



**Provincetown Public Pier Corporation (PPPC)
Provincetown Town Hall, Judge Welsh Room
Meeting Minutes of Thursday, April 27th, 2017**

Members Present: Kerry Adams (KA), Herbie Hintze (HH), Scott Frasier (SF- via telephone conference), Carlos Verde (CV)

Other Attendees: Rex McKinsey (RM), Ray Sturdy III (RS), Jarrod Koskey (JK)

Excused Absences: Ginny Binder (GB)

Chair, Kerry Adams called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M.

(KA) asked for any public statements. (None)

(KA) asked for any special agenda. (None)

A motion to accept the PPPC Meeting Minutes of April 13th, 2017 as written was made.

Motion- (HH) 2nd Motion (CV)

Motion to accept by roll call: Yes- (KA), (SF), (HH), (CV)

Motion made to accept minutes of PPPC Minutes as written passes.

Pier Manager's Report:

(RM) discussed the fact that the CH 91 License has been received and signed by the Governor, the 404 water quality certification is complete, Conservation Commission and the CZM Federal consistency review is complete and the final permit we need is the Army Corp of Engineers which has been stated will be complete by the end of May, 2017. He continued by discussing FEMA appears to have crossed a point with the cost/benefit analysis. He also stated that some validation with new wave studies required to represent the benefits derived from Lagasse's pier system.

(SF) asked (RM) about the precise location of the docks to which discussion ensued between (SF) and (RM) and clarification was made for the benefit of Scott's question.

(CV) brought up the point of his concern being the threshold and the issue that we would be dependent on another business or facility's wave attenuator and if they changed this in some way the area would become exposed which we would have no control of.

(RM) replied that if something did change and it has, the CH 91 process would be open to make adjustments if necessary to our plan.

(SF) asked (RM) what the cost difference was between the wave attenuator dock and a regular dock to which (RM) replied that the cost difference would be approximately \$300,000.

(SF) and (RM) discussed the idea of not putting ourselves in that position and building what we need to protect ourselves.

(KA) stated that he agrees and allow FEMA to pay for what we need and if we choose to build in another area the cost is our responsibility and FEMA has no input on that but if we leave the present plan as it is we do not need their guidance.

(RM) stated that if we do wish to ideally protect from the southwest, the better option for a location for a wave attenuator would be the approximate 300 ft area between the transportation dock and the Wydyah Museum where the patrol boats dock providing a complete shield.

(CV) further stated that this is an issue that he doesn't want to backfire on us if things would change and jeopardize this one area in particular.

(RM) replied that this particular area was not included in the original design and we actually added it in 2004 or 2005 in a report and brought to the Board of Selectmen.

Discussion ensued regarding the topic.

(RM) began discussion regarding the lobster closures being extended 7-14 days beyond May 1st, 2017 due to Right Whales being present in the area and this was decided upon by The Division of Marine Fisheries.

(CV) asked (RM) if more staff would be present due to a "back up" of lobstermen and their trailers because of the closure to which (RM) replied that this has been considered and will be taken care of. He stated his concern being the start of ferry service and the potential for heavier traffic becoming an issue at that time and in future years as the whales seem to be remaining in the area further into the season each year.

(HH) brought up the subject that the ferry services were sold out on the weekends even during the very start of and (RM) reminded all attendees that if this were the case the ferries would be limited to 10 knots thus causing long delays in travel time and loss of passengers.

(KA) asked (RM) if he has anyone available just for the weekend shifts for traffic control to which (RM) replied he does.

(RM) continued discussion by stating that an agreement had been reached with Legasee and the purchase of oak fender piles at a cost of \$100 each from them.

Discussion ensued regarding 7 surplus finger docks and how we will be able to use those for various purposes to include rental and as back - ups.

(RM) then discussed the subject transportation network drivers such as UBER and LYFT and the regulations and questions concerning them and their access to the pier. He also discussed methods of identification of these vehicles and standing areas for taxi's and liveries.

(KA) stated he and (RM) discussed having a sign on the pier for the purpose of controlling those not having proper plates on their vehicles with an attorney and the attorney stated this is allowable.

Motion to have a sign placed at the beginning of the pier that states, "commercial passenger pick up may only be done by vehicles with a commercial or livery registration plate"

Motion- (KA)

2ND Motion- (CV)

(CV) brought up the issue of Inns picking up guests and (RM) replied that the wording should be "vehicle for hire" therefore differentiating them from taxis, etc.

Discussion ensued as to the best wording to make the sign fully clear as to avoid confusion for all drivers and informing guest houses that this does not affect them as they are not "for hire"

Roll call vote: Yes – (HH), (SF), (CV), (KA)

(KA) brought up the subject of new parking regulations and enforcement on the approach pier. (CV) asked about reaching out to the fire chief and getting his backing of having this area registered as a fire lane as well as reaching out to the police chief to assist in keeping this area clear for safety issues.

(RM) mentioned other various issues on the subject of parking and proper rules and enforcement of parking to alleviate parking and traffic issues.

(CV) stressed his feeling of the importance of new parking regulations and stronger enforcement.

(RM) did state the west float owners should allow a 15 minute zone as stated in the regulations. Discussion ensued as to the details of 15 minute zones and (RM) stated he would like to provoke conversation with the police and fire chief for any changes as well as the exchange of ideas for ticketing, allowable times in unloading zones and the subject of oil delivery trucks.

Motion made to designate the approach pier a no parking zone and create unloading zones opposite the floating docks.

Motion- (HH) 2ND Motion- (CV)

Roll call vote- Yes, (KA), (SF), (HH), (CV)

The motion to designate the approach pier as a no parking zone and creating unloading zones opposite the floating docks passes.

(RM) discussed the returned surveys from the pier tenants and the idea in particular of parking for crew members of the vessels being a concern brought forward by the surveys to which (CV) replied that any additional crew members and parking for them needs further attention paid to that and alternative solutions to allowing crew members who may not be Provincetown tenants being provided special parking privileges.

Directors Statements:

(HH) asked (RM) if the plastic drapes for the pavilion were available and discussion was exchanged regarding this subject and their need for protection from the weather for people waiting for the ferries.

(CV) asked if the pier patrol vessels are ready to be placed into the water and if the cranes were all in proper condition to which (RM) replied that the vessels are ready and will be in the following week. He also informed the room as to the improvements Luis Ribas made to the hydraulic crane's maneuvering capabilities.

(CV) also asked if the ice machine was ready and (RM) stated it is ready and once the weather warms up a service call will be made for routine check-up.

(CV) asked about the HM truck and it's condition and the topic of purchasing a replacement pick-up truck to properly provide the needs of the pier. Discussion ensued regarding the present vehicle and the idea of sharing the cost with the Town of Provincetown for a replacement for functional purposes as well as the present vehicle needing repairs in recent months. (RM) agrees

with a replacement but feels it serves properly at present but also shares the point made by (CV) that it fails to provide the proper needs of the pier but can wait until 2018. (SF) asked if it is serving the pier properly in all manners of the pier and Harbormaster duties. (HH) stated his support that the pier and Town of Provincetown should share in the cost of a replacement truck and it was agreed that this subject should remain a topic of discussion and follow up.

(CV) asked about a time frame for rebuilding of the docks to which (RM) stated that by the close of the next two weeks the work in question should be completed

(SF) then started discussion of pier security for potential terrorist threats and what the costs may be for adding blockades on the pier or steel posts that would be prevent large vehicles from entering the pier should the need arise.

(KA) agreed with (SF) and (CV) posed the question of there is a potential to receive grant money for such a project possibly from Homeland Security and his desire to have this researched.

(RM) suggested concrete barricades that could be placed by a forklift.

(KA) then asked about the topic of fishing off the pier and when this resumes to which (RM) replied it will resume in one week. (KA) then brought up the topic of a fisherman's memorial and potential locations to which a brief discussion followed to be re-visited at a later date.

New Business:

None

Motion made to adjourn PPPC Meeting of April 27th, 2017.

Motion - (HH)

2nd Motion - (CV)

Yes - (SF), (KA), (HH), (CV)

Chair, Kerry Adams adjourned the PPPC Meeting of April 27th, 2017 at 6:25 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jarrold Koskey
PPPC Administrative Assistant

Kerry Adams, Chair

