

Hi Kevin (and staff),

Sending questions in advance so staff have time to prepare answers and are not put on the spot during the meeting.

Request that these get added in the minutes/public comment, as done in the past.

## **Consent Agenda -**

### **f. Task Order 10 Amendment 6 with HDR for On-Call Engineering Services**

- What work has this task order been covering in the past, and what is it covering in practice? Task Order 10 serves as the Port's general on-call technical and engineering services task order with HDR. Historically, it has been used to obtain professional engineering advice, technical reviews, operational support, regulatory guidance, and other consulting services that do not fall under a specific capital project or dedicated task order. In practice, this task order functions as a "catch-all" resource that allows staff to quickly access HDR's engineering and technical expertise when unforeseen issues arise or when specialized professional guidance is needed.

A good example of the value of this on-call task order occurred when Port staff identified a significant pothole on the north approach of the bridge. This was an unforeseen and unplanned maintenance issue that did not fall under any existing project-specific task order and therefore would appropriately be billed against Task Order 10. Before proceeding with repairs, staff consulted HDR to determine whether the location and severity of the pothole raised any structural concerns due to its proximity to the bridge joint. HDR provided immediate professional guidance, directing staff to document and inspect the underside of the bridge for any visible changes or indications of structural distress before moving forward. After confirming no structural concerns were present, staff was able to proceed with repairs efficiently and confidently. Situations like this are difficult to predict in advance, yet they require timely access to specialized engineering expertise. Given the complexity of the bridge and the limited margin for error when making decisions that could impact a critical transportation asset, having immediate access to HDR's professional judgment helps ensure maintenance activities are performed safely, appropriately, and in a manner that protects the long-term integrity of the bridge.

- What specific tasks or projects are anticipated between now and June 30, 2027 that justify extending the period of service and increasing by \$20,000? The proposed extension is intended to maintain continuity of engineering and technical support

services through June 30, 2027. While specific future assignments cannot always be identified in advance, staff anticipates continuing needs related to bridge operations and maintenance, review of consultant and contractor submittals, engineering evaluations, permitting support, regulatory coordination, technical review of maintenance activities, and general professional consultation as operational issues arise. The purpose of this task order is specifically to address needs that cannot be fully anticipated today. As examples, staff may need HDR's professional opinion on unexpected bridge maintenance issues, operational concerns, inspection findings, regulatory questions, or other technical matters that require engineering expertise but do not justify establishing a separate task order. Larger, well-defined projects would continue to be handled through separate project-specific task orders, such as the Steel and Coatings Maintenance Project.

- The memo states that approximately \$25,000 remains under the current authorization. Why is an additional \$20,000 needed now rather than waiting until the remaining amount is further drawn down? The proposed amendment is intended to proactively ensure uninterrupted access to HDR's on-call engineering and technical services throughout the upcoming fiscal year. While approximately \$25,000 remains available today, the balance can fluctuate significantly depending on unforeseen operational needs and technical support requirements. Rather than waiting until the authorization is nearly exhausted and potentially requiring an emergency amendment, staff believes it is prudent to extend the term and modestly increase the not-to-exceed amount at this time. The proposed increase from \$180,000 to \$200,000 represents a relatively small adjustment based on historical utilization trends and is intended to provide sufficient capacity through June 30, 2027 while maintaining continuity of service.
- Why is this work continuing under a broad on-call task order rather than being separated into project-specific task orders where feasible? Staff agrees that defined projects should be managed through project-specific task orders whenever feasible. In fact, this is the Port's current practice. Significant projects with a defined scope, schedule, and budget are established under separate task orders, such as the Steel and Coatings Maintenance Project. Task Order 10 exists to address the many smaller, operational, and often unforeseen technical needs that arise throughout the year. Creating a separate task order for every engineering question, technical review, maintenance consultation, or operational issue would create unnecessary administrative burden and delay the Port's ability to obtain timely professional guidance. The on-call structure allows staff to efficiently access HDR's expertise for issues that cannot be reasonably anticipated in advance while still reserving project-specific task orders for larger capital projects and defined scopes

of work. This approach provides flexibility, responsiveness, and administrative efficiency while maintaining appropriate project-level controls for major initiatives.

**g. Amendment No. 5 with Professional Account Management (PAM) for Tolling Services**

- The memo states the Port’s official contract expired in April 2026, but the proposed amendment is effective April 10, 2026 through April 30, 2027. Please explain why the Port is being asked to approve the amendment after the prior contract expired and whether PAM has already been performing services during that period. **PAM has continued providing the service. Our attorney said to date the amendment April 10, 2026 when the old one expired.**
- Please provide the total amount paid to PAM in the most recent full year and the amount budgeted for FY 2026-27. **We paid \$92,893 for DMV lookups in the last 12 months and have budgeted \$100,000 for the coming year. We paid \$46,937 for collections services in the past 12 months and have budgeted \$50,000 for the next fiscal year.**
- Attachment B lists a 30% delinquent collection fee and a \$1.10 per out-of-state DMV “hit.” Please provide the recent actual totals associated with each of those charges. **The \$1.10 is the total of \$92,893 noted above. The delinquent collection fee was \$46,937.**
- What performance measures does staff use to determine whether PAM is providing good value to the Port vs toll collectors? **All electronic tolling appears to be about \$100,000 savings compared to paying for toll booth staff and keeping the toll booth operational. PAM was the Port’s license plate lookup provider prior to going to all electronic tolling, and they have not raised the price per lookup since we went all electronic; the volume, of course, increased dramatically. We are working on an analysis of collections at this time but don’t have the results yet. Depending on the results and the future of the Replacement Bridge project we will likely do a request for proposals next year before this amendment expires.**

**h. President’s Signature on Joint 6(f) Letter with HRWSBA**

- Does Port staff agree with the appraisal value of \$3.4 million referenced for the 2.79 area currently being treated as the conversion footprint? **Port staff is generally agnostic regarding the appraised value of the Section 6(f) land. The bridge project will compensate the Port for the value of any converted 6(f) property, and those funds will then be used to acquire replacement recreational property of equal value. Because these funds effectively pass through from the project to the eventual owner of the mitigation property, staff does not believe it is critical to advocate for a particular valuation.**

- Please explain why the Port’s participation is beneficial if the stated purpose is only to request reconsideration and discussion. Staff understands that the HRWSBA is seeking to direct the 6(f) mitigation value toward the bicycle and pedestrian facilities included in the replacement bridge project. Because the affected 6(f) property is owned by the Port, the Bridge Authority has requested that the correspondence be submitted jointly. While staff is neutral regarding the valuation issue, we have consistently supported reasonable requests from the Bridge Authority that advance the bridge replacement project. Examples include providing letters of support for grant applications, approving two \$500,000 zero-interest loans for non-reimbursable project expenses, assisting with administrative and financing matters, and coordinating closely with contractors to ensure project activities do not adversely affect operation of the existing bridge.
- The memo references estimated conversion-related costs of approximately \$4.0 to \$4.5 million. Please clarify **who** would bear those costs if the compatible public facility argument is rejected. Any costs associated with Section 6(f) mitigation, including acquisition of replacement property and any improvements necessary to meet recreational-use requirements, would be the responsibility of the bridge replacement project. For example, if a replacement property required environmental remediation or removal of an underground storage tank to satisfy mitigation requirements, those costs would be borne by the project rather than the Port.

**i. Notice of Intent to Award to Abhe & Svoboda for Bridge Steel and Coating Maintenance Repairs**

- Please provide the engineer’s estimate or internal cost estimate for this project so the Commission can compare it to the two bids received.
- The bids were \$625,885 and \$1,780,000. Please explain the reason for that spread to the extent staff can determine from the bid review. Staff along with HDR reviewed both bids against their engineer's estimate and found that the pricing submitted by Abhe & Svoboda generally aligns with the anticipated costs of the work, while Vimas Construction's pricing was significantly higher across most bid items. Excluding mobilization and painting items—which are typically more variable and difficult to estimate—Abhe & Svoboda's pricing was approximately 17% below HDR's engineer's estimate, while Vimas Construction's pricing was approximately 106% above the estimate. Staff and HDR believe the disparity can be at least partially attributed to contractor familiarity with the project and bridge. Abhe & Svoboda has previously performed similar work on the Hood River-White Salmon Bridge and therefore has direct knowledge of the structure, access constraints, and work

requirements. Vimas Construction is an out-of-state contractor that submitted several questions late in the solicitation process, which may indicate a steeper learning curve regarding the project scope and site conditions. HDR's review concluded that Abhe & Svoboda's bid falls within a reasonable range of the engineer's estimate and is representative of the expected cost of the work.

- Please provide a short explanation of Abhe & Svoboda's relevant qualifications and bridge steel/coating experience. Abhe & Svoboda specializes in bridge preservation, structural steel rehabilitation, industrial coatings, and complex access work on major transportation structures throughout the United States. The company routinely performs steel repairs, coating rehabilitation, corrosion mitigation, and maintenance work on suspension, truss, and movable bridges. Of particular importance, Abhe & Svoboda has previously performed bridge repair work for the Port on the Hood River-White Salmon Interstate Bridge. In 2023, the Port awarded Abhe & Svoboda the Miscellaneous Truss Repairs Project, which included structural steel repairs and associated bridge maintenance work on the bridge. The project was successfully completed, providing the contractor with direct experience working on this specific structure, including its access requirements, operational constraints, and maintenance needs. This prior experience is significant because it reduces project risk, minimizes the learning curve associated with mobilizing to the bridge, and provides confidence that the contractor understands the unique challenges associated with maintaining this critical transportation asset. HDR specifically noted that Abhe & Svoboda's familiarity with the bridge is likely one of the factors contributing to its competitive pricing compared to the higher bid received from the out-of-state contractor.

#### **j. Accounts Payable to Cable Huston LLP**

- How much of this amount relates to recurring general counsel work versus one-time or unforeseen meetings? This bill is for two months – April and May. Approximately \$140 is general counsel and \$3,749.50 is for one-time items.
- Are there any unusual, non-recurring, or potentially escalating legal matters reflected in these invoices that the Commission should be aware of? Nothing other than what is discussed in executive session.

#### **Financial Questions**

- The report states all categories are expected to be well within budget, but also notes possible future budget adjustments depending on capital outlay timing. Please identify the areas staff is most closely monitoring for potential adjustment in July or August. The "well within budget" comment referred to the current fiscal year, which

ends on June 30<sup>th</sup>. Future adjustments will depend on how much work is completed by June 30<sup>th</sup> on the T-hangars and the Turf Taxi lane, as those projects will carry over to next fiscal year. An adjustment could also be necessary for the Jensen roof as the number in the recommended budget for next fiscal year is based on old estimates. If we purchase the other property on Wasco Court that will probably be next fiscal year now, so that will require an adjustment to the currently recommended budget. The Roundabout project is on-going and the amount in the recommended budget for next fiscal year (\$1.55M) will most likely be sufficient to cover the amount of work that is expected to be completed next fiscal year. The final item that is known at this time that could require a budget adjustment is work on the proposed terminal building at the airport, but that depends on getting the federal EDA grant and other funding.

- Non-operating revenue is only 11% of budget as of April 30. Which major revenue items are simply timing differences, and which ones are now at risk of not materializing this fiscal year? The primary reason for the 11% is that we did not sell the Big 7 Building and it looks like the Lower Mill property will likely close next fiscal year. Note that operating revenue is at 86%, which is above the April percentage of 83% expected.
- Capital outlay is only 26% of budget through April 30, and the footnotes already identify projects that won't be completed this fiscal year. Can staff give us a clean list of what is definitively slipping into FY27 and how that affects both year-end closeout and next year's available capacity? As I noted above, it is the T-Hangars and Turf Taxi Lane that will slip into next fiscal year, but we don't have an estimate for that until we see how much work is completed by June 30<sup>th</sup> (most of the expenses for the T-hangars is being recorded in May and June as that project is currently wrapping up). The roof on the Jensen Building will not be replaced in this fiscal year and has been re-budgeted to next fiscal year. There was \$750,000 budgeted to build storage units at Lower Mill, but that project will not be occurring as the current plan is to sell the property. There was \$500,000 budgeted for relocating administration facilities, but that will not occur in the current fiscal year and has been re-budgeted to next fiscal year. We might close on the second property on Wasco Court this year, but it looks more likely that it will slip to next year. There is also a possibility that we will not purchase the property. The Parking Lots were completed in the fall of 2025 for a total of just over \$1.2M. In the Bridge Fund the projects that were initially budgeted for this fiscal year will now occur in the next fiscal year and have been re-budgeted to the next year. There are still some expenses in the Bridge Replacement Fund that will increase the percentage of the capital outlay that is spent in the current fiscal year.

- The budget message states several asset centers continue operating at a deficit, while Parking and Industrial Properties are expected to help support governmental activities. Please provide the clearest summary of how sustainable that cross-subsidy model is over the next 2–3 years. **The current model shows that parking and industrial property revenue is not currently enough to sustain the deficits at the airport, marina basin, and waterfront. To get sustainable the Port needs to find additional sources of positive net income, most likely from redevelopment of Marina East and West, and/or redevelopment of the property where the Maritime Building is currently located. The Maritime is leased through calendar year 2029, so the most likely source of revenue would be the Marina Basin property (East and West buildings). The current on-going deficit appears to be about \$320,000 in current-year dollars. In addition, there are other opportunities with Lot 1, Barman and commercial overaly opportunities along Nichols Basin that will open up upon the roundabout being installed.**
- The ending fund balance figures look stronger than budget. Can staff break out how much of that projected ending fund balance is actually unrestricted and available, versus committed, designated, or otherwise already spoken for? **All of the ending fund balance in the General Fund as currently shown is unrestricted and is not committed/promised for anything else. If we did, somehow, close on the Lower Mill property then \$500,000 has been pledged for the terminal building at the airport and the rest is pledged for construction costs on the Roundabout project. The ending fund balance in the Bridge Fund is now committed solely to bridge operations. Fund balance in the Bridge Replacement Fund is restricted for the Bridge Replacement project. Both the Administration Fund and the Bi-State Bridge Fund will end the year with a zero fund balance as those funds are on a cost reimbursement basis.**

### **Waterfront / Marina East-West RFDI Questions**

- What criteria does staff recommend the Commission use in deciding whether to interview the respondent, authorize further discussions, or conclude the process with no further action? **Staff recommends that the Commission use the RFDI-defined evaluation considerations. The evaluation considerations from the RFDI include: (1) Alignment with Port objectives: consistency with the Port's objectives related to financial sustainability, compatible waterfront activation, protection of public access, year-round community benefit and long-term adaptability; (2) Concept Feasibility: viability of development concept; (3) Context Sensitivity: responsiveness to waterfront setting, marina operations, recreational activity and adjacent public spaces; (4) Team Experience: relevant experience of development team with comparable projects, particularly waterfront, public-sector, leasehold or**

public-private partnership; (5) Financial and Business Approach: general soundness of proposed financial and business framework, including ability to support long-term Port revenue and private investment.

- If the Commission authorizes further discussion, what guardrails will staff use to ensure the Port does not inadvertently move from exploratory discussions into a de facto negotiation without a clearer public process? The RFDI is structured as a non-binding process, and any interview or follow up discussions would be a continuation of the exploratory process. Staff recommends discussions be limited to understanding the concepts presented in the RFDI submittal, clarifying assumptions and evaluating alignment with Port objectives. Discussions should not include negotiation of development rights, financial terms, exclusivity or property disposition. Should the Commission want to pursue any concept further, staff would return with recommendations regarding an appropriate public process (which could include a Request for Qualifications (RFQ), Request for Proposals (RFP), Development Agreement, etc.) and seek additional Commission direction before advancing into any formal negotiations.
- Please explain how any further RFDI work would align with the Port's long-term waterfront objectives, current tenant realities, and expected redevelopment sequencing. Further RFDI discussions would support the Port's objective to better understand how Marina East and West may contribute to a more active waterfront, including the Commission's articulated priorities for maintaining and enhancing public access, creating year-round activity, supporting local jobs and economic activity, and generating revenue that can support the long-term upkeep of Port assets. The current site use does not generate sufficient revenue to cover maintenance and operating costs, resulting in a ~\$100,000 annual toll subsidy. The current leases for the two existing tenants expire on December 31, 2026. Understanding market interest at this stage allows the Port to evaluate potential opportunities and constraints before making future decisions regarding timing and redevelopment sequencing. Staff views the RFDI process as an opportunity to better understand future possibilities and inform long-range decision-making rather than a commitment to a specific project.

Thank you,  
Kathryn

1. On page 78, regarding the joint letter request from the HRWSBA, it states that the appraised value of the conversion footprint is \$3.4M, but goes on to say that there are additional design, permitting, and development costs associated with the 6(f)

conversion that would bring the total cost to \$4-4.5M. If this reflects an isolated analysis of the 6(f) conversion, please explain these other costs. Why would there be any other costs in the first place? Michael Shannon from HNTB indicated that that would include any improvements to the land being purchased to make it meet the recreational requirements would also be a cost for the mitigation. An example, would be if an old fuel tank needed to be removed.

2. On page 85, does staff possess any insight as to why the two received quotes for bridge maintenance/repair are separated by over one million dollars? If not, can we gather further information? Staff requested HDR to perform an independent review of both bid submissions and compare them against the engineer's estimate. Based on that review, Abhe & Svoboda's pricing was generally consistent with the anticipated cost of the work, while Vimas Construction's pricing was substantially higher across most bid categories. When the more variable bid components, such as mobilization and painting, are removed from the comparison, Abhe & Svoboda's bid was approximately 17 percent below HDR's engineer's estimate, whereas Vimas Construction's bid was approximately 106 percent above the estimate. HDR's assessment indicates that Abhe & Svoboda's pricing is within a reasonable range for the scope of work and reflects expected market costs for this type of bridge maintenance project. While neither bidder provided a detailed explanation for its pricing methodology, staff and HDR believe a contributing factor may be each contractor's familiarity with the Hood River-White Salmon Bridge. Abhe & Svoboda has successfully completed similar structural steel and coating repairs on the bridge in the past and therefore has firsthand knowledge of site access requirements, bridge conditions, and project logistics. By comparison, Vimas Construction is an out-of-state contractor with less direct experience on the structure and submitted several clarification requests near the end of the solicitation period, suggesting a greater degree of uncertainty regarding the project conditions and scope. Based on the information available, staff believe the lower bid is both responsive and reflective of the work required.
3. On page 139, what is the "Local Government Investment Pool", and why does this insurance payout require being deposited somewhere for safekeeping? The Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP) is a "savings" account offered by the State of Oregon. The State Treasurer manages it and it provides a better interest rate than just about anything else we can invest in. It is not "required" to be deposited into that account, but since it has the highest interest rate that seemed like the best

place to deposit it. It can be transferred back to the checking account at any time if the cash is needed.

4. On page 155, despite the complainants of airplane noise not offering contact info, and the fact that no known aircraft were flying during the reported time, airplane noise is a valid concern which we pay attention to. The Port, the airport, and our commercial and private users do care about our community and operating as courteous aviators. The Port does communicate these issues to local businesses who perform aviation testing (the circling flights for hours that irritate some). I just want to bring attention to the fact that these companies have all moved to higher altitudes when possible. And a second point I'd like to make is that the Port has no jurisdiction over the national airspace. The FAA is in charge of that, just as the Federal Highway Administration is in charge of I-84. The Port will continue to advocate friendly flying. **Noted.**

Submitted by Commissioner Tor Bieker