

MILFORD HARBOR MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
January 15, 2009

The Milford Harbor Management Commission held its regular meeting on Thursday, January 15, 2009 in the conference room at Milford Landing. Chairman Montano called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Commission Members Present

J. Beard
N. Bodick
R. Brennan
G. Montano
D. Newman
R. Post
A. Waterman
R. Winters

Not Present

R. Miller
R. Swift, Operations Director, Harbormaster
L. Bodick, Deputy Harbormaster
B. Bier, Alderman Liaison
N. Veccharelli, Alderman Liaison
R. Hatfield, Stratford Liaison

Consideration of Minutes

The minutes of the regular meeting of December 18, 2008 were presented. Mr. Post made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Waterman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments – None

Chairman's Report – None

Nominating Committee – Mr. Newman submitted the slate for officers for 2009 as follows: Gary Montano for Chairman, James Beard for Vice-chairman and Nancy Bodick for Secretary. Mr. Brennan made a motion to accept the candidates, Mr. Waterman seconded. No additional nominations were presented from the floor and no objections were raised. Motion carried unanimously.

Director's Report – None

Harbormaster's Report – None

Report of Standing Committees

Milford Landing – None

Finance - Fund balance as of 12/31/08 was \$288,057.07 in savings and \$211,031.72 in checking for a total of \$499,088.79. All bills are paid.

Harbor and Mooring – Mr. Beard inquired about how many moorings were unfilled. Ms. Tougas stated 37 are untaken at this time. There have been 5 solid applicants since the December meeting – just waiting on some paperwork. Ms. Bodick thought that we'd had a good return so far. She stated that her slip renewals are coming in very slowly. It's as if everyone is holding their breath waiting to see what happens with the economy, their jobs, etc. and not renewing right away. Mr. Beard wanted to know if advertising locally would help. Ms. Bodick thought that by advertising to a target audience, in Windcheck magazine, for several months was the best way to go. Mr. Waterman had heard an unconfirmed report that Spencer's marina was offering their slips at last year's rates if they were paid for by January 31, 2009. After that, the rates would go up.

Housatonic – Mr. John Lust representing Mr. Rene Leduc, property owner of #70 and #64 Riverside Drive presented a Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) draft application for building a new dock between the two properties, cleaning up of derelict structures presently on site and relocation of the timber bulkhead. The properties involved are adjacent to and north of Valley Yacht Club. The house on #70 will be a single-family residence, not a clubhouse for a marina. Mr. Leduc stated that the certificate of occupancy is in the mail and he plans on moving in soon. The dock would be shared by both properties and deeded that way in the City Clerk's office.

It was questioned how much water would be at the end of the 100' pier at low tide. There would be a 24' ramp at the end of the pier leading to a floating dock that would have 2 – 3 feet of water at low tide. Ms. Bodick questioned if the pier and retaining wall that are there are permitted. Mr. Lust responded that they are not now permitted; they were built before the permitting process. The proposal is to move the bulkhead landward 6', above the high tide mark, and get it permitted. Mr. Brennan wanted to know what type of wall it would be. It would be a timber wall 2 to 3 feet high consisting of 18 to 20 foot lengths. Mr. Winters wanted a clarification of the term "community dock". It means it will be shared by the two lots only and deeded that way.

It was questioned about removing the floating dock and ramp over the winter. The dock would not be removed because the DEP has discovered that it is hard to police the removal of docks such as this so it is not demanding it at this time. The project was presented to Mr. Carey at the state aquaculture office for growth of oyster seedlings and other aquatic life present at the site and he did not think it would be a big concern. As such he signed off on the project.

The dock would have power and water. #64 is a build-able lot – it is 50' x 100'. Several harbor commission members questioned Valley Yacht Club's opinion on the application. Would it impede navigation or encroach on them in any way. Mr. Lust replied that their nearest dock was 40' offset to Mr. Leduc's. Ms. Bodick observed that Mr. Leduc is not wharfing out further than the Valley Yacht Club and the new dock probably would not infringe. Also, that the DEP is strict on non-permitted structures and they would probably place more restrictions on the application than the harbor commission would.

Discussion ensued with pictures and descriptions of the project. The bound draft copy shows the proposed floating dock to be 8' x 20' and the unbound schematic pages should it to be 8' x 12½'. Harbor commission members wanted to know which was going to be submitted. They will submit the 8' x 12½' dock size. In preliminary discussions, the DEP asked the dock size be reduced to the 100 square foot residential guidelines that they prefer.

The DEP apparently changed their application process and would now would like applicants to submit drafts and forms to the parties involved to review the application before it is submitted with attendant paperwork attached. If any suggestions or changes are requested, they are to be made on the form for that purpose. Mr. Lust would like the form to be filled out and then submitted to the DEP as soon as possible.

Mr. Beard said that it is a lot of material to be thrown at the harbor commission with the unusual request to process it and vote on it in one meeting. He is a former member of Valley Yacht Club and familiar with the properties involved. There was a general lack of maintenance of the property and structures. Mr. Beard would welcome any improvement and cleaning up of the shoreline. He did not

seem to think that the Valley Yacht Club would be adversely impacted. Mr. Brennan stated that the form was for “dredging and filling” and was there to be any dredging and filling? Mr. Lust replied no there wouldn’t but that was the form that needed to be filled out in this instance. Mr. Lust stated that if there were any revisions to the application, the harbor commission would receive a current copy. Mr. Waterman said that it seemed to be a nice project but he felt an obligation to advise Valley Yacht Club that the harbor commission would probably approve it. Mr. Montano asked Mr. Post and Mr. Waterman to chair a committee to meet with the Valley Yacht Club commodore and run the proposal by them as well. Also, have them submit a letter on their letterhead with approval, suggestions, and their general thoughts on the matter. Mr. Waterman made a motion to contact the Valley Yacht Club before either reporting back or approving the project. Mr. Post seconded. The vote was unanimous with Mr. Montano abstaining for business reasons.

Amendments – Mr. Beard reported on the results of the Ordinance Committee and Board of Aldermen meetings on January 5, 2009. Alderman Veccharelli questioned Mr. Swift closely about parking spaces for the public without vessels to use at the launch ramp. In 2004, the police commissioners had awarded 8 spaces for this purpose unbeknownst to the Harbor Commission. In the amendments at this time, the harbor commission was trying to eliminate these. Objections were raised for elimination and who should have the authority to designate how many spaces and where they would be. After much debate, the ordinance amendments were passed with the provision that 3 spaces would be marked on the launch ramp and the Harbor Commission given the authority to designate where the spaces were located.

Mr. Beard recounted that awhile back as part of the Head of the Harbor Plan, public access was an issue. When the launch ramp was moved from next to the Coast Guard auxiliary building to across the harbor, a search for city owned parcels along the harbor was done. As part of the stipulation of the grant money received to help build the marina, charge was given to develop and place signage to indicate public access along the harbor on those city owned parcels. Neighboring property owners had encroached upon most of the parcels. The neighbors were afraid that excess public parking, partying, etc. would turn the spaces into a nightmare. The effort was curtailed. Since the Harbor Commission was very instrumental in creating a usable launch ramp, municipal marina and public access spots on the harbor, Mr. Beard was annoyed that now the aldermen seemed to be diluting the revenue capacity of the enterprise zone to maintain the launch ramp as a launch ramp.

Correspondence – None

Old Business – No meeting has been held regarding the Wepawaug Ponds dredging.

Mr. Rich Wincapaw came to the meeting to discuss the mooring float upgrade. He thought it would be advantageous to the commission to go forward with the project in one phase rather than two. The bid was for a total of \$172, 237. If the commission has him do the project all at once, he can do it for \$167,245 for an approximate savings of \$5,000. More importantly is the prudence of doing it all at once. The helix separation hasn’t damaged the inner webbing at this point but he doesn’t know what he will see the second year if the commission waits. The old seaflex would be moved from the weather end to the lee end but the bridles will still be an issue and were not discussed in the bid. Mr. Wincapaw offered to install all new bridles for 50% of the value that is in the maintenance bid for a savings of \$3,000. \$8,000 would be the total for all new bridles. Ms. Bodick questioned the bridle replacement cost and where that payment comes from should a bridle need to be replaced for wear and tear. Ms. Tougas replied that that came from a separate fund and was budgeted for each year. Ms. Bodick thought replacing the bridles at the same time was a good idea. Mr. Winters wanted to know if that was it. Would anything come up later that needed to be addressed at this time? Mr. Wincapaw said no. It was suggested that a maintenance schedule would not be a bad idea and things could be replaced on a regular basis and with a regular schedule. Mr. Beard wanted to know about electrolysis effect on the helix system. Mr. Wincapaw stated that there wasn’t any at this time. Mr. Brennan commented that there are zincs on the bulkhead at the Milford Yacht Club because the electrolysis is bad up there. It was asked whether Mr. Wincapaw would do the entire project and the bridles for \$170,000? Mr. Waterman wanted to know

which parts would not be new when all is said and done. The original helix, 1 1/8" shackle attached to helix, seaflex on lee end, some thimbles and 3/4" shackles at dock end. There would be no thimbles underwater. Some dock end thimbles were replaced about 1 1/2 years ago because of a bad original batch.

Ms. Bodick made a motion to proceed with the project all at once including the bridge replacement for \$170,000. Mr. Waterman seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business – The Housatonic dock application for #70 and #64 Riverside Drive was covered under the Housatonic sub-committee.

Liaisons

Stratford - no report

Aldermen – no report

P & Z - no report

Being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 8:16 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Tougas
Recording Secretary