

Mitchell Field Committee
Workshop Minutes
Consolidated Boat Launch & Town Dock Project

Workshop Date: March 15, 2021

Attendees: Spike Haible, Don Miskill, David Znamierowski, Lee Cheever, Mose Price, Sharon Oehmig, Bob Yanders, and Katherine Goodrich.

Also present: Mark Eyerman, David Chipman, Barney Baker (Baker Design Consultants), and Gary Vincent.

Workshop commenced at 5:04 PM, it ended at 6:59 PM.

Purpose: The workshop reviewed the four design options presented by Barney Baker for a consolidated Boat Launch (BL) and Town Dock (TD) Project at Mitchell Field. Additionally, Mark Eyerman presented a memo which reviewed our SHIP grants, where we are at this point in time, and offered a hybrid design option for consideration. Goal of the workshop is for the MF Committee to decide on which option they are going to recommend that the town submit with a new SHIP grant application.

Handouts for the workshop:

- 2021 03-01 18-58 PLAN COSTS MF Integrated Town Landing
- 2021 03-01 18-58 PLAN OPTIONS MF Integrated Town Landing
- 2021 03-12 Planner Memo Consolidated Options

Notes and Comments:

Mark Eyerman gave a brief summary of the history of the two projects, Boat Launch & Town Dock, where we are at in the decision process, and Maine DOT's proposal for a consolidate project. Based on that, we now have the consolidated project options Barney has developed.

A "consolidated project" must include elements of both individual projects originally submitted under two separate SHIP grant applications, the boat launch and the town dock (a boating facility). The town dock elements can be either large floats (10' x 20') attached to the Boat Launch Floats (6' x 20'), or building a stub pier at the end of the causeway.

The stub pier is the attaching point for a gangway ramp that would lead to a set of large floats comprising a town dock. It would be added to the existing abutment at the end of the causeway. It would be raised above the abutment and extended seaward to enable the gangway to clear the slope of the causeway at low tide.

Currently, the town has \$260,000 in the MF Capital Reserve account (CRA). \$160,000 were marked for the original Town Dock SHIP grant. The bids were too high so none were excepted. The town has spent \$30,000 to date for engineering and design work. The 2021 town meeting will vote on a final \$50,000 funds for the MF CRA giving us a total of \$310,000.

Individual SHIP grants are limited to \$250,000 maximum. Since Maine DOT has agreed to a consolidated project, we can combine the individual SHIP grant amounts for the two projects \$160,000 and 195,000. This will allow the town to ask for matching funds up to a maximum of

\$340,000 which would give the Town a total of \$680,000 in funds for the project.

The town will have to withdraw the two approved SHIP grant applications, and submit a new one for the consolidated project. There is no guarantee that we would get 2021 funding.

Briefly, referencing to the handouts, the five options being evaluated are:

- (BB) Each Alternative provides the Boat Launch and deep-water docking facilities and all but PLAN C & D include improvements to the Truck Turnaround for off causeway parking and Causeway Head improvements to complement the Town Landing.
- **Plan A - ORIGINAL CONFIGURATION** - Combines the 2020 Town Dock design and the 2011 preliminary Boat Launch design. The projected costs are significantly over the target budget of \$620,000 for the project.
- **Plan B - REDUCED (SKEWED) LANDING** – A modified version of the Town Dock design together with the 2011 preliminary Boat Launch design. This achieves a cost reduction of approximately \$120,000 but remains significantly higher than the \$620,000 target. No attempt has yet been made to reduce or eliminate **Optional Elements** to achieve cost reduction.
- **Plan C - EXTENDED DEEP WATER FLOATS FROM LAUNCH RAMP FLOATS** – Eliminates the gangway float system that is separate from the Boat Launch. Instead deep-water floats are connected by an extension from the Boat Launch floats perpendicular to the launch ramp floats axis. To close in on the target budget of \$620,000, no **Optional Elements** are provided except for ADA parking on the causeway.
- **Plan D - EXTENDED DEEP WATER FLOATS FROM LAUNCH RAMP FLOATS** – Also eliminates the gangway float system separate from the Boat Launch. It retains the Plan C perpendicular deep water float at the end of the launch ramp floats, and adds three more deep water floats extending along the same axis as the launch ramp floats.
- **Hybrid Plan B-D** – Includes the Boat Launch design and either the stub pier or the extended floats, whichever is achievable based on the bids amounts received and our available matching funds.

Questions and comments:

- The genesis of this project was in the 2008 MF Master Plan. Then came design studies for a Boat Launch Facility and a Replacement Pier Structure so here we are today.
- Are we guaranteed to get the state money? The state is very interested in this project since it adds new public access rather than improvements to existing access. If they accept the application then we would get the funds. The funds that the state has committed to our two projects would be there for our consolidated project.
- This is state money from our annual state bond approvals. The state is unsure when we would get back in the funding queue, 2021 or 2022.
- Can we break it up and use local contractors? This is a state project so they have standards for pay scale, material standards, construction standards, approved contractors, bonding requirements, and other criteria. This screens out fly-by-night bidders. The prime contractor is responsible for compliance. Local contractors would be encouraged to submit sub-contact bids. Anything we do outside of the contract would be paid for by the town, 100% of the cost instead of 50%.
- Concern about having enough money for the project. The \$310,000 available doesn't get us to the \$340,000 maximum possible for the combined project. Does that mean we have to delay and wait another year to submit? There is a possibility that another \$35,000 could be added to the MF CRA at town meeting under a separate warrant article on

disposition of the Cell Tower revenue. When the state gets ready to execute the project is when we need to have our matching funds so we have some time to get to town meeting.

- In the cost estimates, LOW is based on our low bid for the town dock. AVERAGE is based on recent Maine DOT project bid costs. Each plan has the CORE Elements – Boat Ramp, causeway improvements, Design, permitting, and 10% contingency. Then we have ALTERNATE Elements are optional depending on the bid amounts received. We are in a tough project estimating environment versus what bids are actually coming in at.
- Why the boat launch here? We have other boat landings but not all are suitable for trailer launches. Many are not all-tide, and don't have very much parking or cannot accommodate trailer parking. An early survey of the two commercial launch sites, Dolphin and Great Island, indicated that they are full with their seasonal customers, and have raised daily use prices to discourage same. They endorsed one at Mitchell Field.
- What population will we serve? State money acceptance means it's open to everyone. We can charge a fee, but non-residents can only be charge 5x's what we charge residents.
- Boat Launch Floats are 6' wide. Are they stable enough? Should we consider 8' floats. Mere Point can be less stable in some weather. (BB) There is no standard. We did add some large floats (Option C & D) at the end of the BL floats to help stabilize them. In options A & B, the town dock installation would help shield them. Also, Mere Point floats are completely exposed. The MF BL floats are protected on the south side by the causeway. Prevailing winds for the time it would be used are from the south so that should help keep them stable.
- Budget concern. (DC) we have \$260,000 in the MF CRA. Optimistic about the town meeting vote for the \$50,000, and for the additional \$35,000. So, we have two options that fall within the available funding.
- Regarding fees, have we thought about doing that? Yes, but it means having hiring someone there to collect fees and manage the site so discussions ended there.
- Question about value of stub pier? (BB) Some towns have a town dock, some do not. You can do it by extending large floats (10' x 20') from the BL floats. A stub pier, options A & B, allow for a separate gangway to a large float town dock which is better suited for ADA access, and it would allow larger vessels to dock. If you just want to serve a mooring field and launch boats then floats from the BL floats would work. Options C & D are very expensive based on our available funds and doesn't get us to trailer parking.
- Stub pier prepositions us for future development and it gets us to a consolidated project. Just a boat launch project limits us to \$250,000 in matching funds which we already know won't be enough. There are two different locations in A & B. Option A – it is located on the south edge of the abutment for a gangway straight off the end of the causeway. Option B – it is located at the north end of the abutment and canted to the northwest. This would allow a shorter gangway to access the large floats in this design.
- State doesn't pay 50% of the total project cost. They reimburses 50% of our expenditures up to their maximum, normally \$250,000 but \$340,000 if we do a consolidated project.
- Polled members: (Bob – A/D), (Mose – Hybrid), (Don – D), (Sharon – Hybrid), (Katherine – Hybrid), (Dave Z. – D), (Lee – Hybrid) (Spike – D)
- Some concern about building a stub pier now. There are two different stub pier locations in options A and B, building it now commits us to that configuration. If conditions or requirements change in the future relocating it requires additional expense.
- Option D is too expensive. One correction – it is floats and moorings, not piles. There was also an extra charge for connector floats that are not in this option. The floats are

required. So, you will still not have enough money to execute this option.

- If we vote for the hybrid, we have to make a stub pier location decision right now. The stub pier location oriented to the NW would limit vessels using the future town dock and it's right next to the Bl. There may be congestion with launch & recovery operations. The W orientation is more expensive but allows for larger vessels and lessens potential congestion with Boat Ramp operations. (BB) Prevailing SW winds make the separation more protective for the boat launch floats.
- Repolled members: (Lee – NW Stub) (Dave Z – Hybrid, W Stub) (Katherine – Hybrid) (Sharon – W stub) (Don – Hybrid, W stub) (Mose – W stub) (Bob – Hybrid, W stub) (Spike – Hybrid, W stub)
- Public Comment – (GV) Not sure what the selected option look like, but if it has large floats connecting beyond the narrow boat launch floats, have safety concerns with the dual use of the narrow floats. That is, people getting out to the town dock floats while people are launching and recovering boats, and ADA access.
- Barney will draft the hybrid designs with the stub pier on the south end of the abutment for a future town dock as designed in option A with cost estimates for the two cost options – Stub pier and extension floats.