

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE
Special Joint Planning & Development Committee & Waterways Board Meeting
Wednesday, December 5, 2012 – 6:00 p.m.
1st Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall
-Minutes-

P&D Committee: Chair, Councilor Bruce Tobey; Vice Chair, Councilor Greg Verga; Councilor Jackie Hardy

Absent: None.

Waterways Board: Chair, Tony Gross; Harbormaster Jim Caulkett; Patti Page; Capt. Phil Cusamano; Peter Bent; Tom Hovey; David McCauley; Vito Calomo

The meetings were called to order at 6:00 p.m.

1. *Update and Plans for a Gloucester Harbor Transient Floating Marina*

Tony Gross, Waterways Board Chair noted out they have a feasibility study quote received today (submitted and on file prior to the meeting) from CLE Engineering for \$24,000 which includes a \$10,000 marketing study which is needed for due diligence. This will go before the Board at their January meeting for their consideration.

Jim Caulkett, Harbormaster reviewed CLE's proposal with the Committee saying that since CLE is doing the re-gridding program for them, they may be able to do a change order as this does not incorporate a building, this is a study. They will check with the Purchasing Agent and the City Auditor to make sure of the appropriate process.

Mr. Gross stated Mr. Costa did a great job with their enterprise funds and continues to be a great help to their Board. There is a MassDevelopment letter dated October 16th (on file) saying they can go through for power and water. **Capt. Phil Cusamano**, Waterways Board member stated the letter says they can go through the State property. If there is tunnel there, and power and water goes to the end, they can pick it up there. Or they can pick it up from the street if it does not. It would be about the power, but water will be easily done. The tunnel is an advantage. **Mr. Gross** stated they contracted on the basic physical layout for the re-gridding. They did some in house, but it was too much. **Mr. Caulkett** reviewed the charts submitted (on file) dated December 4, 2012. The first drawing is a 2 to 1 (two times the depth of high water which indicates swing) scope drawn July 28, 1993. The second drawing showed a 3 to 1 scope (number of moorings significantly drop with the increase in scope). **Capt. Cusamano** stated it is whatever the depth of the water is times 2, or times 3. Their regulations call for 3 to 1 scope. It is the standard. Historical data shows the moorings today have less than 2 to 1. The third chart which the Harbormaster did based on the number of moorings now, there is the federal anchorage; the mooring field. There is a line representing 450 feet of floats. All the existing moorings won't be displaced by putting the 450 foot float system in. It is a fifty foot radius which doesn't allow for a lot of scope for a 30 ft. boat referring to a 1 to 1-1/2 scope. The fourth drawing shows moorings mapped with a full swing with no overlap; they would not get half of the moorings in that they have now. There are 58 to 60 boats moored through the season. The fifth drawing is a 2012 Max. Overlap Drawing. It shows all the overlaps. They included by Red Nun #4 which include the sailing school floats. There are fairways for vessels and gets every mooring they have now in there; or they could spread them out a bit more. This is based on the inventory they gave CLE on the sheet of permittees. They may not have moved the moorings by Americold and Rocky Neck. Power boats and sail boats are separated based on the inventory they have there also. He said it seems promising. **Mr. Gross** stated they want to keep the conventional mooring gear rather than a specialized gear. It can be up to \$3,000 apiece for new specialized gear. They need to do this re-gridding everywhere. It hasn't been done in many, many years. The last drawing is of Solomon Jacobs Pier Proposal with the National Grid (NG) mitigation program. The City would gain control of that whole property and the building; and they provided these drawings to NG to go to the State to increase public landing to 500 linear feet that would house the patrol boats; keep the float system between them and the Coast Guard station and the secondary gangway for visiting boaters' dinghies (allowed for four hours). Larger boats can pick up and drop off for 30 minutes. The Solomon Jacobs's project is tied completely into National Grid's mitigation. **Mr. Caulkett** stated they are putting together a package for General Counsel to review to accept. NG hopes to tear the pier down and start the dredging in the fall of 2013. It could be pushed back. Once they get going they want to have it done in 3 years. They have to have the pier and float structures all approved when they start. They will be ready in 2015. It is a small window because of winter flounder with the dredging. They are in the Seaport Bond Council pipeline for \$1.2 million. **Peter Bent**, Waterways Board member stated this is the core that makes all the other projects work. There is a number of funding opportunities available for this. Tier 2 has a lot of limitations, a national contest. Tier

1 is available each year. It is not Seaport Bond money, but recreational boating money. This is a recreational boating project, and they can do a project for up to \$100,000. The gangway would qualify and make it handicapped access. The dinghy docks qualify for the Tier 1 grants. They have worked a 30-year lease of the entire building. They could pay for the restrooms and showers in year 1. They can apply annually for the \$100,000, and have up to three years to expend it. **Councilor Tobey** stated they are looking at dual funding then. **Mr. Bent** added this ties in with what the Maritime Center wants to do; it's a symbiotic relationship. Working together will create a very good home base for Gloucester on the water. **Councilor Hardy** asked if the project would be eligible for CPA funding. **Mr. Bent** expressed it could be. This is what makes everything out in the harbor work. They need their home base. **Mr. Caulkett** stated NG is very willing to work with them and has been a good partner. **Councilor Tobey** noted the transient floating marina is called a breakwater marina. **Cate Banks** stated it has to be like a breakwater. It catches the same southerly fetch. It was pointed out NG does not use anything in the building (referring to the building between the Coast Guard Station and Maritime Gloucester where the Harbormaster's office is housed). Ken Lento, of NG is the project manager and is going as fast as they can. **Mr. Gross** pointed it is a massive clean up. **Mr. Bent** noted there is no reason they can't go full tilt to get the lease in place from NG. Once they have that they can go for funding for the project. They're willing to allow them to use the water sheet as best they can in the meantime. **Mr. Caulkett** stated NG is looking to do the Coast Guard and the Harbormaster's pier first off season. Then they'd move to the Maritime Center. **Mr. Gross** said they're doing berming. They're removing the soil off of Solomon Jacob's Park and capping it. They will be asking for deed restrictions. It will remain a park. There is nothing really there anyway. If they could have gotten this to be bottom anchor then it could be a 10A float permit, but it needs piles. He also pointed out a draft timeline (on file) of what they're looking to do in the future to help the Board to move forward with their projects. **Councilor Tobey** stated if the feedback from the Purchasing Agent that they don't have to do an RFP, they can sign the CLE contract. They would have to come forward for an appropriation for this cost. **Mr. Gross** stated the Board will take it up at the beginning of January. The contract limit can be extended beyond 30 days. **Mr. Bent** commented that Solomon Jacob's Park is an absolute necessity. The regridding is a great idea and in process; the floating marina is a great idea; and they need to figure out if it is financially feasible. If it doesn't work, with the regridding they could add more transient moorings and run launch service. **Mr. Gross** knows that they have the demand. They want to create better access to the land side of the City's port. They are moving forward to increase that considerably. They have to regrid to get anything and now have to come up with the mechanics. It will require precise placement and a cost to someone, and what they will have to require on the bottom; legal has to come into this also. They have to also look at what they have to pay to have the moving of the moorings done, etc. **Cate Banks**, Waterways Board member stated they have to work with the permittees as well. People think their mooring spot is theirs for life when in fact it is the Harbormaster's choice and is his right. They want to finesse it so permittees are supportive of the changes which have to take place. They will do the inner harbor first and get the word out; eventually it will be realized it has to be done. **Mr. Gross** noted boat size has gone down with the economy. Moorings are charged by footage of the boat. **Councilor Tobey** stated the most important part is they will have a full business plan demonstrating the amount of debt this project will sustain and accept the delta between what it will pay for and the project cost. This is a business venture. **Mr. Gross** stated that was why it was written this way. It is unique; a hybrid marina. They have a new harbor plan being written and I4-C2 possibly coming out of the DPA. **Councilor Tobey** stated the water sheet there would remain commercial. **Mr. Gross** stated that may trigger more release of land out of the DPA. **Mr. Bent** noted although this is a sheltered dock, these floats were designed to be bottom anchored. They aren't doing that because the design to be bottom anchored is preferred. They can move which is a huge advantage. They're incredibly expensive. The concrete floats are the "elephants" of the project as is the electricity. They are an asset that doesn't go away and is adaptable. He reiterated it was a very unique project; new and different and is a good reason to proceed cautiously. **Councilor Hardy** noted as this is in the inner harbor it is naturally sheltered. **Mr. Bent** pointed out it is not as sheltered as one might think. There is a steady roll. **Mr. Gross** said it creates an uncomfortable bounce. There is a buffering aspect to the floating marina that is beneficial also. **Capt. Cusamano** noted the floating marina in Portland, Maine has survived four hurricanes which is 900 feet long. The one proposed here would be 400 feet long. **Mr. Caulkett** stated these systems have been used on the West Coast for a long time. **Councilor Tobey** asked when the next logical benchmark is. **Mr. Gross** stated they'll see them at the Council on December 11th for the 10A float increases. Councilor Ciolino will be able to keep the Council updated. June is really their next big benchmark. **Councilor Hardy** would want them to have a meeting with the Community Preservation Committee to learn when they can apply for funding for anything they need. She would like to see them integrate into the timeline the potential lease from NG for Solomon Jacob's Pier. She also pointed out NG has no consistency in their contacts. **Mr. Gross** would try to get more meetings with their NG representative, Ken Lento. **Mr. Bent** stated NG does not want the exposure of having the public on property they lease. This is the best alternative for them. They want this

to happen because it releases them from the liability and is the safest course for them. **Mr. Gross** stated it would be under the Waterways Board umbrella. Their insurance rider would take it on. NG is also paying for all the permitting. **Capt. Cusamano** stated if Solomon Jacob's Pier takes a long time, they don't have to wait for it to be done to do the transient marina. They can still land a launch there. Their highest priority is the pier. The projects will run concurrently. **Councilor Hardy** expressed the importance of keeping the Waterways Board membership continuity. **Councilor Tobey** stated the feasibility study will show them what they need to do, and how and when they can do it.

Motions were made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn both meetings at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dana C. Jorgenson
Clerk of Committees

DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.