

City of Edna Bay - Special Meeting

1 — Meeting Date, Place and Call to order:

This Special Meeting was held on Thursday, June 6th, 2019 at Edna Bay School.
Mayor Richter called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM.

2 — Roll Call:

Heather Richter	- Mayor / Presiding Officer	(Present)
Karen Williams	- Vice Mayor / City Council	(Present)
Tyler Poelstra	- Clerk / City Council	(Present)
Myla Poelstra	- Treasurer / City Council	(Present)
Sandy Henson	- City Council	(Present)
Doris Greif	- City Council	(Present)
Lee Greif	- City Council	(Present)

2.1 — Public Participants:

Logan Richter	Joe Wargi	Richard Stockdale	Maureen Viera
Louise DiPaolo	Roger DiPaolo	Ken Widmer	John Dodson
Sue Crew	Pat Richter	Russ Bartels	Aaron Widmyer
Gracie Heitman			

3 — Consent Agenda:

A: Approval of Meeting Agenda:

The current agenda was read by Councilor (Mrs.) Poelstra.

Consensus of the public attendants was taken in favor, and no objections were noted.

Motion:

Mayor Richter moved to pass the consent agenda.

- *Seconded by Councilor (Mr.) Poelstra*
- **Approved by unanimous vote of the council**

3.1 — Business:

Special Business:

- a: *New Edna Bay Dock Facility Details and Design Review, Discussion and Decision.*

4 — Special Business

Item A – New Edna Bay Dock Facility Details and Design Review....:

Councilor (Mr.) Poelstra projected and handed out copies of DOT harbor design Alternates 1C(A), 1C(B), 2(A) and 2(B) and their accompanying cost breakdowns for those in attendance to review.

Alternative 1C(A) was discussed first. The estimated cost of 1C(A) is ~\$1.91 Million, but the current anticipated funding for the project is a little over ~\$1.8 Million so some items will need to be optional or reduced in order to get the project in budget. A new gangway is not included in the estimated cost of the Alt 1C(A), and would otherwise add \$250K to the price of the project. It was noted that ~\$50K will come off the top of the anticipated funds for the project to remove a float in a neighboring community.

Gangway refurbishment costs of \$50K were discussed. It was suggested that the current gangway could possibly be used as a backdown after some modification to the roller and ramps. DOT is looking into if the current gangway can safely be modified / improved for that type of use and load. It was agreed to make refurbishing the gangway an option to reduce the cost of the project.

Most of the new pilings will be 16" diameter and will cost \$16.5K each, which includes drilling a socket, installation and sacrificial anodes. The smaller skiff float in the design would use 12.5" piles which will lower the cost some. It may be possible to re-use some existing piles on this float to save more.

The current main dock float is 150' long and DOT has suggested a reduction to 100'-125' which locals feel could make fitting large vessels end to end a challenge. It was agreed 100' is too short and to request at

least 125' of main float length. The existing gangway float is 12'x40', and the new 25'x50' gangway float included in the design could accommodate adding a back down ramp at a later date.

The dock design in 1C(A) realigns the dock some facing more Northward, but boats anchoring to the South tip might still experience issues with the rock under the dock. Mayor Richter suggested a sign could be installed on a pile at that stall on the dock indicating the max safe boat size for that area of the dock.

\$75K is included for demolition of the existing dock and other items, and that figure can be reduced or eliminated if the City acts to remove or manage the items that need to be removed during construction. The DOT has suggested the City could sell the main float, and stockpile the pilings somewhere after they have been removed to cut costs. Some pilings may also be reused if they are of sufficient quality.

1C(B) was reviewed costing ~\$1.97 million. The most notable change is the addition of an 8'x50' reenforced float at the North end of the T float. It was discussed that if possible this should be included to brace the strength of the facility since that end of the T float took on the most damage over the years, especially when there was no breakwater protecting the dock. The added cost for this float is \$50K. It was agreed to request this as an option, and to request the outside float stay at 175' with this added float instead of being reduced to 150' as suggested in 1C(B).

2(A) was reviewed for ~\$2.05 million. This design suggests leaving the original main float in place and only doing basic repairs and refurbishment to it, and adding a new gangway. DOT feels the old float could last much longer and is still in good condition. General consensus was not favorable to leaving any old part of the dock remaining and to the ~\$300K cost of the gangway at this time. It was agreed that 1C(A) is the preferred design.

Councilor (Mrs.) Poelstra suggested that to cut costs we could provide an option to 1C(A) to install the pilings for the extended skiff float, and get funding and work to install the floats later. She noted that as currently designed we cannot afford the project and we need to choose some items that can be optional. Some felt that the skiff floats were necessary no matter what and that they should not be optional.

Pat Richter suggested the 87.5' skiff float length was too long and would put the end of the float into the tidal flat at low low tide. He felt it should be reduced to 65' regardless, but that reducing the length would save money. He also suggested keeping all 3 fingers but putting one off the end of the 65' float, and possibly adding two fingers to the new gangway float once the City owned it to add more space. After further discussion it was agreed to split the difference and request a 75' float for more room and make it three 25' sections which Kirk appeared to prefer working.

Councilor (Mr.) Poelstra noted the breakwater still needs to be discussed in the cost estimates and that we need options identified of things we can all agree to live without in case there's not extra room in the bid. This would include things that could be added to the project if the bid comes in low, but things we know are acceptable to construct later if its too high. He felt agreeing on the core things we knew we could afford was important to decide at this point.

With the current amendments as discussed, ~\$70K can be cut from the cost of the project which puts us in budget, minus the breakwater. The breakwater is estimated to cost the DOT \$600/ft, which will come to ~\$150K for a 250' breakwater. The current boom stick breakwater is 280' in length. The cost estimate includes transport, anchors, chains, buoys and lines. The cost is higher for DOT due to paperwork and requirements Pool Engineering must follow for work with a State entity.

Pat Richter asked how everyone felt about spending \$200K of City funds on a breakwater. Councilor (Mr) Poelstra felt that as long as the City is not put in a financial bind after spending \$200K that could impact its ability to fill the fuel tanks and take care of business we have committed to do, that he was in favor. He noted that based on the financial overview we have done it looks like we can safely provide up to \$200K.

Councilor (Mrs.) Poelstra suggested that if more funding is needed the City could reduce committees that don't anticipate expenditures to 10% and take out a fuel loan for the next load of fuel if necessary to free up more budget. Mayor Richter noted that the \$50K in Municipal Lands is the remaining portion of the Incorporation Grant, and after inquiring about how the fund can be spent with our LGS she was told it is available for any expense that benefits the City, which the dock project falls under.

Pat Richter asked that the City obtain quotes from Pool Engineering for the City to work with him directly, since it could lower the cost of the project further and in case the City ends up needing to work with him on the project instead of DOT. It may be possible to re-use the exiting anchors and save 25% of the fees

required for contingency overhead on State contracts.

After further discussion it was agreed to recap all of the points and put them into a motion.

Consensus of the public attendants was taken in favor of moving forward with the DOT on Alternative 1C(A) including the suggested options as discussed. No objections were noted.

Motion:

Mayor Richter moved that we move forward with the DOT for construction of a new harbor facility with the following parameters:

- 1: Selecting design 1C(A) as our choice.
- 2: Reduce the skiff float length to 75' with the 3rd on the end.
- 3: Optionally adding an 8'x50' L to the end of the North end of the facility.
- 4: Optionally refurbish the existing gangway as project funding allows.
- 5: Any remaining funds in the project to be utilized on the Poole breakwater design, with the City optionally providing necessary funds to construct if project funding is short

- *Seconded by Councilor (Mr.) Poelstra*

- **Approved by unanimous vote of the council**

5 – Persons to be Heard:

None.

Adjournment

Mayor Richter moved that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion seconded by Councilor (Mrs.) Poelstra.

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 PM.