

### **Port Hadlock Launch and Wharf**

I am fully supportive of restoring the functionality of the Port Hadlock facilities. A small change in configuration will improve functionality. At the same time, it is important for all users to be paying their fair share for usage of the facility and some administrative changes and increased enforcement will be required to make sure this occurs.

### **Housing**

I am very aware of how seriously we need economical housing for our children so that they can afford to live in our county and I consider this as a development priority for our Port, to whatever extent possible. I don't have an immediate answer, but I am committed to help.

### **Cruise Line Visits**

The cruise line has been docking here for years and the largest vessel that they offer here has a maximum capacity of 170 guests; the vessels arriving in summer will have between 90 and 130 guests. The vessels arrive mid-morning and stay moored at Union Wharf until departing very early the next morning; they do not require tugs, pilots or other assistance; they do not take water from here and they do not leave sewage or other waste here. It is probably accurate, as some merchants have complained, that the cruise guests do not buy much of anything; that is because, like many of us, they have reached the point in life where the acquisition of material things is no longer an interest, although I suspect that they do shop for gifts for their grandchildren. Many of them take tours arranged by local guides and that contributes somewhat to our economy; the cruise line managers believe that the passengers are eager for other such experiences if they are offered.

Based on the published schedule of the cruise line, we can expect 18 more port calls this calendar year and approximately 41 in calendar 2026, all between late March and the end of October. There would be a further increase in arrivals of these vessels in 2027, with two port calls per week during summer. Some of their port calls would occur on weekends. Based on the current cruise schedules and the current tariff, the expected revenue to the Port would be approximately:

2025	\$ 45,100	(Note: Port budget shows only \$28,000)
2026	\$ 45,100	
2027	\$ 78,100	

Currently, there are no expenses associated with this revenue, as American Cruise Lines is responsible for all expenses associated with this use of the wharf.

American Cruise Lines apparently has high hopes for an agreement. As near as I can determine, Port Townsend is one of the most popular stops on their Puget Sound Cruise and they might not find a suitable replacement port if they were denied further port calls here, meaning that we would be negotiating from strength if we consider an agreement. With an agreement in place, we could likely expect a significant increase in the revenues given above. American Cruise Lines would like to control scheduling at the wharf, not necessarily because they want to add more visits or lock out other potential players, but simply because that would provide them with more operating flexibility; an agreement would not necessarily include their having the right of schedule control.

As a personal viewpoint, I dislike the cruise business and I especially dislike the impact that large cruise operations can have on coastal communities. There are some technical issues that need to be considered for continued use of Union Wharf for cruise ship visits, but these issues are not really pertinent. At this time, the American Cruise Line visits do not appear to have any impact on the Jefferson County community, except in the immediate vicinity of downtown Port Townsend. The main issue here seems to be whether or not the City populace and businesses want to continue having cruise visitation in the City downtown area.

The City transferred ownership and control of Union Wharf to the Port in 2012, apparently without any caveats that would prevent cruise ship visits. One might take the viewpoint that the cruise ships are simply a marine motel that is placed on the Port property, whereas past precedent has been to discourage development of Port property for such uses. Another viewpoint would consider whether the City is entitled to, or even wants, revenue equivalent to lodging tax for such port visits. Yet another viewpoint should consider the extent to which Union Wharf would not be available for potential visits by visiting historic vessels, tall ships or scientific vessels that are too large for moorage at the other Port facilities, if such a visit would conflict with a cruise ship docking commitment.

Any decision on the cruise ships issue deserves careful consideration, but leadership should not postpone action on the issue.

#### **Moorage for Locals**

A common complaint in our community is that the current permanent moorage inventory of the Port is either unaffordable compared to our local economy or is completely unavailable due to low turnover and occupancy by county non-residents. Federal law prevents discrimination in the leasing process and thus unfairly favors port tenants that live and work in other (often more affluent) locales and may have kept their boats in the Port over a long period of time. This is an old issue, but deserves current attention. Another viewpoint might be consideration of the extent to which non-resident moorage may actually improve income for the marine trades.