



**Provincetown Public Pier Corporation (PPPC)  
Harbormaster's Office  
Work Session Minutes of Monday, November 19, 2012**

**Members present:** Lee Ash, Rich Wood and Carlos Verde.

**Members via telephone:** Ginny Binder (left meeting at 6:00 P.M.) and Scott Fraser.

**Other Attendees:** Rex McKinsey (Harbormaster) and Ellen C. Battaglini (Recording Secretary).

Chair Lee Ash called the Work Session to order at 5:00 P.M.

## ***AGENDA***

### ***Discussion***

#### **Report to Board of Selectmen:**

Lee stated that PPPC report was presented to the BOS and she is waiting to hear if anyone on the BOS has questions. Has not heard from Sharon Lynn or BOS yet. Discussion with BOS on agenda for next Monday. PPPC is suggesting that Marine Patrol Officer pilot project be continued but with various improvements.

GB: To optimize productivity, Board should insure that PPPC directs presentation of its opinion of how the MPO program went and this work session should be about reaching a consensus about which elements of the program did or did not work or need to be dropped from the 2013 program, or at least further codified or amended so they can be tested in a more effective way.

SF: Thought what worked well was the presence of a uniformed police officer on Pier. It managed relationship with problem tenants and Pier had better traffic control. Finds nothing wrong with seeing an officer when tourists get off ferry. Not sure whether public order/safety were enhanced. Presence of MPO on Pier was of greatest benefit. That should continue. Issues arose when there was an attempt to turn police officers into mariners. Training programs were focused on non-police elements, more about harbormaster elements. And there was difficulty with training manual. Culture clashes arose when getting into issues of who was to do what. Biggest contingency is defining clear lines of authority and responsibility for functions re the conduct of affairs in the Harbor. MPOs were reporting to Harbormaster in all areas and functions other than law enforcement area and that was a source of conflict.

RW: Board seems to agree re continuation of MPO program, whether pilot or not. And all agreed that contingencies were needed. Wants to communicate those contingencies to

BOS, including communications re equipment and staffing, scheduling re shoulder season and closing the shift-change gap and the clarification of duties/authority and thorough training. MPOs should have duties on the Harbor and in the boat, not just on Pier, which was an asset. Recent events have brought that issue to the fore.

CV: Believes MPO program should continue with officers on Pier and on the water. Agrees with Rich's points. Most complaints were that MPOs were on Pier, not on the water. Didn't see an issue with MPOs on water.

GB: Thinks most acceptable aspects of MPOs are in the areas of law enforcement and traffic control. Those were a success, but communication in terms of the law enforcement issue could be improved upon. Areas of disagreement can be opportunities to optimize the benefits of what the Board sought to do when the program was created. Disagrees with Carlos and Rich in thinking that there is a role for MPOs on water. A clear division of labor between on-the-water and off-the-water needed. Insofar as Board wants to continue the pilot program, the physical presence of the police on the Pier in terms of law enforcement and traffic control needs to be tweaked and refined. Must be mindful of issues that were raised around MPOs on water. Ample time to minimize personnel, communications and scheduling conflicts and can report to BOS that those are issues need to be improved before next summer.

LA: Haven't spoken about budgeting. Don't know what the Police Dept. spent on the program. Thinks including clarification of the budget is important and full cost of the program is needed. There were a lot of scheduling issues with the program.

GB: Is it worth it to demonstrate to BOS of value/savings re budget as a result of having MPO program?

LA: Doesn't know. When asked about budget issues she doesn't have all the information.

GB: Could Board work cooperatively with the PPD to pinpoint over-runs and under-runs?

LA: Not possible before the BOS meeting. But we can only know our budget numbers.

SF: As Directors, Board should not be concerned about Town or PPD budget or burden on taxpayers, but only impact on PPPC. Not obligation of Board to justify to public re total impact of program. Can say that PPPC saved money (about \$20,000 based on Rich's research). PPD can answer questions about their budget. Question to ask is did PPPC get \$20,000 worth of value out of the program and will PPPC get \$20,000 value out of program next year?

RW: Money saved translated into more maintenance tasks completed. Should look at that this winter and how to look at cost benefit of program.

CV: Wants to spend the \$20,000 saved on maintenance. Looking to put money back into Pier. MPO program was to address law enforcement issues and free up cash for maintenance. MPOs are just another tool on Pier or on water.

LA: Could do a better job on budgeting next year.

RW: Believes MPO program brought benefits to Harbor.

SF: Elaborate. What was the value of having MPOs do what AHMs did last year?

RW: Thinks MPOs were responsible for going out on boat, doing patrols, assisting mariners, doing enforcement on Harbor and doing pump-outs.

CV: The value gotten was mapping of the mooring field, which raised attention and concerns of citizens.

RM: MPOs doing what AHMs did re traffic control. Not sure whether there was additional value in that aspect. Detective Scott Chovanec felt he didn't have enough time out on water to do boardings and safety checks. Commercial tenants already regulated enough. Boarding recreational boats may not be a good idea. Detective Chovanec doesn't believe MPOs should be doing pump-outs. Mooring field issue is not understood. All data is on HM office computer. Some discrepancies are present as some mooring holders give up moorings every year. Out of nine arrests reported over summer, only five happened on Pier. Detective Chovanec's report to BOS makes it sound like MPOs did more on Pier than what they did.

SF: Is there an advantage to doing safety checks or is it just negative public relations for Harbor? Will change the character of the Harbor, which doesn't need to be changed. Thinks MPOs should be doing pump-outs because they are working in the HM office and that is a duty of HM staff.

LA: Her understanding was that there were AHM duties to be assigned to MPOs and when out on water, mooring enforcement would be done. Mooring field issue started at Town Meeting when a question was asked about mooring money that is collected for Town. People were confused and concerned about issue and that Town could be missing out on revenue. Mooring field now under scrutiny. Thought MPOs would improve mooring enforcement, but didn't realize mooring mapping was going to occur and it ended up skewing the MPO program. Tries to separate MPO program and mooring mapping issue when asked about moorings.

GB: Wants to address effectiveness re MPO program, specifically understanding how and where Rex felt program was effective. And need to flag where there was overlap or ineffectiveness. The mooring field issue is more of an MIS issue than an enforcement issue. Wants to speak to the issues of whether the MPO program accelerated our effectiveness with the mooring field or not, and where the MPO program was effective

and how the value created was directly applied to other things that Pier needed to get done.

RM: Agreed with Lee about mooring project skewing MPO program. Thinks the intent of mapping of mooring field was a ruse to find something to make him look incompetent and that is why there was no effort to question employees in the HM office, such as Rex or Ellen, or others in the Harbor as to how things were already set up. Thinks that is why a detective was assigned to HM office as opposed to community officer.

RW: Relationship between HM and Chief is so negative that he questions whether HM and PPD can effectively have MPO program proceed, despite talking about it all winter. Need to address that.

LA: Directors are responsible for deciding to continue pilot programs. MPOs are professional and have to be cooperative and carry out program. This is a cooperative effort between PPPC and PPD.

SF: Board has spent a lot of time on MPO program. How much more time will be spent to work out issues with Chief? Try to figure out what PPPC was trying to accomplish with MPO program and if there is another way to achieve same goals.

LA: Important to reiterate that PPPC wants the program to go forward and what the areas for improvement are and that is the purpose of the BOS meeting. Should go with a united front to go ahead with the program and do the best to work out issues. Board seems to agree on major problems.

SF: Doesn't think the goodwill on part of PPD is there to work out issues of concern or to make any compromises, especially on shift change coverage gap and pump-outs.

RW: Thinks scheduling gap can be solved. Pump-outs should be part of MPO's job and Board should argue strongly with Chief about requiring that.

SF: Mooring issue is a big deal because it was something of high public visibility under the purview of the HM that was done without the HM being responsible for it. Proves that PPD is not in a partnership with HM office. The Town Manager did not ask the HM to look into the mooring field, but the PPD was brought in to fix a 'problem'. She should have gone through the Board to address the issue.

LA: Can Board agree that it will go before the BOS and, pursuant to the vote taken in the past in favor of the program, do its best to answer the questions of the BOS in an honest and positive way, particularly when it comes to the areas of concern? Would like to summarize what Board discussed tonight and state the areas that need improvement. And to emphasize that the partnership should be a joint venture and, as long as both sides have the same understanding and improvements can be made, the Board expects a much better second year.

SF: Agrees with Lee's sentiment. Based on what he said at the last meeting, questions will be asked of him, which he will answer honestly, but not necessarily positively. He is willing to not attend the BOS meeting.

LA: Asking people to get on board with the agenda.

SF: Doesn't know if he can get on board before Monday. Anticipating getting questions about his letter containing his belief that the program should not go forward.

RW: Board did take a vote and he should attend the meeting and answer questions honestly.

SF: Supports the ends the Board is seeking, but not the means. Doesn't want to embarrass the Board.

CV: Should attend and speak honestly.

SF: Lee wants unification of view in front of the BOS and he cannot agree to that right now. Reminded the Board to vote to institute policies related to Accounts Receivable.

Board will discuss that issue at the next meeting on December 13, 2012.

Motion to adjourn @ 6:30 P.M.

**Motion:** Rich Wood                      **2<sup>nd</sup>:** Carlos Verde

**Vote:**

**Yes:** 3                                      **No:** 0

***Motion Passes.***

Respectfully submitted,  
Ellen C. Battaglini  
PPPC Administrative Assistant

---

Lee Ash, Chair