



CITY OF Des Moines

+

Marina

**Des Moines Marina
Master Plan Update
Comments / Questions / Answers**

Index

The following is a list of the overall questions and comments received on the Marina Master Plan Update. The feedback has been organized into the following themes:

- Slip Mix Pg. 2-4
- Covered vs. Open Moorage..... Pg. 5-7
- Guest Moorage..... Pg. 8
- Upland Uses / Interface..... Pg. 9-11
- Adaptive Building/ Dry Stack Storage..... Pg. 12-17
- Financing and Rates..... Pg. 18-19
- General..... Pg. 20-24
- Waterfront Zone vs. Marina Zone Map.....Pg. 25

City Disclaimer

The following questions and comments were received by Marina tenants who were/are current tenants at the time of submission. City responses are subject to change as the Marina Master Plan continues to evolve with its planning process. This is a continuous working document and may be changed/and or updated as more questions and comments are received.

Created and published 04/23/2021

Updated 05.13.2021

Slip Mix

Comment:

Pivoting to 50ft slips from smaller slips does not serve the residents of Des Moines, but the wealthy boat owners many of whom are not residents of the city.

The 20ft slots are all filled and many of us already spend approximately \$100,000 for a boat in that size range. Are we just catering to the rich and eliminating the approachability to boating and inclusivity of The Waterland City? If that is indeed the goal then the city manager and council need to communicate a plan on how the balance of our city is going to shift to cater to that.

Response:

This is certainly a policy question for the future of the Marina. However, there are a number of issues with these comments that need to be pointed out:

- *The City has never made a distinction between large boats and small boats, other than our ability to serve them.*
- *The value of the Marina to the City – remembering that no property tax goes to support the Marina – it is access, recreation, opportunities to enjoy the Sound that are the hallmark of the value to our citizens.*
- *Wealth is a relative term. The reality is that boating is a recreational activity.*
- *The comment assumes that the focus and goal of the Marina should be to specifically serve the Des Moines residents when it is in reality much broader than that.*
- *The comments assume that the Marina serves Des Moines residents. In reality, approximately 24% of the current Marina tenants are Des Moines residents; 76% of Marina tenants are from outside the City.¹*
 - *Also recall that about 80% of the land side visitors to the Waterfront Zone also come from outside the City (data from a former license plate survey). The data indicates that the Des Moines Marina has value as a regional asset and serves the region on both the land side and the water side of the Marina.*
- *The comments assume that Des Moines residents do not own large boats. Current data reflects that 23% of Des Moines residents with boats moored at the Marina own a boat that is 32 ft. and larger, and moor it year round.²*

¹ Of the 730 slips, only 176 tenants are year-round Des Moines residents.

² Of the 176 tenants that are Des Moines residents, 40 own 32' boats and larger. Approx. 136 own 28' boats and smaller.

- *The comments assume that the Marina cannot accommodate smaller boats in some other way. The Master Plan does suggest accommodating some of the displaced smaller boats in dry storage. This will also help reduce the number of derelict boats.*
- *While larger boat sales may have declined in some other States in the US, Washington State has actually seen an increase in sales for boats 31'+ (Source: Paul Sorensen presentation at Pacific Coast Congress; April, 2021).*
- *The Marina Master Plan is the plan which documents and 'communicates' the response to the transition to larger boats.*

Comment:

What data did you use in arriving at slip sizes of 30/34/38/42/50/54/64? Boat sales? Registration data? Demographic (historic or forecasted)? Other? (Pg.10 of Report)

Response:

The consultant took the natural progression of boat sizes based on their experience of the most common sizes, slip size vacancies, and a comparison with other Marinas on the Puget Sound.

Comment:

I disagree with the consultants comment that the marina is losing money on the 20, 24 and 28 ft slips.

Response:

The phrase "losing money" is not an accurate term to convey the situation. It is a case where smaller slips do not generate nearly the same revenue as larger slips. That facts on this are hard to refute. See the table below:

Dock:	E	F	M	N
Slips:	69	63	47	34
Size:	20-24'	24'	40'	50'
2019 Revenue	\$151,167	\$136,767	\$305,862	\$311,447
2020 Revenue	\$159,070	\$159,568	\$322,709	\$327,680

Generally speaking, docks for larges boats produce twice the revenue.

So there is absolutely an opportunity cost to having smaller boats on the water, verses in dry storage. That opportunity cost is significant is at least 3 specific ways:

- 1) *Lost revenue from larger boats.*
- 2) *Increased up front capital costs for more docks. In other words going to larger boats means fewer docks to build.*

3) *Reduced Operations & Maintenance costs due to fewer docks and fewer slips.*

Comment:

I would argue that the configuration proposed by the Consultants is much more aggressive than what would serve the residents and those who have been supporting the marina for the past 10 years.

Response:

Support for the Marina is not provided by Des Moines residents but by the Marina tenants. .

However, this is an interesting perspective. The questions is, should the Marina feel obligated to the tenants who have benefitted from long term moorage at the Marina

The perspective of the consultants is based on establishing the most viable, healthy, safe, solvent, and sustainable Marina possible for all future users and trends in the Pacific Northwest boating community.

Comment:

Should slip sizes be based on current information (occupancy and wait list) or on a forecast of future boat demographics – boat sales and recreational trends (cruising vs. fishing, boat club rental data, etc.)

Response:

Slip size and slip mix should be based on both those aspects. Past, current, and future trends will drive the discussion, and waiting lists are a good indicator of demand and trend. Currently our wait times for 30-62' slips range from 1-8 years. Wait times like these are not limited to Des Moines. That indicates a shortage in supply.

The Des Moines Marina is not the only Marina looking at these aspects. For example, here is an excerpt from the Port of Edmonds Web Page:

“Smaller-sized slips can be obtained fairly readily, however. This is a reflection of current trends in the recreational boating industry, with smaller sport fishing vessels gradually being replaced by larger recreational boats. As the Marina considers upgrades and/or expansion, it will plan with an eye on this trend towards larger boats.”

Covered vs. Open Moorage

Comment:

I disagree with the consultants on the topic of covered vs non-covered slips. While there may be a trend in private marina's to "maximize space and minimize cost" that should not be the focus of a public marina. There is a material safety factor to also consider, as the marina will have a liability should there be a law suit for negligence or injury to the boaters. Many of the non-covered marina's I have visited have safety issues that do not exist at our marina, due to the covered slips. Covered slips also reduce maintenance on the boats and as a result there will be more demand for covered vs non-covered slips (I would wage 95% of the non-covered slips are sailboats).

Response:

We do not agree that a public marina should be run differently than a private marina.

The requirements of running a business utilizing an enterprise fund, like the Des Moines marina, are similar to private Marinas that utilizes revenues to pay for their costs, and make a profit.

The Des Moines Marina is committed to operating a safe and secure facility for all whether they are in a covered or open slip.

Liability is a complicated subject and the author of the comment does not take into account that complexity however we encourage to continue that discussion about enhancing safety at the Marina.

We understand that covered moorage is in high demand and that boaters at the Des Moines Marina love and cherish our current covered moorage; an undervalued luxury that has been enjoyed for many years now.

The City will strive to provide as much covered moorage as possible with the following caveats:

- 1) We can actually get permits to construct covered moorage. Environmental permitting agencies may not allow this at all. No permits means no covered moorage; it's that simple.*
- 2) Assuming that we can get permits, and let's hope we can, it is undeniable that covered moorage is more expensive to build/ maintain than open moorage. We are happy to provide covered moorage as long as boaters are willing to pay a premium moorage rate and the costs of construction do not exceed what the market can support.*

At the present time, our wait time for open moorage are longer than for covered moorage.

Comment:

Covered moorage is not explained as a competitive feature for Des Moines. There are very few marinas that have this on the Sound. It has, and continues to be, the feature that draws boaters to Des Moines. Without it, we are just like everyone else. Many will look for a place in the general area. Likely Commencement Bay. (See chart on Pg3 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

We understand that covered moorage is in low supply and high demand on the Puget Sound. It will come down to cost, the price tenants are willing to commit to, and permitting and mitigation approvals from multiple State and local government authorities.

Comment:

What was the basis or reasoning for a 60/40 split on open vs. covered moorage? (Pg.16 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

This is an assumption by the consultant to create a scenario and expectation of some covered moorage but not all covered moorage. This is not a hard and fast target for the City to aim for, but rather an estimation of what may be feasible environmentally and economically, and that serves market demand.

When we get the next level of cost estimates based on engineering design and permitting, we do not think all tenants will consider committing to the inevitable increase in cost of covered moorage. That commitment must be understood before the City moves forward.

Comment:

What are the covered moorage options? What assumptions are to be refined? For Example, does covered moorage require an extra figure pier? (It does not at the Kingston Marina for the 40-50' slips.)

Response:

Most covered moorages usually require a pier on either side for roof support. However, we will be looking at specific options and alternatives as we move forward in the design phase. Permitting requirements will most certainly effect design alternatives and associated costs. Providing the most cost efficient and effective design alternative will be a significant consideration. We understand that construction costs will have a direct impact on moorage rates, and we want to be able to provide competitive moorage rates.

The City is moving forward with selection of a consultant team for engineering design and permitting. Some of these design details will be sorted out with that initial scope of work. That work will also result in further refinement of probable cost estimates.

Comment:

We have absolutely no interest in an open slip. If we were ever unable to have a covered slip at the marina, we would move to another marina.

Response:

We understand the value and desire for covered moorage. If the amount of covered moorage is reduced for environmental or economic reasons, the demand for the limited supply of covered moorage will increase. Some tenants may not be willing to pay the new rates for covered moorage set by the market and may be forced to consider other options, including covered dry stack storage being considered at the Marina. This will be a decision some of our tenants will ultimately make. As discussed throughout this document and this process there will be many factors that will come to play in making this decision on covered vs. uncovered and our tenants/customers will need to ultimately do what is best for them as individuals.

Guest Moorage

Comment:

I believe the path to connecting the city is an important decision and I believe that if done it will improve the use of the marina and it will bring more “day use” to the marina which will increase the use of smaller boats.

Response:

We agree that upland side development of the Marina could generate more “guest” or “day use” moorage. Our master plan is designed to accommodate the potential for an expanded guest moorage area for this very reason.

One option that is being considered is, as M and N docks are being replaced, to shift all of the coverage moorage on N dock over to M dock (if we can get permits to do covered moorage). That will leave N dock with all open moorage, creating a possibility for an expanded guest moorage dock in the future. This will be beneficial as we development and economic activity expands on the Marina floor and the downtown area.

Guest moorage can be designed in a way to accommodate various sizes of boats who will all participate in increased activity on the Marina floor and its connection to the down town.

Marina Upland Use and Interface

Comment:

Connecting the city and marina will be an expensive endeavor, but if done will massively enhance the businesses in the City and will increase the value to all tax payers.

Response:

We completely agree. There is a synergistic relationship between the Marina and the City, and the interface needs to be well thought out. The development of this interface and visioning is what the City has been working on with The Holmes Group, Skylabs, the Waggoner Marina Group, and the community over the past couple of years. The productivity and vibrancy of the interface area will support the future needs of both the Marina and the City.

Comment:

I believe Gig Harbor is a better example of how to grow the city value, versus looking at what the marina in the City of Bellingham is doing or what private marinas are doing. Neither have the goal of connecting the city and the marina.

Response:

We tend to agree that the water side and land side will benefit from integrated development. One of our primary goals is to create more value connecting the city with the Marina. This is a challenge at Bellingham due to the distance of Squalicum Harbor to the city's core. They are creating their own amenities to the marina as in the shopping, offices, restaurants and hotel in the Bellwether area.

Comment:

There is not enough room on the marina floor for a 75-100 room hotel. There are too many other competing needs. This should be placed up on 7th Avenue. There are several large vacant lots that would be more accommodating. For guests, it would be an easy one block walk to the marina.
(Pg. 17 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

Successful development requires thoughtful planning. The goal of redevelopment on the marina floor will be for the businesses who choose to participate to be successful. It is too early yet to establish what the precise development pattern will be.

The ultimate use of parcel A is not part of the Marina Master Plan per se. We have identified that there is interest by the City in developing Parcel A, but that development work will stand on its own and be evaluated as a separate process. It will however, be integrated as part of the overall development theme for the marina.

Comment:

The most significant impact regarding parking capacity would come from a passenger ferry terminal in the marina. It would likely require a 2 or 3 level parking garage. The best location for a structure that size is against the east bank. That is where the Adaptive Purpose Building and/or boat Dry Stack is being planned. A priority is needed among these uses and then right-sized for the available area. (Pg. 27 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

We agree that as part of passenger only ferry service, parking needs would need to be studied. That study and work is beyond the scope of the Marina Master Plan. We have mentioned the interest in passenger only ferry service in the master plan, but that work product will be provided as a separate process.

Comment:

Traffic Pattern and Parking should be laid out in a manner that provides easy access to the top of the docks for tenants and does not encourage car cruising as a pass time for visitors. Visitors should arrive, park and enjoy a scenic walk through the marina, public areas and the beach park. (Pg. 27 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

The paid parking system on the Marina floor has already addressed many of these issues.

Plans for the south lot will likely eliminate the drive isle along the sidewalk. Temporary load and unload parking zones will continue to be provided for tenants to conveniently access the docks, taking particular care that boaters have appropriate access to the docks.

Comment:

Socializing Areas for Tenants and Guest Moorage: Not sure this is needed or if it would be well used. Permanent tenants socialize on the docks at their boats. The dry stack area could use a gathering spot, but likely not the best use of that space. Maybe an area on a dedicated small boat dock for gatherings. The guest dock has an existing area. Good point about the need to social gathering areas. Such gathering areas may look different in the future, depending on how much covered moorage the City is able to build. (Pg. 17 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

There are a number of gathering areas currently on the Marina floor (i.e. guest dock pavilion, fishing pier, promenade, south marina park, Quarterdeck). With the redevelopment of the Marina Floor, other social and gathering areas will be accommodated into the design, such as the marina steps, plaza, pedestrian connections to Van Gasken Park, not to mention various restaurants and the year round farmers market.

Comment:

There seems to be more features desired than space available. Too many things in one spot. The marina development should be right sized, with priority established for those features that are preferred. (Pg. 17 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

Yes, the Marina floor needs to be right sized. The City has been working with The Holmes Group and Skylabs to develop a right sized plan for the land side of the Marina, based on the feedback we have received on the previous community outreach and visioning processes. Much of that work has been guided by pedestrian access standards established by the Urban Land Institute.

Adaptive Building/ Dry Stack Storage

Comment:

Building a dry storage facility similar to what is on Lake Union is not attractive and will be a bone of contention for the condo's that would be looking at the boat stack.

I would request that the City consider a configuration that retains options for those boaters that have boats of less than 30 ft.

Response:

The condo owners will not see the dry stack storage. If it can be incorporated into the "adaptive purpose building", this would all be interior to the building. The condo owners would see the green roof of the building, with active pedestrian uses to enhance the current view and overall aesthetics of the Marina.

Comment:

What would the plan be for the current tenants, who are paying for 20, 24 and 28 ft slips.

Response:

Smaller boats displaced off of the water will still have the option of being located at the Des Moines Marina, but in dry storage. It is not likely that the dry storage facility will be able to accommodate all of the displaced boaters. Therefore, some will have to go elsewhere. Dry stack storage, as well as moorage on the water will be purely a market driven, supply and demand choice for individual boaters.

Comment:

It appears in a best case scenario of moving small boats out of water, moorage would fill up the dry stack and end up still displacing 231 boats from the marina. Question: What other access to the water will be appropriate or available for those no longer able to keep their boat at the marina? (Note: The Redondo ramp, with no protection, is not acceptable to the majority of small boaters.) (Pg. 10 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

This will remain a topic of discussion as we move forward.

We of course know there will be an impact to smaller boats, however mostly to the boat owners who use our moorage on a seasonal basis (3-4 months out of a year). The majority of our year round tenants will be able to move to the dry stack storage or another slip (28-30' slips) and as we combine those smaller slips moving the smallest vessels to the 28'-30' slips will in turn eliminate the high vacancy rate between Fall-Spring seasons for those sizes. It is expected that there will be minor displacement of year round tenants.

Available launching sites will remain to be Redondo, Point Defiance, Alki, and Des Moines Yacht club memberships.

Comment:

The number of in-water slips (shown as 532) does not appear to recognize that a portion of one dock (yet to be identified) will need to be dedicated as a launch and retrieval staging area for dry stack boats. The income shown appears to be overstated. (Pg. 14 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

The layout of the docks will need to accommodate a staging area for boats moving in and out of the dry stack.

It is true that the report did not set the final area or number of slips for staging for both lift areas. The consultant suggests that this is often about 4 slips. In the final design this could be 4-8 slips and may change based upon the season and/or the demand. For example, some of the staging slips in the off season may be rented out as full time or transient moorage since less staging space is needed in the off season.

Obviously, adequate space will need to be set aside to facilitate boat movements from dry storage to the water. This is a detail that will need to be accommodated in the design phase.

The consultant did accommodate some staging areas when developing the estimates. Is it possible that the revenue could be overstated? Perhaps. But keep in mind that at this stage all of the figures are preliminary and will vary until the marina configuration is set.

Comment:

Replace Boat Sheds: This should be a covered storage concept and needs to be right-sized for the area available. (Pg. 17 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

Agreed. If we provide storage sheds on the valuable marina floor, that use will need to generate the appropriate revenue for the space. Ideally it would be covered – inside – the adaptive use building.

Right sizing the space is dynamic, and there are many competing uses for the same space. The adaptive purpose building will need to address as many of those competing uses as possible, yet generate the maximum potential revenue to feed other Marina capital expenses.

Comment:

What data was used in arriving at a boat length of under 30 ft.?

Response:

The consultant looked at the data provided by the marina for historical use for the slips 30 ft and under. This is also a trend in the maritime industry.

Comment:

There is no land-based staging area for load/unload or maintenance. There is no identified dock for staging at launch and retrieval. Would it be in close proximity at K, L, M or N Docks?

Response:

On land, we could remove (if needed) or use some existing parking spaces and make them land based staging areas. In the water there would be part of the dock at D dock and most likely part of L dock. In theory the staging areas would be for temporary storage (2 hours or less) until a tenant or customer is able to move their boat.

At this stage, we are working with a general conceptual design for the Marina to gather input and then communicate the conceptual design to an engineering team to draw up the marina design. Based upon this construction design new numbers will be run to show marina revenue based on theoretical rates. The moorage rates will be refined based on construction costs and the desire to build an asset replacement fund for rebuilding the Marina after another 50 years.

Comment:

Supporting calculations for Dry Stack revenue \$1.2M annually. What is the data on the expected expense for operations to understand the net? (Pg. 25 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

This is a fair question. This would require ex ante and ex post data analysis.

We understand that we will need to calculate the estimated annual operations cost for this, to include added labor, equipment costs, and facility maintenance costs. In addition, we may be able to redeploy some of our current staff and resources, due to the fact the maintenance needs on new docks should be less than we are currently having to provide.

Comment:

The current tenants on the water are not likely to want to pay for wash down, pump out or engine flush. They tend to their own ordinary maintenance. (Pg. 26 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

It would not be a requirement but simply a service that we may, or may not provide, depending on the interest.

Comment:

There will be a need for 2 boat lifts to ensure access to the water for 200-248 stacked boats on boating season weekends. (Pg. 26 of Phase 2 Report)

Response:

Yes. Accommodations for a second lift near D dock were included in the report.

Comment:

What elements are needed early for the Dry Stack assumptions? For example operations, storage area, staging (land & water), boat sizing, occupancy, staffing and surge management; noise implications, tenant maintenance of boats.

Response:

This is a work in progress. We are looking at all those details as well as partnering with other business who provide these types of services and potentially have an interest in it.

In-water and land staging will be similar to other Marinas like the Narrows Marina that offer similar services.

May include options for tenant maintenance area for boats.

(New Comments as of 05/13/2021)

Comment:

The building alone (adaptive purpose building) will take up about the area of a football field. (Reducing available parking)

Response:

At the present time the parking availability around the dry sheds amounts to approximately 20 spaces. Some or all of these spaces may be displaced. Parking needs for the structure will need to be assessed as part of the on-going planning work, and addressed as needed as part of any structure that is built. At this point parking impacts are not known as design and engineering work is still needed.

Comment:

Moving the boats from the storage building to the water? With a 20'+ forklift and a 30' boat that will require a very large secured pathway through the parking lot to get to the water. (Reducing available parking and access through the lot.)

Response:

The Waggoner report does include the launch/travel area for this type of storage and we agree appropriate amount of space will be needed for that. We are working on obtaining a design concept that will be able to accurately identify those aspects and will address those types of concerns.

Comment:

Is there an estimate of how many of the 200-240 boats may be launched on a sunny weekend?

Response:

Launching more boats on a sunny weekend is not a new concept for marinas. Similar to other marinas that offer dry/stack storage as well as our current launching policies, appointments will be required to be made in advance for boat retrieval/launching/hauling. This is a practice that is in place in a variety of business's where an appointment is needed and once the daily allotted appointments are filled they are filled. (i.e, dentist offices, hair salons, massage parlors, financial advisers, etc.) Marinas that use dry stack storage are no different.

While we realize there will be an increase in requests when weather is more appealing on the Sound, the reality is that this concept has always existed and will continue to exist. It is doubtful that all 200-240 boats will be requesting to be launched on the same day/weekend as this is not something that occurs at this time with the current marina dry shed/small slip layout or at other dry stack marinas. We anticipate some users will foresee the demand and utilize weekday launching and Guest Moorage to insure they are ready for their trips. Not all users will require their boat to be launched in water. Some will be taken by land. Staging areas will be incorporated in the design process for both land and water retrievals. A positive note on the staging area is that when not in use for dry stack it can be utilized for other Marina operations.

Comment:

Of these boats launched, how much dock space will be required to stage these boats waiting for the owners to show up and load? How much will this staging area reduce the available permanent moorage?

Response:

This is something that will come out in the design and engineering work. As mentioned previously the Phase 2 Waggoner report identifies possible staging areas to be used for this purpose. In water staging areas are only expected to take up a similar or even smaller amount of space than what currently sits vacant 9-10 months of the year.

Comment:

Will the stack storage folks have priority parking like the permanent in water tenants?

Response:

All Marina tenants will have priority parking as a part of our permanent moorage programs. We do not envision this changing at this time.

Financing and Rates

Comment:

I believe the city needs to be thinking about vehicles like a local improvement district or economic improvement district to capture property tax dollars in a way that can enhance the community and capture assets to growing the value of the city.

Response:

These revenue tools are worth looking at as part of the City's budget process. We do explore these options from time to time.

If the City were to explore a LID or EID, the revenue captured within the District would be used to support expenses with that specific District.

In a very real way, that is how the Marina is already set up. It is crucial to understand that the Marina is an Enterprise Funded activity of the City. That means that revenues and expenditures of the Marina stay within the Marina. Users of the Marina pay for the Marina expenses.

No property taxes are used to support the operating of the Marina.

Comment:

Should explore a range of options and their net effect on revenue.

Some possibilities include:

- More Live aboard options

Response:

Currently we allow for 10 liveaboards who pay a 20% premium for this option. This additional revenue from liveaboards only brings in about \$11,000 a year. Even if we were to triple the amount of liveaboard space, revenue would be well below \$50,000/year. That added revenue would certainly be offset by increased expenses, not to mention various operational challenges. Would current customers pay these rates?

- Floating retail (at the slips closest to shore)

Response:

This is similar to some Marinas found in Canada and California. This is certainly something that the City would be interested in pursuing. These types of activities and uses would provide an enhanced boating experience. The question is whether or not these uses would actually add net revenue to the Marina.

- Long term moorage leases

Response:

This is something we will be investigating further.

- Floating home slips and/or docks

Response:

At the present time we consider Live-aboard tenants on boats as floating homes. We do understand the difference and the allure of living in a home floating on the water. Doing so would require a different set of permitting requirements along with major infrastructure construction and accommodations. Still an option that could be investigated further.

- “Condominium” (privatize) some or all of the docks

Response:

This would be an option for an entire dock as we would not do this by slip. This could potentially provide a one-time payout of maybe \$2 million if there was interest by tenants and the Marina would revert the monthly fees similar to HOA fees for maintenance of the dock.

At this point, the City is not considering selling or privatizing the Marina.

Comment:

What is the overall financing outline for the entire marina project? Where is the money coming from and when?

Response:

The City’s bond rating recently increased significantly, reducing our cost of money. We will be reviewing multiple revenue streams to finance the marina redevelopment. We will continue working those details out as we move forward with the Marina Master planning work.

General Questions/Comments

Comment:

I believe that the City should be considering that the marina is an asset that can enhance the entire city.

Response:

The City agrees that the Marina is one of the crown jewels of the community.

Comment:

I am a resident of Des Moines and to my knowledge there has not been a resident survey.

Response:

You are correct. The residents do not pay for the Marina. While we would welcome their input, those who financially support the Marina enterprise fund is the top priority of the Master Plan. The City has held a number of community outreach meeting to help us understand the community's desires for development options.

Comment:

While the consultants reached out to CRS and Anthony's, they made no effort to send a survey to marina tenants. They have spent a year in this study and yet there has not been a survey of the individuals who are paying for slips in the Marina.

Response:

Input from marina tenants was solicited during the Phase I report. The City has also had numerous community outreach events related to the marina redevelopment over the last couple of years.

Yes, the consultant has been under contract for over a year now. However, COVID caused unavoidable delays to their work and ours. In fact, for many months in 2020, no work was undertaken on the Marina Master Plan.

This is now your opportunity to provide input into the process. While we may see things differently, we do value your input into the process and will take it into consideration.

Comment:

The current Des Moines' marina tenants are more likely to look to Tacoma and the Commencement Bay area. It is close in proximity and similar in the range of affordability. Not sure the list of other marinas on page 3 are the marinas that might compete for Des Moines tenants.

Response:

Possibly. Beyond the pure economics of the decision, there are other factors that might play into a decision to transfer to a different marina, such as where the tenant actually lives, and the convenience of being proximate of the airport.

This is something we have considered and understand. At the end of the day, it really is about supply and demand, and personal choice.

Comment:

I don't feel confident that our council or the city leaders really understand how the marina serves our population I've seen a few at the marina but NEVER on a boat.

Response:

At the present time, no Council members are registered as tenants of the Marina. However, there are current council members who were tenants at one time, and most are heavily involved with other aspects within the Marina.

Comment:

After reviewing the Reid Middleton condition report and visiting the site, I feel that it's possible that the information contained in this condition assessment is being used improperly to inform this level of capital planning. As a result, I feel that more site-specific information may be extremely beneficial.

Response:

The assessment report is not intended to drive capital replacements. It does however help us establish relative priorities for initial capital reinvestments. At this stage of the Master Plan, relative replacement priorities is what is needed.

Another aspect of the condition assessment report is that it does help us identify docks where other improvements could be made that would extend the life of those docks. That is actually a crucial part of the master plan given the potential financial constraints.

It is our conclusion that docks listed in poor condition should be replaced. However, we do need to consider ways to extend the life of docks in fair condition as long as possible. In those cases, that comment is correct that more site-specific information may need to be gathered.

Comment:

After observing the site, it seems to me that perhaps the general information contained in this cursory report is being used to inform very high impact, specific action, causing undue alarm. Instead of rushing to replacement, I feel that the collection & analysis of additional site-specific data may potentially enable the Des Moines marina to justify a delay in major dock rehabilitation work by significantly more than Table 2 estimates, resulting in substantial savings. A site observation supported this idea. Considering the benefits to careful planning of such high capital requirements, are there any plans in place for Reid Middleton to collect additional data required to refine design life estimates?

Response:

There is no specific action being generated with the preparation of the Marina Master Plan. The assessment report is not intended to cause alarm. Again, the assessment report was intended as a prioritization tool. As stated above, certainly some intermediate improvements (less than full replacement) of some docks in fair condition may be necessary and financially viable. That is something that may be worth investigating. However, making significant financial investments to enhance docks currently in poor condition does not make sense to us.

The City has no plans to do further site-specific work with Reid Middleton at this time, especially given their current recommendations to the City.

Comment:

Many of the dock systems currently in use at the Des Moines marina are of a very simple configuration and are relatively easily maintained. Have you considered the cost-benefit of initiating a more robust preventative maintenance program instead of capital replacement? Due to the long-lead permitting and other restrictions, capital programs are often overly conservative as a consequence, driving down asset life and driving up costs.

Response:

Reid Middleton was the original engineers of the Marina in 1969. As the original designers, they offered a unique perspective on the current assessment.

As the condition assessment mentioned we have always had a strong and robust maintenance program that has extended the life of the dock as long as possible.

Comment:

As regards raising money to cover the cost of rebuilding the marina pilings/slips, is it possible for the city to return the \$6-7million that was redirected from the marina capital account to the city in 2008-2009?

Secondly, again related to the cost of repairing the pilings/slips in the marina, is there anything to prohibit the city from contributing money from the city's general fund toward the repair costs, assuming that the city deemed it a worthwhile maintenance expense?

Response:

All City Departments, including the Marina, contribute a proportional share of the costs for the overhead and administrative functions of the City. This is accounted for in what is called an inter-fund transfer for these indirect cost allocations. There was a period of time under the former City Administration when it could be argued that the indirect cost allocations changed to the Marina for administrative services provided by the City were out of proportion with the services received by the Marina. While some argue, right or wrong, that there was a disproportionate cost allocations that were charged to the Marina, the theoretical total of those disproportionalities would be well below the amount suggested in the comment above.

Rather than arguing and debating about what the magnitude of those cost allocations was, or even should have been, let's talk about what the City has done since the New Administration has come aboard:

- 1) The annual indirect cost allocation charged to the Marina have been reduced by approximately 50%.*
- 2) Significant financial liabilities have been removed from the responsibility of the Marina, including:*
 - The North Parking Lot. This is now considered part of the City's Waterfront Zone together with the Beach Park, the Overlook Parks, and Van Gasken Park. All of the expenditures and revenues collected in the Waterfront Zone are now part of the City's general fund. This is significant to the Marina in at least two ways:*
 - The City's general fund and capital funds are being used to cover the costs of replacing the North Bulkhead. Those repairs will cost more than \$10 Million; money that is now being paid for by the City – not the Marina tenants.*
 - While Marina maintenance staff may do work in the Water front zone, their time, materials, and equipment are allocated to the City for any work they perform in that Zone.*

- *The Redondo Zone was created to account for expenses in Redondo. That Zone is also part of the City's general fund, and work in that zone is no longer covered by Marina revenues. This is significant to the Marina in at least three ways:*
 - *The City's general and capital funds covered the expense of the Redondo Boardwalk a few years ago. Those repairs were over \$4.5 million; money that would have been covered by the marina.*
 - *Fishing Pier and restroom replacement is being covered by the City's general and capital funds. Those repairs will cost several million; money that is now being paid for by the City – not the Marina tenants.*
 - *While Marina maintenance staff may do work in the Redondo Zone, their time, materials, and equipment are allocated to the City for any work they perform in that Zone.*
- 3) *The City's financial systems, including the Marina, are audited annually by the State Auditors Office. There has never been a finding of improper accounting related to the Marina. In fact, in the last three fiscal (2017, 2018 and 2019) years the City has been awarded the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting from the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada.*
- *The Certificate of Achievement is the highest form of recognition in governmental accounting and financial reporting, and its attainment represents a significant accomplishment by the City of Des Moines and its management.*
- 4) *The City is currently updating its financial accounting system and software. This will make it even more efficient to track and allocate operations and maintenance costs, but also the indirect cost allocations to the Marina and other departments.*

