

ELECT BILL HUNSINGER POA COMMISIONER POSITON THREE

I'm Bill Hunsinger. I would like to have your vote for Port of Astoria Commissioner Position 3. First I would like you to know what I stand for and what I support. Also, what I am not in favor of. I am a strong supporter of the wood products industry, commercial fishing industry and tourism, and all new ideas from the public. I am a strong supporter for new and better jobs for Clatsop County. Transparency is what I will bring to the public. South County, I have asked the commission on many different occasions for a meeting in Seaside so that you can tell us your problems and issues. All voters and taxpayers should have a voice. It is your port also.

I would like to have two meetings a year in South County, but I need your help to make it happen. It bothers me that South County doesn't have a representative on this commission.

I am a strong supporter of loading logs grown in Oregon and loaded in Oregon ports. Instead of Longview and Aberdeen. I believe the port needs the rail back to Astoria. I also think that the port should use the water to move other types and create even more jobs. The port has a lot of unused property that should be utilized like the city of Warrenton has done. The port has an industrial park at the airport that sits idle. The port needs to market itself in its next budget so that possible tenants can see what we have to offer. The port needs to mend its ways with our state and federal elected officials. I am totally against the sale of port property to make up for bad decisions. Our forefathers had the right idea. They did what ports are supposed to do, they procured land to possibly make the future better for us. If you sell these properties you are never going to get them back. Now I am going to tell you more about the things that I am not satisfied with that are going on at the POA.

As a commissioner, over the last 4½ years, I have had some concerns about what is going on at the POA. I am worried how the public money is being spent. As a Commissioner, elected by the voters, you should treat the public dollar as if it was your own. I am going to give you some examples of my concerns.

- 1. Attorney fees.** In 2015, the port spent \$172,786.00, which is \$14,398.00 per month. In 2016, the port spent \$109,045.00, which is \$9,087.00 per month. In 2017, Steve Fulton and myself brought these numbers to the Commission. The commission decided to hire a new attorney to represent the port, hoping this would stop the enormous amount of taxpayers dollars being spent on attorney fees. But in 2017, the port spent \$115,360.00, which is \$9,613.00 per month. In 2018, the port spent \$216,442.00, which is \$18,000 per month. We also spent \$33,710.00 in 2019. This total comes to \$647,343.00 plus the attorney fees paid as directed by the court that the port has to pay in the Riverwalk Inn lawsuit (\$145,000.00). That makes the total \$792,343.00. This information is public record given to me by the financial officer at the POA.
Solution: If I am elected, we need to stop these unbelievable attorney fees. I have talked to businesses that employ more people than the POA. They tell me that their business spends somewhere between \$6,000.00 to \$9,000.00 a year. Supposedly the executive director and on occasion the chairman of the commission are the only ones able to talk to the port's attorney. The solution to this should have been in 2017, on an unanimous vote by the commission, to cut back on attorney fees, but yet the port attorney that the port got rid of has received \$126,009.00. Someone should have listened to their commission.
Solution: The commission needs monthly breakdowns on all attorney fees and a print-out from the attorneys on what we are being charged for
- 2. Executive Director employment total package is \$209,000.00 per year.** He is also allowed a monthly nontaxable mileage fee. The executive director received a pay raise from the commission after losing the Riverwalk Inn lawsuit on a 3-2 vote by the commission. I was totally against this raise. I hold our executive director for this lawsuit. He told the commission that the Param Group was no longer in the picture and they were gone. This should have been researched more than it obviously was. Look at all the time by staff and attorneys and money that was wasted on this issue.
Solution: A better informed commission would have been the answer.
- 3. 12 loans with the POA's name as payee.** We continue to look at new loan ideas. Such as, the Pier 1 building as collateral. This would be the third time this has been done.
Solution: We need to look at all 12 loans, see what our monthly payments are or even daily, which was done 10 years ago, so that the commission totally knows what our payouts are. I believe we are totally loaned out.
- 4. East End Basin:** I have very strong feelings about the East End Basin and how our commercial fishermen were taken advantage of by this administration. The port took in between \$700,000.00 and \$800,000 without any budgeted infrastructure for this facility. This facility costs to build somewhere around \$22 million plus. We have 143 possible tenants looking for moorage at the POA. That lost revenue could have easily helped with maintenance fees at the facility. Now the port has raised fees on our commercial fleet and they have to take a skiff to go back and forth to their vessels, which is unsafe.
Solution: This is something that the port needs to talk about federal and state, marine grants and possibly ODOT grants.

- 5. Tenants at POA:** The commission has had tenants sending letters and asking for help from the commission. Their statements tell the commission that they are getting nowhere with the executive director, not returning phone calls and meetings to get their leases renewed. Also, the executive director asked a tenant to leave that brought revenue of \$100,000.00 a year to the port. Also, this tenant had been there over 30 years and has always been at the port's side to help us with our infrastructure needs. At the present time, we have received emails from tenants who are asking for the commissions' help with an issue. It seems like to me, in our east end tenants case, and our Chinook building tenants case, that they are trying to get rid of them, which makes no sense and is a financial burden to the port.
Solution: We as commissioners, need to have an open public meeting with our tenants to help them solve their problems. We want them to stay. How can any tenant have a business with a month to month lease? Even our executive director stated "I don't know if Bergerson construction was on a yearly or monthly basis". Get rid of month to month leases.
- 6. Executive director breaking POA policies:** Recently we received a letter from the second in command at the POA stating that Jim Knight was breaking port policies. The commission is held to strict port policy rules. Both staff and commission should pay attention. The letter received did not seem to carry much weight with the commission. In my opinion, it should have been an issue that the commission should have reviewed more closely. The person that wrote the letter has now resigned from the port staff with no new job in line. This job is a well paying position with great benefits and a possible future. I asked myself, why would a person leave this position when he was very good at what he did. This should be a red flag to the commission that something is wrong at the administrative level at the POA.
Solution: We need to, as commissioners, have a better relationship with our employees and they should be able to talk to us about their concerns without retaliation.
- 7. Stormwater.** Jim Knight the executive director needs to be responsible for statements he clearly made to the commission on the stormwater issue. The commission was told that the port needed a loan of \$1.75 million to cover the construction. It has been duly noted that Jim Knight told the commission that the port would pay half of the loan and the tenants the other half. He also stated that he had no pushback from tenants on their fair share. This was told to the commission so we could agree to take out the loan. These statements have been noted in articles in The Astorian on four different occasions. We weren't told the terms of the loan. First year, no payments. Second year, interest only. I asked the financial officer when we finally found out the terms of the agreement, can't we afford the payments now? He said "yes". The stormwater project was never finished, mainly because the POA didn't have a representative on a daily basis overseeing the project. On the best piece of available ground to lease we have 400 truckloads of dirt that is piled up with no projected place to go. This would have been a perfect place for Astoria Forest Products to expand. Bergerson Construction could have stayed right where they were.
Solution: When you start a project make sure you cover all your bases by having somebody

- who understands what is going on to oversee and protect the ports interest. Also, have a vision of the surrounding area that you might affect.
- 8. ODOT grant:** The administration at the POA did not follow through rules of the application. The first rule, do you have the match money? Yes. We put half into the 2015-2016 budget and half into the 2016-2017 budget. Are your permits in place? Yes. The port never followed thru with putting the money into either one of these budgets. So they didn't tell the truth to the state or ODOT. Even after both of those budget cycles in November 2017, the port represented by Jim Knight and Bob Mushen accepted the grant. After this time of realizing we hadn't followed through with the budget process and we didn't have the funds. The administration came up with FEMA is going to pay the match which turned out to be incorrect. The port was told "no" on two different occasions by FEMA, but yet the commission and The Astorian were told a different story. I called ODOT and asked them the status of the ODOT grant to the port. I was told that your executive director had given the grant back. This is totally against port policy rules. Why did the executive director not tell the commission what he was doing with this grant? Why was it kept a secret from the commission? There was a letter sent by ODOT closing a portion of our pier that was supposed to be fixed by this grant. This letter came months before the commission found out about it. There was over 200 applicants, private and public, that applied for this grant money - 40 of them received money. The port was the last to receive money - \$1.54 million. Of those 40, only two gave their grant money back. This was to fix our infrastructure at Pier 2. These grants are highly competitive and a lot of people helped get these grants. If we would have followed through and did things the right way, we would have been in much better shape with the state and ODOT and whatever grant we might want to pursue. After talking to people at the state level, I believe that this grant mistake has hurt the trust and credibility of POA.
Solution: I don't believe that we can fix this immediate problem without a change in the administration and a new strategic plan.
 - 9. POA credibility and trust.** For me this is a hard one. You can't always blame the commission, but we do deserve criticism, and we need to hear it from the public. The major issue is only part of the commission receives all of the information. This is a proven fact. This what the ad-hoc finance committee has stated. We need to be able to trust the information given us by staff are the true facts. We need to be able to have better transparency to the public. We also need to have a better way of telling the public what the agenda items are. Another thing to help fulfill this mission is to get rid of the 4 p.m. meetings and move them back to a time when everyone is able to attend. The position the port is in at this time financially, the public is the best resource the commission could have. The taxpayers should have a voice.
 - 10. If elected,** I will make sure that these issues are brought back to the commission and reviewed. We cannot continue down this road. This will be hard and take a long time - at least 10 years or more - to get the port back to where it belongs. I hope I can get your vote and try to get this to happen. I care about Clatsop County and the POA, I am willing to listen to anything that will fulfill this mission.

Thank You,

Bill Hunsinger, Port Commissioner #3

ELECT BILL HUNSINGER POA COMMISIONER POSITON THREE

Paid for by Bill Hunsinger