? *Cost is intentionally set to be the primary driver, as this is a removal and demolition project and the Port has an interest in obtaining the work at a competitive price. However, since this is not a low-bid procurement, methods and schedule also are considered. Proposers are required to provide company information and references, which allows the Port to review qualifications and past performance as part of determining the overall feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed approach. Staff is open to adjusting the proposed point scale based on Commission feedback.*
- Is a 90-day firm offer period standard for procurements like this? *The RFP does not specify a 90-day firm offer period, but the timeline between the RFP advertisement and anticipated Commission consideration for Contract approval is about 90 days (August 19 – November 18). This accounts for the standard procurement timelines for an RFP for Goods and Services in the Port's Procurement Rules, including the 30-day RFP advertisement period and the 7-day protest period following Notice of Intent to Award. It also accommodates the Commission's monthly meeting schedule, with Notice of Intent to Award anticipated for consideration at the Commission's October meeting and Contract Approval at the November meeting.*
- Why is Boathouse #10 not included in the removal scope? *Boathouse #10 is the Hood River County Marine Sheriff's boathouse and is not part of the removal process. The August 2022 Commission decision for non-renewal of the boathouse lease agreements excluded the Marine Sheriff. The Port's Marina Rules and Regulations also reflect this Commission direction.*
- In the photo attachments I noticed grills. Please remind me what the current policy is regarding grills at the boathouses. *Port Ordinance No. 30 states "SECTION 12. Fires. No person shall build or attempt to build a fire on Port Property." The Boathouse Lease Agreements state "COMPLIANCE WITH PORT RULES: Tenant has received, read and agrees to abide by current Port of Hood River which apply to the Port Marina. Tenant also agrees to abide by any new and revised marina moorage rules, regulations and ordinances adopted by the Port hereafter." We'll be following up with the structure owner.*
- Is the port confident the contractor can obtain all the required permits to complete the work, or begin the work by Jan 1? *Yes, the Port believes this is an achievable schedule based on current available information.*

Consent Agenda Item D – Commercial Dock Repair Contract / Megan

- Why did the contractor who originally provided the rough estimate decline to submit a proposal? *The contractor that provided the initial rough estimate is a large-scale* *marine contractor. They indicated that the commercial dock repair is small in scale compared to the typical jobs they perform.*

- Only one responsive proposal was received. Are staff comfortable that the proposed pricing is reasonable based on market conditions? *Yes, staff are comfortable given current market conditions and contractor availability. Staff's outreach to the marine contracting market demonstrated very limited contractor availability this season. Nine qualified firms were solicited through the Port's intermediate procurement process (note that the Port's procurement process only requires outreach to three firms). Note that this repair will be reimbursed by Linblad, the company that caused the commercial dock damage.*
- The proposal repeatedly references possible additional underwater conditions and change orders. What level of additional cost risk should we realistically anticipate? *Civil Built conducted an above-water site visit and dock inspection prior to submitting their proposal, adding confidence to the proposal. As with any marine repair, there is risk of unknown underwater conditions. The proposal acknowledges that possibility. Staff, however, are not currently aware of conditions that would indicate significant added costs should be anticipated.*
- The proposal suggests replacement of the affected section could be in a similar price range. Why is repair considered preferable to replacement? *The replacement cost range is a preliminary budgetary estimate rather than a firm price, while the repair price provides a defined scope and price and can return the dock to service while retaining components that remain serviceable.*
- The proposal excludes pollution-related coverages. Does our final contract require those protections regardless of proposal language? *Staff will work with the Port's insurance representative to ensure that all appropriate coverages are included in the final contract.*

Consent Agenda Item E – City IGA / Megan

- Are the hourly rates shown in Exhibit A fully burdened rates? *Yes, these are the City's fully burdened rates per hour.*
- Why are third-party services billed at actual cost plus 10%? Is that standard practice for these arrangements? *Yes. The 10% is an administrative markup, similar to markups applied when a consultant/contractor manages subcontracted services. It accounts for the City's administrative effort to manage those services. This is also consistent with the IGA between the Hood River White Salmon Bridge Authority and the City for bridge replacement design and permitting services.*

Consent Agenda Item G – CMLK ENA / Megan/Amanda

- I appreciate the language recognizing that existing tenant lease extensions may continue provided they do not interfere with redevelopment.
    - Can you explain the practical intent of this provision? *The intent is to allow the Port to keep the property productively occupied (as feasible) while the redevelopment process moves forward. Specifically, DMV has requested an extension to their lease, which expires on December 31, 2026. DMV also is actively working with the Port on relocating to a Port-owned building on Wasco Loop, which requires a Conditional Use Permit approval from the City. As the permitting process may extend beyond December 2026, this provision in the ENA allows the Port flexibility to continue the DMV lease while the redevelopment due diligence and the permitting process for DMV's relocation move forward.*
- How many tenants do we currently have in Marina East and Marina West?

  For each tenant, can you provide:

  Name

  Length of tenancy

  Monthly rent/payment

  There are two tenants – one in Marina East and one in Marina West. Columbia River Acupuncture is in Marina East and has been a tenant since April 16, 2007. Their rent is $1,021.55 in base rent and additional fees of $382.03/month. The remainder of the Marina East building is vacant. DMV is in Marina West and has been a tenant since 1977. Their rent is $2,857.68 and they are not currently being charged additional fees.
- What alternatives to a ground lease have been considered? *In the RFDI, the Port assumed a ground lease structure, with the Port retaining ownership and the developer financing, developing and operating the improvements. The intent was to support private investment while retaining public control of the waterfront. Other structures could be considered during the due diligence and negotiation periods if determined to better fit the Port's financial and redevelopment goals. The ENA does not approve or commit the Port to a ground lease. Ground leases are a key solution for funding the Port's waterfront and marina recreational assets.*
- Has the Port received any redevelopment interest outside of CMLK? *CMLK Development was the only firm to submit a proposal response to the RFDI. No additional redevelopment concepts have been received. In July, after the RFDI closed in April, the Port received a general inquiry from an independent developer broker, who stated they work with hotel developers but did not have a specific developer or concept. Staff advised that the RFDI had closed and while they were*

welcome to share additional information, there was no guarantee that the materials submitted would be considered. No further follow-up on the general inquiry was received.

- Does entering into an exclusive negotiating period create any concerns from staff's perspective? *No. The exclusive period is intended to provide time for CMLK to invest time and resources for due diligence and for the Port to work with CMLK to see if initial mutually acceptable development terms can be reached.*
- Who will serve as the Port's designated point of contact, and does that person have any actual or perceived conflicts of interest? *Megan Channell will be the Port's primary point of contact. There are no actual or perceived conflicts of interest.*
- I appreciate the Section 6.f, as that has been one of my primary concerns throughout this process. *Thank you.*
- Can we ensure tenants are fully informed regarding any property access contemplated under the ENA? *Yes, the Port will maintain open communication with existing tenants and will follow the standard property access notification and access procedures.*
- For the public engagement process, may Port representatives attend in person, including Commissioners? *Yes, this will be a public meeting and staff and Commissioners are welcome to attend. Commissioners will need to be mindful of quorum requirements.*
- Will certificates of insurance be obtained and reviewed to verify required coverages before any activities occur? *Yes, staff also will coordinate closely with the Port's insurance representative to confirm required coverages at the appropriate time.*
- The ENA references Marina East and Marina West, but portions of the agreement appear focused on Area A. Can staff clarify exactly what property is covered? *Marina East and Marina West refer to the buildings within the Area A property shown in Exhibit A of the ENA. Area A reflects the full property area available for redevelopment, though some of that area will be required for ROW acess to other parts of the Marina Basin.*
- Have objective milestones been established that would allow the Port to terminate negotiations if adequate progress is not occurring? *Yes. Exhibit B of the ENA states milestones and deliverables. The ENA also allows either party to terminate with 30 days' written notice if the parties reach an impasse, if the developer fails to timely achieve the milestones, or if there is a material breach that is not cured.*

Consent Agenda Item I – WJE Mechanical & Electrical Services / Amanda

- Can the strain gage testing utilize any of the existing monitoring equipment or historical data already collected on the bridge? *WJE will attempt to use the existing* *strain gages to do the testing. Typically, the gages are good for several years but in an outdoor environment that is not always the case. WJE does not monitor data on an ongoing basis. The strain gage data that is to be collected will be compared to previous data to check for changes compared to previous data as well as the determine the current span balance and system friction.*

- Is WJE working under an existing professional services contract with task orders, or are these stand-alone procurements (now wrapped into one)? *WJE is working under an existing five-year Master Services Agreement executed in 2024 for lift-span mechanical and electrical services. The agreement allows the Port to authorize individual work orders as services are needed. The proposed work is therefore being issued as additional work orders under that existing agreement, not as separate stand-alone procurements. The related work orders have been combined into one package for Commission consideration and approval. Because the individual and combined value of the work orders exceeds the Executive Director's purchase authority, additional Commission approval is needed.*
- What operational training remains incomplete? *The remaining operational training involves instruction at the top of the bridge towers on manually lowering the lift span by hand-cranking the motors located there. During WJE's previous visit, high winds associated with a storm made it unsafe for staff to access the tops of the towers, so this portion of the training could not be completed.*
- In the budget breakdown, why are the two two-day training efforts budgeted at 32 hours each? *Each two-day training effort is budgeted at 32 total labor hours because two WJE personnel are expected to participate for two eight-hour days. The 32 hours represent the combined time of both WJE personnel, rather than four days of training. Specifically that time is for training associated with the maintenance manuals and includes travel time for one mechanical and one electrical engineer.*
- Regarding safety language, I would like staff and legal review of whether the proposal should more clearly state responsibility for maintaining safe operations not only for WJE personnel, but also for Port staff participating in operational training. *Staff takes the safety of the Facilities crew very seriously. The Port requires all applicable safety standards to be met during bridge operations and training, including OSHA requirements and the use of appropriate fall-protection equipment, safety harnesses and associated procedures. Staff is happy to review the proposal language with legal counsel to ensure responsibilities are clearly defined and that WJE's safety requirements and protocols are also being met for both WJE personnel and participating Port staff.*

- I would also like confirmation that the Port will be named as an additional insured before work commences. *The existing Master Services Agreement requires WJE to name the Port of Hood River, its Commissioners, officers, agents and employees as additionally insured under its commercial general liability coverage. Staff will confirm that a current certificate of insurance and the required additional-insured endorsement are on file before any work commences.*
- Was this scope competitively procured, or what process was used to validate the overall cost? *This scope/work order was not separately procured because it is being issued under the Port's existing Master Services Agreement with WJE. WJE has provided specialized mechanical and electrical engineering services for the lift span for many years and has detailed knowledge of its machinery, control systems and prior risk assessments. Staff reviewed the proposed labor hours, personnel classifications, contract rates, travel expenses and costs of comparable prior WJE work to assess the overall price. Staff also combined related tasks where practical to reduce duplicated mobilization and travel costs.*
- Of the approximately $227,000 identified as "risk item" work, how much is associated with operations manuals versus physical field work? *The risk items include:*

  Mechanical and electrical maintenance manuals: Office cost = $108,045, field time = $18,880, expenses = $4,760, total = $131,685

  Adjust live load bearings: Office cost = $23,120 , field time = $42,120, expenses $7,785, total = $73,025

  Reduce machinery failure risk: Office cost = $10,420 , field time = $9,440, expenses $2,380, total = $22,240
- The wire rope lubrication alone is approximately $79,000. What comparable historical costs do we have for similar maintenance? *The Port does not have a directly comparable historical cost for lubricating the full wire-rope system. Previous wire-rope expenditures involved different services: the 2020 comprehensive rope inspection was approximately $38,500; the 2022 follow-up inspection was not to exceed $30,602; and WJE's 2023 engineering oversight, replacement support and post-installation tension verification was not to exceed $115,956. The wire ropes were replaced in 2023, and this would be the first full lubrication of the new system. Because the prior work involved inspection, engineering and replacement support rather than lubrication, those costs are not directly comparable to the proposed $79,000. Staff will request additional detail from WJE regarding crew size, access requirements, labor, materials and the number of work shifts included in the proposed cost.*

- Given current bridge replacement planning, how much of this work would still need to occur even if replacement proceeds as currently anticipated? *Nearly all of the proposed work would still be necessary even if bridge replacement proceeds on the current schedule. The existing bridge must remain safe, reliable and operational until the replacement bridge opens and the current bridge is removed from service. The proposed strain-gage testing, wire-rope lubrication, risk-reduction measures, operating procedures and staff training address current operational needs rather than long-term modernization. Staff will continue evaluating each item to avoid investments intended primarily to extend the bridge's service life beyond the anticipated replacement date, but deferring immediate safety and reliability work would create unacceptable operational risk during the remaining service period.*

Financial Report / Debbie

- Please continue highlighting the reduction in bridge traffic. This trend stands out and seems important to our long-term financial assumptions. *Will do.*
- Page 153 note (3): Why are we carrying the marina debt rather than paying it off? *The interest rate on the debt is about 2% and we are earning about 4% on our investments. It makes sense to continue to have debt.*
- Can you provide a refresher on the PERS buy-down and the overall financial benefit derived from it? *The Port contributed $1.2M and the State contributed $300,000 for a total of $1.5M to reduce our liability with PERS. It reduced our PERS rates and we are saving about $100,000 per year.*
- What is the approximately $5.7 million transfer out of the Bridge Fund? *$2M to the General Fund (last year of this transfer), $289,200 to the Admin Fund for the PERS Buydown; $3.4M to the Bi-State Bridge Fund to be transferred to the Bridge Authority (additional toll revenue).*
- At what bridge traffic decline percentage would we need to revisit our long-term operating assumptions? *We will update the assumptions in the Fall, which is the next time we do long-range planning.*
- What FY26 capital projects remain unfinished and are expected to roll into FY27? *The Jensen Roof carried into FY27; the Roundabout is on-going; the Airport Hangars and Turf Taxilane are just being finished this summer; most of the budgeted repairs on the existing bridge will be completed in FY27; there is still about $2.5M of the ARPA grant to spend on the replacement bridge project.*
- How much of the stronger-than-budgeted ending fund balance is truly available versus already committed to known projects and obligations? *Fund balance ended about $8M higher than budget. A little more than $1M was budgeted for a replacement location for the facilities department – that money was not spent and*

we still need to find a location for facilities. About $1.2M of Bridge capital outlay wasn't spent last year but will be part of the repairs and maintenance for FY27. Bridge Replacement will carry over about $2.5M. So of the $8M higher-than-expected fund balance, $4.7M will carry over and $3.3M is truly available.

Strategic Business Plan / Executive Director Report / Kevin

- Thank you for including the FHWA clarification regarding acquisition of property owned by participating agencies. I found that update very helpful. *You're welcome.*
- Airport: How is the transition to the new FBO operator progressing? *HoodAero, FlyIt, and Jeff Renard are working through issues related to timing of fuel sales, and ramping down HoodAero activity. The mid-month start of the new FBO is taking a bit to navigate through, but the three parties are looking to get everything sorted out by September for a clean start. HoodAero was nice enough to assist in helping with transition through mid-August so as not to lose valuable continuity with the WAAAM Fly In approaching in September.*
- Airport: Are any airport grant reimbursement requests or submittals being denied or returned for correction? *No, Jeff R. has done a great job of processing several grant agreements. Staff is tracking signatures and ensuring that everything is archived. Gen. Counsel has been reviewing and signing off for consistency review.*
- Airport: What is the age of our oldest outstanding reimbursement invoice? *All submitted reimbursement requests as of today (8/17) have been paid to the Port. Jeff will be submitting a few more shortly, now that the T-hangar/taxline project is concluding and the new tie-down project starting up. It's been taking about two weeks for payment after reimbursement submissions.*
- What is the timeline for the Congressionally Directed Spending request? *We should hear by the November election.*
- Why did Lightwell Hotel ultimately decide not to move forward with valet parking? *Lightwell entered into an agreement for parking with Mt. Hood Railroad.*
- Why was the BUILD grant application not selected? *Huge demand; highly competitive (10% success rate); awaiting BUILD feedback scheduler.*
    - How many applications were submitted nationally? *Almost 1200*
    - What was the average award size? *~$13.6M ($1.73B awarded to 127 project)*
    - How much funding did we request? *$3.8M for capital construction; $950k for planning*
    - Did we request formal feedback? *No opportunity has been extended*. If so, what was provided? *USDOT will email an opportunity to request a debrief; those should be coming any day now.*

- What alternative funding opportunities are staff actively pursuing now that BUILD was unsuccessful? *Subsequent rounds of CDS, re-submission of BUILD, Safe Streets for All, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), City of Hood River tax increment programs are a few of the programs currently being investigated by staff and WSP.*

Airport Advisory Committee / Kevin/Jeff R.

- What does "directly involved in the aviation community" actually mean in practice? *Jeff is looking for advocates interested in growing business and activity at the airport. This would include pilots, mechanics/support, and members of the aviation industry (eg. Trillium, Insitu)*
- Would living near an airport and being impacted by airport operations qualify, or is the intent limited to aviation users and aviation-related businesses? *Jeff would prefer participation limited to aviation users and aviation-related businesses only.*
- More broadly, is the AAC intended to be a technical aviation committee or a community advisory committee? That distinction seems central to the discussion. *Jeff would prefer it to be a technical aviation committee. His staff memo in July suggested development of a separate community relations committee for neighbors.*

-###-