



Provincetown Public Pier Corporation

Minutes

The Provincetown Public Pier Corporation Meeting of Tuesday, August 17, 2021, at 4:00pm in the Judge Welsh Hearing Room of Town Hall, 260 Commercial Street, Provincetown, MA 02657.

Members Present: Jamie Staniscia (JS), Chair, David Colton (DC), and Beau Gribbin (BG). Herbie Hintze (HH) (remote participation).

Other Attendees: Doug Boulanger (DB), Pier Manager; Jamie Demetriou (JD), Office Manager; Don German (DG), Harbormaster; Blake Peters (BP), GEI Engineer Consultant, Inc. (remote participation)

Members from the Public: Two
Remote Public Attendance: One

DB read the policy for Virtual Meetings in Provincetown Under the Executive Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, signed March 12, 2020, by the Governor.

Agenda (Discussion may ensue, votes may be taken)

Review Minutes

Minutes of July 28, 2021
JS: Motioned to approve.
DC: Seconded.
Vote: Unanimously.

Public Comments

Ginny Binder: Congratulated Jamie and the staff on the beautiful event to dedicate the Wave Attenuator to Luis Ribas. Thanked the staff and the director for making it happen.

Discussion and Vote on Float Space 1D-Changes to Size and Moving Slightly

DB: Described the project proposed for E1. They are looking to relocate the float to the south by 6 ft 6 in. Believes it would not have a large impact and would not interfere with the water sheet. The drawing showed the new dimensions and how the float will be utilized by size. Right now, it is a 15 ft by 36 ft float at the end of the gangway and they are proposing an 8 ft wide by 70 ft float with the gangway coming into the first third of the gangway. The

float would be moved closer to the pier. Currently, it is about 20 ft to 25 ft from the pier and would be 10 ft from the pier in the proposed plan.

JS: He asked if there has been a written proposal for the use of the extra space.

DB: They are planning on that from what he has gathered. The Seal Tour business would like to move to the new float. They also mentioned ply and delivery of materials to vessels and boats, which would fall into harbor regulations. Suggested to continue discussion when Mike Winkler entered the meeting.

Agreed to continue discussion once MW entered the meeting.

Pier Manager Report

DB: Business on the Pier continues with full activity and passenger ferry counts have returned to normal and up this week due to Carnival week. They had dropped during the Covid up-tic.

The American Constitution has canceled e visits to Provincetown due to the up tic in Covid cases. They have canceled the 5th, 12th, and the up-coming visit 22nd of August. He spoke with them recently and they confirmed their intent is to return on September 1st.

Met with the town Conservation Agent/Environmental Planner and the Marine Coordinator two weeks with regards to dredging and hopefully working together on a plan that may benefit all parties. Trying to coordinate on that. Additional meetings will be scheduled to keep the ball rolling. More updates to follow.

Currently in the process of researching electrical design engineering outfits for new lighting design on the pier and repairing for an RFQ.

Researching and discussions began regarding engineers and design options for the water main replacement. Will be preparing an RFQ for an engineer search as well for this fall.

The Provincetown Business Guild/PAX Labs event team have rescinded their request to use the Pier as a "Contingency Plan" during Carnival week.

Received the check from the approved Bidder for the Cavalho and now working out the details for the pickup of the vessel. Mike is working with the buyers of the crane, and they are working on how they will transport it.

The 5ton ice machine was down over the weekend and required a new water pump, which was replaced first thing Monday morning, both machines are both back up and running.

DC: He asked if they are discussing possible engineers with the Town if they already have an engineer vetted through an RFQ process that they have already approved of.

DB: Agreed with suggestion to communicate with town about possible engineers. Stated he has been working with the Town water departments and their engineers and will continue to have discussions with them on this.

HH: Asked if the cranes are still on the pier.

DB: He hoped they will be removed soon. Stated Mr. Winkler is hoping to be off as soon as possible. It is contingent on the vote that will hopefully be taken today on 1E.

Continuation of 1E Discussion

JS: Asked if there was a presentation or anything to tell the board.

MW: Presented a short overview of the proposed plan. He plans to make the float narrower, but stated regardless, the pilings need to be replaced.

JS: Brought up concerns he had over the Chapter 91 license and the future use of the float in terms of the number of vessels that will be there, the potential for reconfiguration of our floating docks or an addition of a weighted attenuator on the West side. Ultimately believed there were questions needed to be worked out before moving forward.

MW: Yes, we have the crane in the barge. Will just replace the pilings if the proposed project is not approved. The crane impedes getting into the floating dock as is.

JS: Asked about the process for a change in Chapter 91 license, assuming they would need a minor modification to Chapter 91 license.

DB: Stated the Chapter 91 license gives them the flexibility to move the floats around. A minor modification would be required if the square footage was changed. If the dock were to become bigger, we would need to go back to Chapter 91 as well as the Army Corp.

BP: Confirmed we have a zone of re-configuration for this area. These floats can be moved around. The criteria is to keep the amount of square footage, but we are able to relocate the floats on the whole East side.

JS: Asked if this is something the Board could approve without changes to the license.

BP: If the size of the float was increased, we would have to get a minor modification to the Chapter 91 license.

JS: He asked about the 11 floats if they fall into the same category of the other floats in terms of reconfiguration or moving them.

Blake: Stated there are two separate zones of configuration; one on the East side and one on the West side.

HH: Asked to clarify if they do not need any kind of clearance to make such an extension on one pier.

DB: Further clarified license conditions. Explained if a 15 ft by 36 ft float were to be doubled, then they would have to go before the Army Corp. Elongating the float from 36 ft to 70 ft and narrowing it will keep to the Army Corp square footage.

BP: Correct and Chapter 91.

DB: Explained that they are shrinking it in width and maximizing the length, it will maintain the square footage requirements. The proposed 70 ft does impede the square footage. Currently, it is 540 square feet and elongating the float to the proposed dimensions would bring the square footage to 560 sq. ft. With the proposed elongation to 70 ft, they would

need to go before the Army Corp. Suggested they could shorten the proposed length below 68 ft if they did not want to go back to the Army Corp.

DC: Asked if there was any beneficial logistical configuration to operation around the pier with the new plan.

DG: Evaluated the proposal based on his experience with training new deck officers. Believed it would be easy to train new boaters to maneuver around the water spaces provided in both the North and South sides of the new floating dock. The new plan would enhance the maneuverability on both sides on the pier. From a mariner point of view, it is a "win-win."

DC: He asked about the financial benefits to the Pier Corp.

DB: There definitely could be. The slip number S1, closest to it, is tight with existing conditions. Moving it away from that slip, boats in that slip could pull-out, back out easier. There would still be the 7th finger timber that belongs on that side, it was eliminated but we lost square footage when we lost that timber tier. Moving over a little, we could put in an additional slip, which may need a new approval there to put back what was there. That could generate and make \$12,000 to \$15,000 for the pier.

DC: Moving the float closer to the pier, does that create any issues gaining access to the float or impeding anyone else's access to the float.

DB: Explained how there was miscommunication with the original plans, which would not have been beneficial. This proposed plan would require installing the seventh finger originally lost at a minimal cost, would connect the dock to the pier, require one piling, and would already have the float. The access to 1E would not be limited and would remain the same. They would use the same gangway. Furthermore, there would be no need to add an additional waiver Attenuator as the Provincetown Marina attenuator extends the length of the pier.

BG: The pier enhancements against weather gives the ability for this proposal. By narrowing the float to the offset, it will ultimately increase the water space to the South and believed it would be a huge asset. The existing float is 15 ft by 36 ft and the proposed is 8 ft by 70 ft. The Army Corp would have to sign off on the additional footage after 78 ft, which is minimal. Without a scale with the exact offset, the engineer suggested to maintain the 10 ft off MacMillan Pier. Lengthening the float to the East would have a small intrusion on the water sheet and would not make a big difference for the slips there.

DB: The three feet would adhere to the footage requirements.

BG: The offset between 68 ft to 72 ft. If they are under the square footage, they would not have to get approval from the Army Corp but believed it would be a reasonable request for that small amount of offset space.

JS: Asked if there is a code for access on dock spaces for passenger vessels. Looks there will be 24 inches between each side if there are to be passenger vessels operating closer to the main pier, specifically any requirements for gangway width or pier width.

BP: The gangway width is minimum 36 inches for access along that edge where the gangway overlaps the float, you would not be able to get people to transfer in that spot. You can berth a vessel there if you can access beyond the end of the gangway to the float.

JS: Stated his concerns over the future use and needs of the water sheet especially over any future needs or possibilities that could arise. Wanted clarification if the Board would be responsible in guaranteeing the float space licensee a comparable amount of water space that is currently there or the new proposed float space. Stressed the importance of understanding the implications and processes if it was approved.

HH: He had concerns of the width of the pier and the safety of individuals, especially the with the daily Seal Tours and other foot traffic on a narrowed pier.

DB: Compared other float size to the suggested plan. Other floats average between 12 to 13 ft in width and 70 to 72 ft in length. Recently the 7W float was placed in the West side is 13 ft by 70 ft. Stressed the difference between the East and West side, stating there is more control of the water sheet on the East side.

DC: Suggested a draft a motion for the Board that would address the of future use, safety concerns, an operator plan, along with conditions.

BG: He asked for the width of the float and the dock.

DB: The float is about 10 ft wide. The finger timbers down the North and South floating docks are 48 in wide. Continued to describe placement of boats.

BG: The concrete floating docks are 10 ft wide and the wooden fingers of the floating docks are 4 ft. In comparison, the proposed 1E dock being 8 ft wide was double the width of existing docks that charter for hire boats working out of the floating docks. Also, the gangway on 1E is steep and if they increased the float's length to 70 ft, they would then gain safe working square footage on the proposed float.

Mr. Winkler believed he was allowed 55 ft to 100 ft, like the South side, as granted by NOAH.

Board members were unaware of such document and would take that into consideration once presented to the Board.

A member of the public asked if other float space owners have written agreements and if the Board will start with these requirements for owners starting with 1E.

JS: Believed it would benefit the Board and the float licensees to agree on conditions now before moving forward.

Mr. Winkler stated as the pilings are, they need to be replaced. Would like to get a motion as soon as possible to either move ahead in fixing the pilings or go ahead with the proposed plan.

Board members agreed it would not make financial sense for Mr. Winkler to fix pilings now and then possibly change the float dimensions. Discussed further on a proposed written agreement between the licensee and the Board before voting on the proposed plan.

HH: Motioned to wait for next week for further information.

DB: Agreed to write an agreement on the limitations to not to exceed square footage, restrictions around boat size allowances, Chapter 91, usage and will add to it as the Board sees fit.

JS: Modified the motion to include DB's statement. Seconded.

Roll Call Vote: HH: Yes; DC: Yes; JS: Yes; BG: Yes

Harbor Master Report

DG: Gave his report of dealings on the pier. They are experiencing an abundant of squish fishing on the pier, especially after hours. He and his team first began asking them to leave, then photographing license plates and will begin to write citations for parking in permit only spots. There is an issue with commercial fishermen unable to find parking in permitted areas in the morning. He is planning to rearrange schedules to have more staff on-site overnight. In addition to putting up new signs stating tow away zone and fishing hours, he believed there to be a need for additional staff to provide safety.

The M3, the main utility boat used over the winter, was originally bought for \$7,500 used. The trim needs to be replaced and is estimated on being \$1,200. He is looking into possibly buying a new outboard as the M3 is unable to go into shallow water and limits operations. He is also collecting information on a ridged inflatable boat, no bigger than a draft of about 18 inches, to get out to the rocks more often. This would increase their capability to get to the rocks. It could be a possible replacement for M3.

He received information on a new pump for pumping out the pump boat on shore. The overall quote for the installation and cost for the pump was \$36,943, with the cost of the pump at about \$10,000 and the cost of installation a little over \$20,000. The CVA grant program believe they could get a grant up to \$18,750. Although the pump will be good for the rest of the season, it is being held together with flex seal and tape and is something to be considered about its use for next season.

BG: Explained his experience with squid fishing on the pier, highly suggested enforcing it through parking, which would allow for the Police Department to step in for traffic enforcement policies. Continued to explain the possible pushback from the Division of Fisheries.

DG: Discussed how staff would have to be there to write the citation and how the MacMillan parking lot is free after midnight.

DB: Commented on how there are large groups in vans and dinghies. His largest concern would be if it was a business.

Discussion ensued around the possible remedies, enforcement regulations, and concerns over being short staffed. Further conversation was around enforcing regulations in place through policy.

DC: Suggested they create an operating plan to ensure the necessary protocols are in place to enforce the regulations. Possibly an operating plan that would set-up the steps taken by staff and a written enforcement policy to fall back on.

Office Manager Report

JD: September bookings are picking up for The Trap Sheds. Applications and inquiries for the 2022 season, are coming in.

Described the dedication of the Wave Attenuator to Luis Ribas on Friday August 13th at the Harbormasters Office. Thanked John DeMatteis for his help on this, Doug Boulanger for opening the dedication, Frank Travers for speaking on the behalf of Beau Gribbin and Noah Santos for speaking. The ceremony was officiated with e proclamation by the Town Crier. She recounted the third shift on Saturday night and the issues with the increased squid fishers. She informed the Police Department due to their rowdiness and for loitering around the MacMillan parking area.

Thanked Jason Brown for his service as minute taker and Maxine Notaro for stepping in until a full-time minute taker was found.

BG: Suggested they try reaching out to enforcement with the Division of Marine Fisheries. Could possibly help as you are short-staffed this season.

Adjournment

JS: Motioned to adjourn meeting at 5:47 p.m.

DC: Seconded.

Vote: 4-0-0 HH: Yes; DC: Yes; BG: Yes; JS: Yes

Respectfully Yours,
Alexandria Paine