

**PEASE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
PORT COMMITTING MEETING
MINUTES**

Monday, July 15, 2024

Presiding: Neil Levesque, Chairman
Present: Steve Fournier and Ex Officio Member Brad Cook, Chairman of the Port Advisory Council
Absent: Karen Conard
Attending: Paul E. Brean, Pease Development Authority (“PDA”) Executive Director; Anthony I Blenkinsop, Deputy Director and General Counsel; Myles Greenway, Interim Director Division of Ports and Harbors; Greg Siegenthaler, IT Director; Raeline A. O’Neil, Executive Administrative Assistant; PDA staff members; and members of the public.

I. Call to Order

Chairman Levesque called the meeting to order at **9:50 a.m.** in the Board conference room on the Pease International Tradeport at 55 International Drive, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

II. Presentation – Portsmouth Fish Pier:

i. Appledore Marine Engineering/Oak Point Associates presentation of schematics for building replacement

Myles Greenway (“Greenway”), Interim Director of Ports and Harbors, handed out two packets of information for discussion and consideration; introduced Noah Elwood (“Elwood”), of Appledore Marine Engineering (“AME”) and Steve Sargent (“Sargent”) from Oak Point (“OP”) speaking to two potential building replacement concepts.

Sargent spoke of existing considerations / challenges at the site, the current building and the modifications to the initial concept determined to be too expensive in relation to available funding. Therefore, two new concepts show a reduction to the size of the building (stick built and metal prefab). Focus of the building is the fishermen needs, resulting in a reduction to the overall size and contents of the facility to include bait storage, ice and market; identifying 2,000 sq. ft.

Fournier asked for clarification of “market”; Sargent indicated it was storage for the fishermen’s goods coming off the boats. Greenway stated this was the difference between fish going to market to be sold for human consumption versus fish that is being stored for bait for lobstering. Brean clarified that there is no “market”, rather the term is utilized to segregate bait from consumption. Sargent indicated it is a short-term cold storage space.

Sargent spoke to Concept A (stick built) and utilizing the current foundation of the building. Through a geotechnical study, it has been determined that the current 1978 foundation is viable from a load standpoint. The floor plan presented depicts a utility room, ice cooler, fish cooler, bait storage, (all with separate access) a center common area and large access doors on both sides of the building.

Elwood spoke to a major change to the building, the elimination of the Port office, as a cost savings.

Sargent indicated the building has been simplified to meet needs; keeping in mind the groups utilizing the premises and the current architecture onsite and with the deed requirements. Further, he spoke to maintaining the location of the current utilities as they are within an insulated space, being a cost

savings. It is estimated that the cost for the shell of the Concept to be approximately \$800,000, with additional options bringing the total concept to \$1.4 million.

Sargent spoke to Concept B (pre-engineered metal building). Due to the load of the building the current foundation would not be able to be utilized; try to keep the location in the area of the 1978 footprint area. It is necessary to understand there are various utilities, within the current building, for various equipment / functions / operations (tanks for gas / diesel; cranes etc.) at the pier. Concept B requires a different foundation, Concept A does not; it is necessary for considerations to be made of these additional utilities / operations and disruption thereof which adds to the cost of utility work. The building interior mimics the same as Concept A as well as the overhead garage doors on either side of the building for access.

Sargent indicated the estimate for a shell of Concept B would be approximately an additional \$60,000 over that of Concept A due to the removal and installation of foundation, moving of utilities and construction costs.

Levesque inquired of other steel structures around and how it would stand up to the weather / proximity to salt air (rotting being a concern). Elwood indicated there would need to be additional treatments of the structure being exposed to the salt air. Elwood spoke again to deed restrictions with respect to the premises and considerations that need to be made so it fits within the environment (i.e., Prescott Park) and indicated a steel building may be an issue.

Brean asked if there was an advantage of one building over the other (stick built versus metal); Sargent spoke to the utilization of the current foundation, insulated utility area, insulation of the building, the building interior being similar and the need to control temperature within the building utilizing two different framework.

Levesque stated the 1978 portion of the foundation as useable but the remaining portion is questionable. Sargent pointed out the area of the useable foundation and further spoke to the slab as being “refrigerated slab” referring to it being rigid and porous with a 4” to 6” concrete slab on top. Spoke to the strategy considered for the flooring and to insulate the areas which would be needed.

Fournier spoke to deed restriction reference regarding the metal building; Elwood indicated the language contained within the deed is not specific, may prohibit a steel structure as the structure needs to fit within the confine of the environment. Anthony I. Blenkinsop (“Blenkinsop”), Deputy Director / General Counsel, referenced the deed restriction, “... all buildings... shall be compatible with the historic ... atmosphere part of this section of the City of Portsmouth”.

Elwood spoke to additional cost savings by keeping the foundation with small modifications due to building removal; pave over foundation with the need for sloping for drainage; and removal of the foundation, but leaving the area as gravel, not pavement.

Fournier inquired to the construction climate for the project. Elwood stated a timeline has been provided and it would depend on how many, if any, bids are received. Sargent stated current market is busy but due to the timing there may be entities looking for projects later this fall and winter.

Brean asked due to the overage, would there be support / guidance for demolition and preserve the highest priority as timing could be a challenge. Levesque spoke to moving ahead and discussing next steps once bids are received based on timing and constraints of funding.

Fournier spoke to concerns of funding and to work toward something so funding isn't lost so the fishermen have a facility.

ii. Proposed Schedule, up to and including contract award

Elwood spoke to a tight, but workable schedule; indicated setting up a bid contract to include options.

Sargent spoke to the expense alone regarding utilities (i.e., security, fuel etc.) at the pier that require consideration. There is a need for careful consideration of the needs and wants which also include efficiency and savings of the project.

Elwood spoke of cost savings for the project and if there may be other areas which could provide funding for different aspects of the project.

Sargent spoke to the need for permitting of the project; may be able to have an expedited review, otherwise it could extend the timeline.

III. New Business:

Councilor Stevens spoke to recent approvals through the State's Executive Council for the dredging component of the Feasibility Study. Further she spoke about the effects of inflationary increases and effects to budgeted projects (i.e., Hampton / Seabrook Bridge project - 40% over budget).

Stevens provided information on permitting and the potential for supplemental funding, she suggested the following:

1. Reach out to Commissioner Scott should there be any DES permitting issues.
2. Katie Easterly Markey is the Director of Community Development and Finance Authority, and she can be reached at (603) 717-9118 and keasterly@nhcdfa.org.
3. Regarding utilities, suggested reaching out to the Commissioner of the Department of Energy, Jared Chicoine, (603-271-6505) to look into funding.
4. Regarding demolition, suggested looking at Invest New Hampshire through its program and speaking with Taylor Caswell to see if there is any funding available.
5. December 31, 2024, requirement for the obligation of funds.

Levesque thanked Stevens for attending the meeting and for her support and suggestions regarding the project.

IV. Old Business:

None.

V. Public Comments:

Dana Frampton – Spoke to the replacement of the building for the safety of the State employees and those who utilize the facility (bait cooler, ice storage and a utility room for the fuel systems). Spoke of possible revenue streams (i.e., commercial discount on fuel; self-funding ice machine for all to use; refigure parking lot to allow charters to be utilized from the facility) the fishermen just want to be able to access boats. Inquired into the longevity of a stick built building versus a metal building and its maintenance; Elwood indicated both buildings have similar longevity (30 years). Doesn't want to take

anything away from the contents, but if need to look at cuts what is needed is bait storage and utility room; could reduce size of fish cooler if it is needed or do away with ice cooler. Feels the best time for the project would be from November to April.

Erik Anderson – spoke to the Pier being an important component to the community and the industry. The current concepts bring the project closer to funding but expressed the need for a cooler for fish and bait. With industry shifts, catches could increase requiring a need for the cooler space. Inquired into the funding obligation deadline; funding shortfall and spending requirements.

Levesque responded looking at all the possibilities for additional funding sources, the obligation deadline would be the end of the year (2024); and expenditure of funds by 2026.

Stevens asked who the best person would be to speak with regarding the project so that the Director of the Department of Energy could reach out to see whether there would be any federal / state funding available; Brean indicated he would be the point of contact.

Levesque asked the Committee if the members had a consensus on moving forward with Project A (wood / stick-built building). Fournier affirmed.

VI. Press Questions:

None.

VII. Adjournment:

Director Levesque **moved** the **motion** and Director Fournier **seconded** to **adjourn the Board meeting.**

Discussion: None. Disposition: Resolved by unanimous vote for; motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at **10:49** a.m.

VIII. Press Questions

No members of the press attended the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul E. Brean
Executive Director