

**PORT DISTRICT OF SOUTH WHIDBEY ISLAND**

Minutes of the Regular Meeting

July 13, 2010

Langley, Washington

**Commissioners Present:** Geoff Tapert (Freeland), Chris Jerome (Langley) and Curt Gordon (Clinton)

**Others Present:**

**Port Staff:** Ed Field (Port Manager), Dane Anderson (Port Financial Manager), Molly MacLeod-Roberts (Port Clerk), and Wayne Nance (Possession Park Manager); **Clinton Residents:** Peter Anmdersoan, Larry Webster, Karl Seemann, David Shoup, Clyde Monma, Richard Engstrom, Marcia Monma, Doug Struthers; **Freeland Resident:** Carl Robinson

**MEETING CALL TO ORDER:** The Regular Meeting of the Port District of South Whidbey Island's Board of Commissioners was convened on Tuesday, July 13, 2010, at the South Whidbey Parks & Recreation District Meeting Room at 5475 Maxwellton Rd., Langley, WA. Following a Special Meeting/Executive Session from 7:00 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.(see separate Special Meeting Minutes), Commissioner Geoff Tapert, President, called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:40 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**BUSINESS MEETING:**

**1. Consent Agenda:**

*A. Minutes:* Minutes from the Special Meeting of February 23, 2010.

*B. Vouchers:* Vouchers audited and certified by the Auditing Officer as required by RCW 42.24.080, and those expense reimbursement claims certified as required by RCW 42.24.090, have been recorded on a listing which has been made available to the Board, and have been presented to the Board for review. The vouchers so listed and presented are summarized on the attached Voucher Listing (**EXHIBIT A**).

**ACTION:** A Motion was made by Commissioner Gordon and seconded by Commissioner Jerome to approve the Consent Agenda as submitted, including the acceptance and authorization of Vouchers #4378 - #4423 for a total amount of \$61,152.47 (subsequently corrected to a total amount of \$61,019.47). The Motion passed unanimously.

**2. Celebrate America Porta-Potty Costs – Voucher #4424 for \$850.00:** Port Manager Ed Field explained that in previous years, Celebrate America has submitted an Application for Funds to the Port for Porta-Potty costs for their July 3<sup>rd</sup> event. Historically, the request has been granted since the porta-potties help protect against overloading the septic system at Freeland Park (which the Port co-owns with the County). In March of 2009, Celebrate America's Application for Funds was approved but an invoice was never submitted. In 2010, no Application for Funds was submitted, but an invoice (Voucher #4424 for \$850.00) for the Porta-Potties was later received. Gordon said he was in favor of paying the invoice because Celebrate America really promotes South Whidbey; however, he would like Staff to send a reminder notice to the organizers that they need to submit an Application for Funds in the future. Tapert agreed that it was okay to pay for this year's costs since they were approved but never received payment for last year's costs.

**ACTION:** A Motion was made by Jerome and seconded by Gordon to approve Voucher #4424 for \$850.00. The Motion passed unanimously.

The Commission directed Staff to send a reminder to the organizers of Celebrate America, per Gordon's suggestion above.

**3. Accounting & Cost Tracking Issues:**

*A. Blanket Voucher Process – Board Direction for August Implementation:* Field presented the revised Blanket Voucher Form (**EXHIBIT B**) for Commission approval. He explained that although the Auditing Officer would still be required to sign each voucher, the Commissioners would only have to sign the Blanket Voucher Form. For the review process and schedule, Field explained that Port Clerk Molly MacLeod-Roberts would e-mail the Commission a preliminary Purchases & Payables Journal on the Friday evening prior to the regular meeting, and e-mail the final Journal (including payroll) at the end of the day on Monday.

**ACTION:** A Motion was made by Jerome and seconded by Tapert to proceed with the Blanket Voucher Process as described, to be implemented at the regular August meeting. The Motion passed unanimously.

*B. Cost Tracking and Reporting – Discussion re: Reporting:* Field referred to the proposed Cost Coding for Time Mileage & Expense Tracking sheet (**EXHIBIT C**) previously submitted to the Commission for their review. He explained that the system would allow for the Port Office Staff to be able to track time per facility and task or project as needed, but at this point the intention is not to change the financial statements to reflect that detailed tracking. The time tracking would instead be done in an Excel spreadsheet and could be summarized and formatted into a report as needed later, without spending too much additional Staff time to produce that information at this time. Gordon said that was fine as long as the tracking is accurate enough to be used if needed for things like leveraging in-kind dollars, etc., and Field said they would be able to capture that information easily. Tapert said the proposed tracking would also be beneficial if the Port were to engage in a cost-sharing project with another entity. For clarification, Jerome asked if the time spent on different projects would be recorded but not reported regularly. Financial Manager Dane Anderson said that was correct – the data is being captured in an Excel spreadsheet, and as reporting requirements come up or the Commission identifies what specifically they want reported, Staff could then produce the reports fairly quickly. The Commission agreed that the proposed method of tracking time without altering the financial statements was acceptable.

**PUBLIC COMMENT – Including Items not on Agenda:** There was no public comment except as noted below.

**ACCOUNTANT REPORT:**

**1. Financial Statement:** The Commissioners acknowledged receipt of the May 2010 Financial Statement, which had been mailed to them previously (**EXHIBIT D**).

**PROJECT ACTION ISSUES:**

**1. Possession Beach Waterfront Park:**

*A. Commission Review of Pending Possibilities for Property West of Possession and Franklin Roads:*

1. Property Boundary & Survey Issues:

- **Fakkema & Kingma Proposal for Unregulated Segregation into 2 parcels (EXHIBIT E):** The estimated fee was \$3,500. Tapert asked if it included County fees, and Financial Manager Dane Anderson explained there are no county fees for an unregulated segregation other than filing fees if there is a recording requirement. Jerome asked Staff if \$3,500 seemed reasonable and Anderson pointed out that it is less than the amount paid for the Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) for the Boatyard Inn property. Tapert thought the proposal was acceptable and they should go ahead and get it done. Gordon noted that there was no survey in the proposal, so Fakkema & Kingma would basically just be researching the information and preparing a description and providing a map. Anderson explained that a survey is not required for an unregulated segregation, but a map is. Tapert summarized, “We would be cutting this 20-some odd acre parcel into two 10+ acre parcels.” Anderson said the two parcels would probably be about 12 acres and 15 acres. Field suggested that Staff could draw the initial layout for the split and present it to the Commission for consideration and direction prior to presenting it to Fakkema & Kingma. Gordon said, “Although Fakkema & Kingma does a great job and they are very thorough, I think the price is a little high.” He would like Staff to draw lines where they think the upper property is and where it splits, because his research shows there are 3 lots and the 2 lots down below take up most of the existing park. Tapert said he was okay with the proposal as submitted. Jerome felt there was no rush to proceed and engage Fakkema & Kingma or anyone until the Commission “has the meeting where we look at what we’re going to do.”

**ACTION: A Motion was made by Tapert and seconded by Gordon to table discussion of the Fakkema & Kingma proposal until the next regular meeting, in August. The Motion passed unanimously.**

Larry Webster asked to address the Commission. He said, “*As Commissioners, you inherited oversight responsibility for property, and in this case, property that has been under Port management for 25 years, and significant investment of time, energy, taxpayer dollars and State grants went into acquiring this property. Where do you as the current Commissioners have the authority to re-purpose this land, which was set up as a waterfront park and recreation area? I just want to know for the record: How can you do that?*” Tapert explained that there are several parcels that make up the Possession property, and some are encumbered by grant restrictions and purchased with State money that require they be left in perpetuity for public use, but the rest of the parcels are not. Webster interjected, “But the rest was purchased with taxpayer money, since the Port isn’t self-sufficient from an economic standpoint.” Tapert said he didn’t know if the Port purchased the property with its own taxpayer dollars or if it was granted to the Port. Webster asked, “*Is there anything that requires Commissioners to be good stewards for any of the things that you inherit when you come into your elected office, or authorizes re-purposing, especially properties that have been part of the Port for such a long period of time?*” Tapert referred Webster to the Mission Statement in the Port’s Comprehensive Scheme, which is available on line at [www.portofsouthwhidbey.com](http://www.portofsouthwhidbey.com). Tapert said again that he didn’t know the complete history and details of how the Possession property was acquired, but the Commission does know for a fact that the upper portion is not encumbered by grant restrictions and that gives the Commission the authority to do with it what they believe is in the best interest of the public. Webster didn’t think repurposing land that has been used for public recreation for years qualified as being good stewards. Jerome said that ports have fairly broad authority to undertake recreational projects, economic development projects, etc. Since this property is not encumbered, the Commission is able to do whatever they think they should do with it as long as it is consistent with the Comprehensive Scheme and follows Washington State regulations that govern port activities. Gordon agreed, and as for being good stewards, he said, “I think it’s the Port’s responsibility to be good steward to all of its citizens, and our mission is also to make the best use of your dollars.” He went on to say, “We are

not a parks department, so if it's in the best interest of the Port to sell that upper portion while maintaining the lower portion, then he would be in favor of that.

Webster noted that Port of Edmonds doesn't have a lot of waterfront area, so they built a dry storage area for boats to generate revenue. He suggested Possession Beach Waterfront Park would be ideal for dry storage. Tapert said the Port has previously discussed the possibility of dry storage at Port owned facilities. One problem with the Possession area is that it is actually zoned residential. Additionally, the results from the economist showed that there isn't enough income from dry storage to justify the capital expense.

**Clyde Monma** asked where the proposed split of the property would be, and Anderson explained that it has not yet been determined.

2. Proposed Cell Tower:

- AT & T Lease Proposal – Commission comments in progress: Gordon said he would like to segregate the property. He doesn't think it is in the best interest of the Port District to continue to maintain the upland portion of the Park. Tapert asked if they should discuss the actual issues of the lease, and if they want to make a decision at this meeting as to a counter-proposal. Jerome noted that at the June meeting, the Commission agreed to submit comments on the proposed lease to Staff for compilation and discussion. The Commission agreed they should wait to discuss the issue during a special meeting, tentatively scheduled for July 27<sup>th</sup> at 6 p.m.
- AT&T Pre-Application - Update on any progress: No update.

3. Alternate Possibilities or Proposals:

**Webster** asked if the Port was aware that the whole slope of the property is a geo-hazard area, not just critical, and so there are setback issues below and at the top that are not addressed in the plan and have not been discussed at any of the public meetings. He said, "If you were developers, would pay attention to this." Gordon explained that because the Port allowed AT&T to go forward with a pre-application conference, Island County's Planning & Community Development Department will address all those issues. All the departments weigh in on a project, and they won't miss those kinds of details in their response.

**Monma** reported that at the last South Whidbey Parks & Recreational District (SWPRD) meeting, Mike Seymour discussed the possibility of the SWPRD taking on the upland portion of Possession. It is within their mission and they will add it to their 10-year plan, but Monma noted they have not made any kind of commitment. Gordon noted that chances for Conservation Futures funding are higher if the property is threatened by development.

**2. South Whidbey Harbor:**

A. Expansion Project – Schedule Status & Special Meeting proposed by Staff to address:

1. Design & Permit Prep: In regards to "where we're at with this project," Field noted that the Port is telling the grant agencies, permitting agencies, etc. that the planned schedule is to be open for business in 2012. As a project manager, he is looking at a \$4 million public job that is at the 30% design stage without permits, and is lacking in funding commitments (although some funding is in place, there are two more major funding questions). In order to meet the schedule, the Port needs to be in design very shortly in order to hit a bidding window of February/March with construction next summer and into fall in order to hit the construction windows. He said, "If we want to be open for business by 2012, we need to be underway real soon, in earnest." Field said as a project manager he really "wants to build this thing" and concluded, "Right now we need to understand we're very close to critical path on the whole design and permitting process to hit this thing on the money and get good bids." His main point is that they need to plan and discuss in detail

and either say, “yes, we’re going to do it and ACT like we’re going to do it, or say “no, we’re going to back off.” Anderson pointed out that making the decision and acting on it will have a huge impact on the Port Security Grant, because money from that grant must be spent by March 2012. Tapert said, “Let’s go for it.”

Gordon said he was surprised at the new sense of urgency. Field explained it’s partly due to the fact that he has not had that sense of urgency from the consultants, and also to the difficulty in scheduling meetings, along with Commissioner and Staff vacations, moving the Port home office, etc. Tapert noted that the Port has spent an inordinate amount of time on the cell tower issue at Possession, which has taken a lot of Staff time away from the Harbor project and getting those permits rolling and responding to the City of Langley. The Port has made commitments for the Harbor and he said, “We need to keep going. We need to move forward and get the permits in place and get this thing done, because it’s been sitting for several months.” Gordon asked for clarification regarding GeoEngineers’ new contract, and Field explained that they are proceeding with the initial aspects of operational permitting for the existing facilities. However, Reid Middleton’s proposal to take the Expansion Project design from current status through bid documents and the HWA proposals for geotechnical engineering services (**EXHIBIT F**) only just arrived today (1½ weeks late). The Commission and Staff said they would need time to review the proposals, and agreed to discuss them in depth at the special meeting tentatively scheduled for July 27<sup>th</sup>.

- City of Langley Response Received 6/21/10: Additional information requested; underway. Jerome said, “It seems like we’re just playing ping pong on the parking issue, so I think we need to talk to the City and find out what they are looking for.” Anderson explained that Staff has been trying to push the parking issue off on a future phase. Although there will be some increase in parking, it’s not going to be significant in the first phase of the project. He said the short version of the City’s response to that is that they just don’t buy it, and they want the Port to accommodate the parking issues in that area as soon as possible. The City is looking to the Port to determine how severe the problem is, and that’s very challenging because of the variability of the parking at the site. Anderson said the parking issue is going to be a critical path issue with Phase 1, and Ed added, “Even Phase 1A.” Noting that the InterLocal Agreement (ILA) says that the City and the Port solve the parking problem jointly, Jerome said they should sit down with the City and he’d be happy to be involved with that. Anderson said the City has some ideas that involve the School District and the CMA church property. Gordon said the church was awarded a grant from RTPO to improve their parking lot and it will become a Park & Ride. However, Jerome pointed out that according to the South Whidbey Record, that parking lot will not be available on Saturdays and Sundays, which are the days the Port has problems with parking.

Tapert suggested the Commission designate a representative to negotiate with the City, and the Commission thought that was a very good idea and Jerome agreed to assume that role.

- InterLocal Agreement (ILA) Amendment #2 (**EXHIBIT G**) (Ramp Issue): Revised & signed by City; ready for action, pending Commission review. Field said he would send a mark-up of the previous version to the Commission as Jerome requested, because there were “small but significant changes” made.
- Boat Ramp Boarding Float Design & Re-Permitting: Authorized and underway.
- Design & Engineering thru Bid Documents – Reid Middleton and HWA proposals: Field said Reid Middleton’s proposal of \$260,000 seems high and includes a geotechnical component that is either \$30,000 or \$130,000, depending on whether the Port chooses to get additional deep water soils data at the anchor locations (because the breakwater location was not known when previous soils data was collected). It comes down to a major risk management-type decision.

Gordon asked what was budgeted for the design, and Anderson responded, "The budget estimates for engineering at the 30% design level are 7.5% of the project, or \$313,000 through completion of D Dock (the Bremerton breakwater and the outer breakwater). Tapert said he would be interested in seeing how much it would cost for the entire design done, so if the Port "comes across a few million bucks, we can actually fill it out and the engineering is there and we go to bid for it instead of just bidding on one segment." He thought they might get some economy of scale that way, and Gordon and Field agreed.

Gordon asked if there was still an opportunity to get another engineering firm to bid, or is that impractical? Tapert responded, "The way these things work is that if you change horses in midstream, you lose 6 months to 1 year typically." Field agreed the project is in midstream and although we wouldn't necessarily lose a year, we would lose some time. Tapert added that there are very few qualified marine engineering firms in this region. Gordon noted that they are also placing a lot of emphasis on speed for the Port Security Grant, and he hopes the Port gets it, but if not then the money would not have to be spent by March 2012. Field said one possibility would be to charge ahead and if the Port gets the red flag from the Port Security Grant in early September, "take a deep breath and re-think."

Regarding the geotechnical portion, Tapert thought they could defer additional studies until just before construction. The numbers do seem high, and he wondered if they really need it right now. Field said if we were a larger Port with a huge budget, then maybe we'd do all possible evaluations. As a smaller agency with a chance of saving a significant amount of money, he felt it was worth the gamble (with the understanding that you could lose), whereas "if you are paying extra money for all eventualities all the time, you are just paying extra money regardless of the risk exposure." Tapert said, "We don't have that money." Anderson said, "Keep in mind we are talking about H-piles, and if you run into a hole or a boulder in one place, you can just move the piles because they are not fixed."

Jerome asked if Reid Middleton could provide a quote for designing the entire project (full build-out) prior to the special meeting on July 27<sup>th</sup>, and Field said that should not be a problem.

## 2. Property Issues:

- Coordination with Adjacent Properties and Tribes: Field explained that there is a potentially significant property issue regarding the anchor plan to the north. Anderson said there have been very few conversations with Ice Floe (the adjacent property owners), and Ice Floe is still considering the original Master Site Plan developed in 2003 (which was written prior to their purchase of Nichols Brothers Boat Builders) as how they want the facility to look in "x" number of years. Ice Floe has a possible issue with the current Expansion anchoring plan, as one of the anchors in the plan is in their DNR-leased area. Since Jerome and Gordon were not familiar with the 2003 Master Site Plan, Anderson agreed to meet with them individually to provide the background information. Field said that Staff has had preliminary discussions with Ice Floe, but now the high level discussions need to be at the Commission level with Staff assistance. Gordon suggested that he and Jerome could then both work on the issue from different angles without meeting with each other.

Field noted that GeoEngineers said the Tribes have been curiously silent, so Staff and GeoEngineers are working on what would be the best approach.

## 3. Funding Issues:

- Rural County Economic Development Funds (RCEDF) InterLocal Agreement: DONE – Signed by both Port and County.

- Boating Infrastructure Grant (BIG) Application – Status Update: Regarding the application (due on July 16<sup>th</sup>), Anderson reported, “It’s in!” The last bit of information that the Port had been requested to provide came in this afternoon. He explained that since the Port’s grant request of approximately \$1.8 million is more than \$100,000, it would be entered in the national competition. The decision is not expected until March 2011. Anderson further explained that BIG applicants get points for the higher match, and the inter-relationship between eligible matching items between BIG and the Port Security Grant enabled him to put more pre-award work toward the BIG application because it wasn’t eligible for the Port Security Grant. The two pools for matching were the RCEDF and the work the Port has already done (design, engineering, etc.), so he was able to flip those around so the Port got a higher match with BIG and meet the 25% match exactly with the Port Security Grant. He estimated that the Port had a 79-point application for BIG (out of 100 points), which is pretty good when you look at the scoring criteria. Field said Anderson had also obtained great letters of support from the entire Washington state and federal delegations.
  
- Port Security Grant – Status Update: Anderson said that application is in, and was also submitted a couple of days prior to the submittal deadline. The fiduciary agent has confirmed receipt of the application. Last week, he had a conversation with the Director of Operations for Washington State Ferries (WSF), and after reviewing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signifying membership in the South Whidbey Security & Resiliency Consortium, the Director had no issues with WSF signing the MOU and subsequently sent it to WSF Director David Moseley for his signature. Anderson has verbal confirmation from Island County Commissioner Helen Price-Johnson that the County will sign the MOU on behalf of the Island County Sheriff’s Department, and the Port already has signatures from Island Transit, Island County Fire District #3, and the City of Langley. He is still working on the Port of Everett, which has been “remarkably quiet.”

B. Harbor Operations:

1. Phil Simon Park Rededication: No update.
  
2. Clean Water Contract with Washington State Parks for Septic Pump-out Cost Reimbursement: Signed.

**3. Staff & Operations:**

A. Maintenance & Operational Wrap-up – Update from GeoEngineers’ meeting: Field said, “They are underway.” Staff had a good meeting with Joe Callaghan of GeoEngineers to go over all of the facilities’ operations with him.

B. Ragnar Relay: Returning to Bush Pt. on July 24<sup>th</sup> (overflow parking – not in paved lot).

**4. New Project Opportunities:**

A. Sustainable Economic Development and Innovative Partnership Zone (IPZ) Issues (Tapert):

1. Potential Langley area “Green” Business Park: Tapert recently spoke with Walt Blackford, Community Services Supervisor at Puget Sound Energy (PSE), and Blackford said he would be meeting with PSE’s “green energy guy” tomorrow. As a result of that conversation, Tapert had drafted a letter of inquiry (**EXHIBIT H**) to Blackford at PSE, requesting a dialogue with them regarding a potential feasibility study for a Waste-to-Energy project within the Port District. The Commission signed the letter as presented and Tapert said he would deliver it.

B. Ferry/Commuter Issues (Gordon): Gordon met with David Moseley at WSF and took the opportunity to ask Moseley to sign the MOU for the Consortium discussed earlier. Gordon also talked about staging parking during peak ferry times in Clinton, but the only comment Moseley had was that, WSF doesn’t have the staff for that, but they would look into it. Because he is concerned about moving goods and services onto

the Island at less expense for the local population, Gordon also asked Moseley about reservations for commercial vehicles. Moseley said WSF would implement that into their plan in 2013.

*C. Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) Electric Car Grant (Gordon):* Gordon reported that RTPO's Larry Cort didn't think the electric car grant for the South Whidbey Harbor would fit the STEP (State Transportation Enhancement Program) grant application process. After viewing the other applications, Gordon said Cort was probably correct because they are all walkways. The applications have to be historical, pedestrian or bicycle and Cort thought it would be too much of a stretch to say the Port couldn't get all the pedestrians up the hill and needed electric cars. Since RTPO declined to be the lead agency for the grant, the Port did not apply for it.

*D. Langley Middle School (LMS) Tech Center (Gordon):* Anderson said he was trying to contact the representative for the USDA's Rural Business Enterprise Grant (RBEG), but hasn't heard from them yet. Gordon said he had a very brief conversation with Superintendent Fred McCarthy and he is still open to the concept of a tech center in the 2-story building at the LMS campus. Anderson suggested it might also be an opportunity to address the parking issue, but Gordon said he had run the parking lot by McCarthy but McCarthy was extremely non-committal and basically said, "Everyone wants that parking lot."

#### **ACTIVITIES/INVOLVEMENT REPORTS:**

- 1. Economic Development Council (EDC):** (Jerome) Jerome had nothing to report. Anderson noted that the Port owns the trademark "Uniquely Whidbey," and in intellectual property law, "If you don't defend your intellectual property – you lose it." He explained that the EDC is using "Uniquely Whidbey" without written permission from the Port, so Anderson proposed sending a letter to the EDC giving permission to use the trademark. The Commission agreed and directed him to send the letter as discussed.
- 2. Council of Governments (COG):** (Gordon) Gordon reported last month's meeting was cancelled.
- 3. Skagit-Island Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO):** (Gordon) Gordon reported last month's meeting was cancelled.
- 4. Marine Resources Committee (MRC):** (Tapert) Tapert did not attend. Minutes are available on their website at <http://www.islandcountymrc.org>.
- 5. Washington Public Ports Association (WPPA):** (Jerome) Nothing to report. Their website is <http://www.washingtonports.org>.
  - 1. Finance & Admin. Seminar in Leavenworth, June 16-18:** (Anderson) Anderson attended and said it was an interesting seminar. He reported, "I learned that we need to update our administrative processing as we sell things on the dock." Some of those procedures have already been implemented and Field pointed out that it has and will continue to require additional accounting time and expense. Jerome said it would be nice if the dock sales made money, but the marina visitors really appreciate being able to purchase ice and fishing and crabbing supplies. Everyone agreed dock sales are a valuable activity.
- 6. Holmes Harbor Shellfish Protection District (HHSPD):** (Tapert) Nothing to report.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

- 1. Recreation & Conservation Office (RCO) Assistance:** Field has "volunteered" at RCO's encouragement to assist with Project Evaluations on August 17.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. Freeland Park Bathrooms – Preliminary Request from Island County Parks for Magnetic/Timed Lock Cost Sharing:** Field explained that Jan Van Muyden (the sole remaining Parks employee with Island County) came into the office just yesterday with a very preliminary request. Once again, the Freeland Park bathrooms have been vandalized, and so Van Muyden is trying to get together enough funding from different agencies and organizations to purchase magnetic/timed locks for the bathrooms. Actual costs for such locks have not yet been determined. Tapert had no problem with the request; and thought the locks should have been put in place a long time ago. Anderson suggested that the Parks Dept. could submit an Application for Funds in September, under the budget for capital funding. The Commission agreed that would be the best approach. Field will so advise Van Muyden.


**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

Approved:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Geoff Tapert, Freeland

Minutes prepared by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Edwin S. Field, Port Manager

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Chris Jerome, Langley

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner Curt Gordon, Clinton

- Exhibit A: Voucher Listing
- Exhibit B: Blanket Voucher Form
- Exhibit C: Cost Coding for Time, Mileage & Expense Tracking
- Exhibit D: May 2010 Financial Statement
- Exhibit E: Fakkema & Kingma 7/7/10 Proposal for Possession Beach Unreg. Segregation
- Exhibit F: Reid Middleton and HWA Proposals for Design & Bid Phases
- Exhibit G: Amendment No. 2 to the ILA for transfer of the SWH
- Exhibit H: 7/13/10 Letter of Inquiry to PSE re: Waste-To-Energy Feasibility