

those substitutions meet their specific standards. The third is when a customer chooses a supplier that they like and that supplier contracts with the customer to do a design/build/install project. Private owners, such as yacht clubs can do this, but not public entities. A variation of the second form is sometimes done where the supplying and installation of the dock system is bid separately. For example, there is one company that builds the system and supplies the materials and then local companies install pilings, run pipe work and electrical lines. SF thought it would be interesting to compare the drawings that were first put out to bid for the Town's Pier with the set of drawings that he obtained from Bellingham Marine for their installation of a floating dock system in Perth Amboy, New Jersey.

RM replied that the floating docks were only a component of the original bid for the Pier and the bids were done through AGM Marine. He will check on it.

The Board discussed the floating dock research. SF gave the Directors the Bellingham Marine website address so they could review their projects. SF suggested that they view one in particular that shows a huge curved wave attenuator with a marina inside. The Directors discussed the issue.

RM stated that the grant money requested from FEMA is \$1.9 million to replace the floating docks and \$2.9 million to further protect the system.

SF said that the Town would have to come up with a 25% share of the FEMA grant, which would be \$1.2 million. A loan for that amount could be taken out by the Town. He noted that a lot of revenue could be generated by the addition of more dock space, especially if that space was rented on a seasonal basis to recreational boats. That money would easily cover the principal and interest on a \$1.2 million dollar loan. From the Town's perspective, it would make financial sense if the wave attenuator could be built into the dock system.

GB suggested that Mass Development might be able to cover the Town's share. RM will check. The Directors continued the discussion as to whether the systems on the website would be appropriate for the Harbor, given its location and the myriad of environmental forces at work in the Harbor.

RM said that the Bellingham Marine's concrete dock system is called Unifloat and was part of the information given to Bourne Engineering and submitted to FEMA as part of the grant application.

SF said that it would be cheaper to build a facility that has a wave attenuator component than designing a set of docks that would have to withstand significant wave action.

RM has been in touch with Bourne Engineering and explained that there is still time to get them involved and have a discussion to determine what kind of system would be appropriate for the Harbor.

SF suggested inviting other companies that are in the same business as Bellingham Marine to meet with the Directors and educate them about floating dock system. GB suggested doing it in

the context of a public forum. SF suggested that the data from the wave study should also be presented at a public meeting. HH suggested getting the fishermen involved in the process as well. CV thought that the Perth Amboy contract provision that required videotaping the materials and processes that went into their floating dock installation was a good idea. RM agreed that scrutiny of the project was necessary and could include videotaping.

Harbormaster business segment:

SF raised the question of whether the Board of Selectmen wants to continue to allow the Pier Corp. to continue to manage the Pier and the Harbor. If the BOS does not want that arrangement to continue, then they should tell the Pier Corp. now because the renegotiation of a contract and lease for the future would then be moot. And it would have a direct bearing on the operations of the Harbormaster's Office in terms of structure, budgeting and staffing is done for the coming year. He brought up the issue of splitting up the duties between a Harbormaster and a Pier Manager, either of which the Pier Corp. could do, or continuing to keep those two positions integrated. The organizational infrastructure that exists in the HM Office would have to be duplicated by the Town if it took over the HM Office. He mentioned some of the negative staffing and financial implications of splitting up the duties, information that was presented in his report on the issue at the last meeting. The Directors discussed the issue.

RM mentioned that from an operational point of view, certain negative effects would result from splitting up those duties, including adding a layer of confusion for the public and creating potential conflicts between the two in certain situations. This would have a detrimental effect on the efficient running of the facility. In addition, Town budgets have already been prepared and they would have to be adjusted if the plan to split the positions were to move forward.

CV is in favor of splitting up the duties of the HM and a Pier Manager because combining them adds layers and slows down the work of the Pier Corp. In the past, the Pier Corp. has gotten too involved in the running and staffing of the HM Office. It would be better to have the Pier Manager manage the funds and the maintenance of the Pier and create opportunities for revenue generation.

HH thought that RM has too many people to answer to. KA and GB agreed. KA suggested taking some of the workload off of RM, but thought that on the whole, the Pier operates well as it is currently structured.

Review of Minutes

No minutes were available.

Directors' Statements

SF: None. Welcome to Ellen.

GB: None. Welcome to Ellen.

CV: Nice to get updates during storm. There was some damage sustained. He mentioned the rescue of a boat. The Pier held together during the storm. Welcome to Ellen.

SF: He wanted to comment on a rumor he heard that BOS thought that either the Town or another entity should manage the Pier. He reviewed a slide in his presentation on the topic where he compared the pros and cons of in-house versus out-sourced Pier management. The January 1st-December 31st P&L Statement showed that the Pier lost \$206,000. The storm damage added up to about \$198,539, but there could be more buried in other accounts.

KA: Welcome to Ellen.

Pier Manager's Report

Condition Report:

RM complimented staff on the continued repair of the floating docks. There wasn't much damage during the recent storm. Some of the finger piers appeared to be broken off from the main pier, but what had actually happened was that as the floating docks begin to rock during a storm, the cotter pins break off, the hinge pins fall out and the dock swings free, making it less likely to do damage. The fingers did not sustain much damage. A couple of whalers were split, but that wood is in stock and can be easily repaired. The transportation dock sustained some damage, including failed welds around some hinges. It might have looked as though the float was sinking, but it wasn't. It has to be taken apart, repaired and put back together.

Work was done in the office. New fixtures and a new floor were put in the bathroom. The front door was replaced. This work was necessary because of water intrusion, mold and rot, which is the result of being in an exposed marine environment. Much of the work has been done with the help of DPW.

A conservation mooring broke during the storm and a wooden sailboat needed to be rescued. RM is looking into why the mooring broke. Staff went out and helped the boat owner to his boat and set his anchors. If they had not done that, the boat would have gone up on the rocks on the next high tide. Many boats on the West End Parking lot were picked up and taken away in the high tide when it exceeded the projected height of 11.5' and swelled to over 12.5'. The boats probably ended up in the cove. They did not present a pollution hazard so there was no reason to get them right away.

CV asked about the transportation float damage. RM said that it was too heavy to lift out of the water and is over by the Johnson Street parking lot and will be repaired there. CV suggested that all the welds be checked considering that some had failed. If the float was not operable during the summer, it would be a major problem. RM said that staff will be inspecting the most stressed welds. CV said that the transportation float had been discussed several months ago and was inspected before the last storm, which was a fairly small event. Shouldn't it be hauled out and inspected by a surveyor? RM said that Luis will inspect it as it is being repaired. KA asked about the engineer's survey of the float. RM said that some cleats and hatches needed to be replaced when the float was visually surveyed last spring. KA suggested getting it inspected by an engineer or a marine surveyor before the season.

SF mentioned that occasionally staff has to conduct rescues in nasty conditions. He asked if staff is adequately clothed in survival gear when they have to go out on a rescue in the cold weather. RM said that they do have adequate gear. He reviewed the policy which states that if a staff member doesn't like what he or she sees during a rescue, or other such operation, the task is halted, the situation discussed and worked through and a contingency plan is developed. CV suggested that non-staff should not be in the HM boat because of the liability issue. RM disagreed and said that in a boat rescue situation, the most efficient way to deal with the situation is to have the boat owner in the rescue boat because that person best knows his or her boat. SF agreed with CV about the issue. RM said that would change the way the HM Office operated. KA suggested that the issue be put on a future agenda in order to clarify or set a policy.

Annual Report:

RM introduced the draft Annual Report. It contains some of the highlights from the past year. It is due on January 23rd. The Directors can review it and send additions, suggestions or revisions to RM or KA.

New Business

Joint Meeting with the BOS:

Tom Donegan joined the discussion. He wants to make sure that the goals of the BOS and the Pier Corp. are aligned, which includes articulating what those goals are. He is looking forward to starting the contract negotiation process.

RM said that there is still money in one of the Town's budgets for a Marine Patrol Officer because the BOS had not weighed in on that subject yet. This issue will be included in the discussions with the BOS. RM has put together an assessment of the MPO project. He understands that Lt. Golden is putting together a report on the project as well. TD said that the BOS wants to make sure that people are safe and things continue to run smoothly on the Pier as things transition into another form. There is a public consensus that something different is wanted, but above all, everyone wants the Pier to function well. TD suggested having Assistant Harbormasters trained in public safety by the Police Dept.

TD briefly discussed Pier issues with the Directors, including the need to clarify and articulate the mission of the Pier, the maintenance of, and investment in, Pier infrastructure, revenue generation, rates, the effect of subsidies on the Pier Corp., fees and the maintenance reserve.

SF summarized a budget meeting at the HM Office attended by KA, RM and TD. He reviewed how much additional revenue would be needed by the Pier if that question were to be asked by the BOS. The biggest need in terms of additional revenue, aside from personnel, is for maintenance. There is no over-staffing or over-payment of staff occurring. In his opinion, the Pier should be budgeting for a profit in order to add new assets in the future, such as a new boat or a truck. That would entail an increase in revenue of about \$25,000 a year in order to realize a modest profit. Pursuant to the CIP, in terms of maintenance, anticipated costs will go from about \$70,000 to about \$120,000, a differential of \$50,000. It is the fiduciary responsibility of the Pier Corp. to build a maintenance reserve, but no one has ever given guidance as to how much that

should be. The Finance Committee has in the past recommended a reserve of 5% of the replacement cost of the Pier, which would be about a million dollars. The account is now at \$50,000. The maintenance reserve was \$250,000 before the storm and that was after 8 years of saving. If you now need a million, the Pier would have to set aside three times what it does now in order to make the 5%. An additional \$200,000 to \$225,000 in revenue would be needed. That revenue would have to come out of the users of the Pier, but according to his estimates, that would be very difficult to accomplish. Subsidies for the fishing fleet could be re-examined. Half of the tenants on the floating docks are not from Provincetown or Truro, but are being subsidized, which is not in keeping with the Harbor Regulations. He thought that the only likely solution to solve the revenue shortfall is to raise fees for Pier tenants.

Meeting adjourned at 6:32 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen C. Battaglini
PPPC Administrative Coordinator

Kerry Adams, Chair