

To: Port of Commissioners

From: Damon Darley  
9736 1<sup>st</sup> ave. nw  
Seattle Wa, 98117

Commissioners meeting 3/8/2016

I am not sure that the Port has taken into account that the Shilshole Bay/ Golden Gardens area is a complex multi-use recreation area, and as such is a Seattle area treasure.

The Marina tenants already are paying high fees. Even a 30' slip costs enough to lease a nice Lexus. Our guests or racing crews, which are an integral part of boat ownership, would be impacted and also reduce the value of our moorages.

In addition to the Shilshole tenants there are the Guest Moorage users including area Yacht Clubs that have organized cruises to Shilshole, national Sailing Regattas, boat ramp users, Golden Gardens park patrons including weddings and parties at the Beach House, The Dog Park, runners and walkers, bikers, the occasional Car Club, and tourists who just come by to look at the boats and the sunset.

At this time area parking includes lots at the Port, Boat Ramp, Golden Gardens, the Dog Park, and a significant amount of on street parking. It should be noted that at this time there is no "Parking Problem" as such that needs to be solved. At times all the available lots and on street parking are near full. Some days with park users, or Sailboat racing crew, and others with pickup trucks and trailers for sport fishing, or with Park overflow.

The probable outcome of the Port converting to pay parking would be many potential users would opt out by parking in the street, Boat Ramp, or Park lots. The City would likely see this as an opportunity to discontinue free parking on Seaview Ave. which would move overflow parking even further afield filling the Dog Park lot and moving into the residential neighborhoods at both the north and south ends.

It should also be noted that there is no public transportation to this area including Golden Gardens further complicating the issue.

As for using pay parking to increase revenues it is a poor tool at best as a significant portion of the fees charged would be used to collect those fees and as profit for the contractor and flow to Texas or where ever. If more income is required by the Port, reducing the subsidy for tenants of Fisherman's Terminal would be more effective.

The bottom line is that the small additional income would not be worth the bad publicity and disruption of this important recreational area.