



**CITY OF GLOUCESTER**  
**HARBOR PLAN PUBLIC MEETING #3**  
**September 7, 2022**  
**6:00 P.M.**  
**Remote Meeting**

**MINUTES**

**Present Harbor Plan Committee Members:** Richard Noonan (Chair), John McCarthy, Tessa Brown, Al Cottone, Vito Giacalone, Tony Gross, Katie Kahl, Tom Balf

**Absent HPC Members:** none

**City of Gloucester:** Mayor Greg Verga, Gregg Cademartori, Gemma Wilkens, Jill Cahill

**Consultant Team:** Matthew Littell - Utile, Taskina Tareen - Utile, Zoë Mueller - Utile, Jason Hellendrung - Tetra Tech, Nasser Brahim - Woods Hole Group, Jamie Fay - Fort Point Associates

**Attendees:** Andree Robert, Ann Molloy, Beverly Palmacci, Clyde Gillard, Courtney Cole, David Fields, Deborah Eliason, Duncan Hollomon, Eileen Mueller, Ellen Leaman, J Burns, Jack Clarke, Joanna Yelen, Joe Rosa, John Cole, Karen Ristuben, Kathryn Glenn, Ken Riaf, Linda Brayton, Lisa Smith, Maggie Rosa, Marcia Hart, Meg Montagnino-Jarrett, Noel Mann, Olimpia Palazzola, Olivia Perez-O'Dess, Pamela Steele, Peggy Dillon, Peggy Matlow, Peter Parsons, Rebecca Reynolds, Richard Hersey, Robert Myers, Robert Russell, Rona Tyndall, Ruth Pino, Samuel Haines, Stephen Sacca, Susanne Altenburger, Tom Burger, Tracy O'Neil, Tucker Smith, Valerie Gilman, Valerie Nelson, Vince Mortillaro

**I. BUSINESS**

- A. Welcome from City
- B. Consultant Presentation
  - a. Part I: Harbor-Wide Process, Goals, and Strategies
    - i. Where we are in the process
    - ii. Harbor Plan Purpose & Approach Recap
    - iii. Draft Goals & Recommendations
    - iv. Quick Poll + Q&A
  - b. Part II: Site-Specific Goals and Strategies
    - i. Publicly Owned Sites
    - ii. I4C2
      - 1. Existing Conditions
      - 2. Site Constraints and Considerations
      - 3. Past Proposals
    - iii. Quick Poll + Q&A
- C. Next Steps

**II. WELCOME**

Zoë Mueller of Utile welcomed participants, City staff, Harbor Plan Committee members, and attendees and presented the agenda for the evening.

**III. CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: Part I: Harbor-Wide Process, Goals, and Strategies**

**1. Where we are in the process**

Utile presented the timeline for the MHP process, and shared information about upcoming public meetings.

**2. Harbor Plan Purpose & Approach Recap**

Utile gave an overview of the goals and objectives of the MHP Process and provided information about the larger process and framework of the MHP process and economic development goals.

**3. Draft Goals & Recommendations**

Utile presented two major goals for the Gloucester Harbor developed throughout the Municipal Harbor Planning process:

- a. Core Goal: Strengthen and supporting Gloucester’s traditional industries by supporting fishing capacity and competitiveness
- b. Supporting Goal: Diversify and invest in Gloucester’s harbor holistically to create a stronger and more resilient harbor economically and environmentally by:
  - i. advancing relevant blue tech opportunities
  - ii. pursuing supportive regulations
  - iii. building organizational capacity

Mayor Verga thanked the attendees and emphasized the importance of the I4C2 parcel in this discussion.

**4. Live Polling**

Utile conducted polls to get feedback on the draft Harbor Plan goals and strategies presented:

Do you agree that the Harbor Plan's core goal should be to "strengthen and support Gloucester’s traditional industries by supporting fishing capacity and competitiveness"?	# of Votes	% of Votes
<i>34 poll participants</i>		
Yes	25	74%
Yes, but I would word it differently (please share in chat)	8	24%
No (please share in chat)	1	3%

Do you agree that the Harbor Plan's supporting goal should be to "diversify and invest in Gloucester’s harbor holistically to create a stronger and more resilient harbor economically and environmentally"?	# of Votes	% of Votes
<i>34 poll participants</i>		
Yes	22	65%
Yes, but I would word it differently (please share in chat)	8	24%
No (please share in chat)	4	12%

Of the following strategies, what are the top three that are most important to you?	# of Votes	% of Votes

<b>38 poll participants</b>		
A. Leverage and increase commercial fishing and seafood processing activity	16	14%
B. Support more vessel activity by retaining/expanding dockage/berthing space to match catch types	14	12%
C. Support more vessel activity by providing more dockage and berthing space	7	6%
D. Adapt infrastructure to meet the needs and evolving nature of catch and flood risk;	25	22%
E. Strengthen tourism by highlighting fishing heritage and industry	10	9%
F. Advance relevant innovation in blue tech and wind industries within and beyond working harbor	15	13%
G. Clarify regulations and priorities for WDUZ, supporting use and flood resilience to facilitate redevelopment of underutilized harbor property	11	10%
H. Identify point entity to lead, monitor, and implement vision of working waterfront development	12	11%
Other	4	4%

**5. Public Comment (in meeting chat)**

- a. In response to polling on goals:
  - i. Duncan Holloman: I assume that’s not the ONLY goal.
  - ii. Clyde Gillard: To your poll questions both are too general / non specific to agree with 100%. Especially goal #2 - what is economic development really mean? How / where does quality of life / environment fit into the plan? The broad goals seem 'fine' give limited background.
  - iii. Rona Tyndall: The second question is a bit unclear, in that it doesn't specify what sort of diversity those of us polled would support. Hence, my “no”. I am not in favor of tourism based industries or dwellings having priority over the waterfront.
  - iv. Pamela Steele: you need to spell out exactly what you mean in these 2 questions. Too vague to vote on! this is not clear to the average citizen you need to make a list and share it (regarding two core goals)
  - v. Robert Myers: ‘Traditional’ should be a core goal not the core goal. It should share focus with offshore wind
  - vi. Ann Molloy: No windmills on ocean!
- b. In response to polling on strategies:
  - i. Courtney Cole: training the next generation of fishermen
  - ii. Robert Myers: Offshore wind support role of Salem for SE MA wind then take lead for Gulf of Maine floating offshore wind towers it latter half of this decade
  - iii. Deborah Eliason: Consider supporting uses that financially support the industry and infrastructure development and improvements

- iv. Clyde Gillard: plan, build supporting infrastructure to expand without hurting quality of life and living in Gloucester
- v. Robert Myers: Need more emphasis on training people in offshore wind and hydrogen tech using Port as a hands on facility
- vi. Lisa Smith: There isn't anything in the plan about the quality of life for people living near the harbor.

## 6. Public Comment (spoken live)

- a. Susanne Altenburger: Gloucester has been able to manage its harbor for 400 years. Federal regulations have failed Gloucester's harbor by curtailing innovation. We need young people who know how to build boats. It's odd that none of this has been discussed. The stagnation of the fishing fleet is the core problem of this port. We should have an ocean-centric boat-building industry.
  - i. Ann Molloy: Agree with Suzanna
- b. Lisa Smith: There isn't anything in the plan about quality of life for those who live near the harbor. That's something that's missing.
- c. Valerie Nelson: I appreciate the attention given to climate change and priorities around the fishing industry. I wanted to point out a particular phrase around a goal of maximizing investment in underutilized properties. Existing flood maps are probably way out of date, natural disasters are going to get worse. There's a movement thinking that only activities which have a natural connection to the waterfront should be placed in high risk areas. We keep overinvesting in properties and real estate in coastal zones at high risk of flooding. A goal should not be to view this very vulnerable area as a place to increase private investment and shore up property values. We should not be investing in properties that are going to be destroyed. Only invest in those with a direct connection to the marine industry and are cheaper to maintain. I would question whether a goal of this plan should be to maximize more dollars being invested in non-marine industrial uses. We should be investing in the economy of the working waterfront but not make regulatory flexibility to increase real estate investment in these high risk areas. We should not have a goal to invest in more real estate development in this working waterfront. We should maintain permitting for waterfront industrial uses.
  - i. Planning Team Response: With a working waterfront, there's definitely a need to balance active uses along the waterfront. The intent of that goal is to increase investment in marine industrial uses.
  - ii. Ann Molloy (via meeting chat): Agree with Valerie
- d. Robert Russell: We need to construct our plan with the ability to transition. The traditional fishing industry is a major economic part of Gloucester (and more than that). Offshore wind seems to be promising as well. Some believe it will happen sooner and some believe it will never happen. We should keep our ear to the ground with new developments. There could be major economic benefits available to the Port of Gloucester. If we are too strongly committed to only traditional fishing that we want to continue, we may not be able to adapt to new technological and economic changes in the next decade. We don't want a bunch of stranded assets.
  - i. Planning Team Response: We can incorporate that into our supporting goals.
- e. Vince Mortillaro: There's been discussion about forming an agency for port economic development. Will there be participation from waterfront property owners? Would we get an advance draft?
  - i. Planning Team Response: As part of this process, we won't be forming that entity. We will be suggesting ideas for what that entity should concern itself with and giving examples of other similar agencies. However, this agency would not be created as a direct result of this process. There would be ample opportunity to engage with business owners.
  - ii. Vince: I don't believe we will be informed.

- iii. Planning Team Response: We can take that back to the city and hopefully implement a process that includes everyone.
- iv. Ann Molloy (via meeting chat): Agree with Vince.
- f. Ken Riaf: In our regulatory system, the overriding doctrine is that if it's not prohibited, it's allowed. The committee needs to understand that. Non-water dependent uses should be prohibited from the DPA completely. It only makes sense. If you don't come to that conclusion, you will be allowing things to take place there that could be located elsewhere. The goal should be to protect our ability to fish. I would disagree- this is not about the highest use determined by the market. If that were the case, we would be in trouble. People who acquired waterfront properties did so under the assumption that there would be a set of rules to alienate that property later.
  - i. Vince Mortillaro (via meeting chat): Full support for Ken Riaf's comments
  - ii. Ann Molloy (via meeting chat): Agree with Ken, agree with Vince also.
- g. Tracey O'Neil: I understand that if it's not prohibited, it's permitted. I would be happy to get names and addresses of owners on waterfront properties and give a list of names/phone numbers or email addresses so that they can stay well informed of the process. Perhaps a quarterly message that could be mailed with the tax bill.

**IV. CONSULTANT PRESENTATION: Part II: Site-Specific Goals and Strategies I4C2**

**1. Existing Conditions**

Matthew Littell of Utile presented an overview of the context and existing conditions of the I4C2 site.

- a. Economic development is a major aspect of this plan. Another important component is I4C2. This is important because it's the largest piece of land on the waterfront and it's also controlled by the city. While this is primarily a regulatory plan, this is an opportunity for the city to influence what happens with that major parcel.
- b. Matthew described the I4C2 site, including the various regulatory boundaries and use/operational restrictions that exist on the site. He also explained the rules for a supporting use within the DPA and the existing and projected flood risks for the site.

**2. Live Polling: Site Constraints and Considerations**

Utile polled meeting participants on their top goals for the development of the I4C2 parcel.

What criteria do you think are most important for development on I4C2? (pick your top 3) <i>38 poll participants</i>	# of Votes	% of Votes
Has positive financial impact to the City	10	9%
Maintains and improves access to commercial dockage	13	11%
Maintains viewshed to water	13	11%
Supports marine activity consistent with image/identity of Gloucester as a fishing port and working waterfront	21	18%
Is resilient to flooding and other climate change risks	26	23%
Public use and/or public access	13	11%
Supports tourism (summer and shoulder seasons)	4	3%

Strengthens connection of Rogers Street uses with downtown	7	6%
Provides public district parking	5	4%
Other	3	3%

What DPA-compliant uses would you most like to see on this site? (pick your top three) <i>36 poll participants</i>	# of Votes	% of Votes
Seafood Processing	6	6%
Fishing storage (for equipment etc.);	15	14%
Fishing loading/unloading;	18	17%
Shared parking for water-dependent uses	17	16%
Boat/ship repair;	7	6%
Boat/ship essential services (fueling, ice, etc.);	7	6%
Marine research and/or education	21	19%
Fishing dockage expansion	14	13%
Other	4	4%

What DPA supporting uses would you most like to see on this site (pick your top three) <i>37 poll participants</i>	# of Votes	% of Votes
Parking	18	22%
Community/visitor center	16	19%
Seafood retail and/or wholesale, public market	20	24%
Restaurant, food vendor, retail	4	5%
Commercial kitchen for community use	14	17%
Other	11	13%

### 3. Past Proposals

- a. Matthew presented the past design proposals for the I4C2 site. Some sites were short-listed because they met the regulatory requirements for the site. These past proposals balanced

existing water-dependent uses with additional supporting uses and opportunities for public access to the waterfront.

- b. Additional ideas that are more current include: a mixed use market, a commercial kitchen, educational space, an ocean innovation campus, and a cultural/civic center.

#### **4. Public Comment (via chat)**

- a. Ann Molloy: Look at red line for DPA. Goes across Roger St. to protect truck traffic to move fish.
- b. Robert Myers: Gloucester mariners need working areas rather than celebrations of our storied past
- c. Ken Riaf: These are not just commonwealth tidelands but commonwealth filled tidelands. Kindly review the case brought by citizens years ago. I4C2 is not doubly burdened but doubly protected.
- d. Responses to question of what criteria and uses should be prioritized on I4C2:
  - i. Robert Myers: I4C2 should be able to support offshore wind loading and unloading of components
  - ii. Ken Riaf: Does it advance commercial fishing activities?
  - iii. Tom Burger: I would support all. Very difficult to do most of these with sea level rise.
  - iv. Deborah Eliason: I don't think these are the best use for the site because those uses do not support the connection to downtown.
  - v. Tucker Smith: fishing education
  - vi. Susanne Altenburger: We will need to replace our 80s-era Fleet with 21st-century types, meaning we need to prototype, train and build that Fleet, mostly on the inner Harbor. Boat-Building on I4-C2 in full public view as both commercial, activity and tourism attraction - a commercial magnet.
  - vii. Duncan Hollomon: Traditional marine arts and boatbuilding
  - viii. Robert Myers: Hardened waterfront to support loading large objects for wind farms
  - ix. Vince Mortillaro: Food innovation center - food system collaborative; education and training community center
  - x. Tom Burger: #3 - Please include ideas in Pier 58 Gloucester in your list as it is a massive investment of non-profit dollars that will benefit the fish, education, arts and business communities in Gloucester.
  - xi. Ken Riaf: These activities would add to traffic congestion and can take place in other locations
  - xii. Tucker Smith: fishing education
  - xiii. Marcia Hart: Open public space that functions as buffer as well to protect Rogers St and existing businesses from flooding. To act as sponge

#### **5. Public Comment (spoken live)**

- a. Susanne Altenberger: The design competition was held in 2010. We produced many different proposals. The ocean innovation campus could benefit Gloucester in many ways - both educational and tourism. I4C2 is the only substantial city-owned property on the harbor. The city should focus on an ocean-centric vision of this site. The I4C2 property should support many different uses. This process ignores the state of the fleet and new fishing technologies.
- b. Tucker Smith: I propose a land-sea innovation district. This could train fishers, farmers, and chefs. I can provide more details. The plan is to construct a two-story building. The ground floor is an open pavilion which can allow storm surge to move in and out. The site will include public access, market space, test kitchen, etc. The primary goal is to provide needed space for future training.
  - i. Ann Molloy (via chat): Tucker's idea is on point!
  - ii. Ken Riaf (via chat): Product Placement?
  - iii. Tracy O'Neil (via chat): If possible, I would like to request the link from the farmer regarding a collaboration between the fishing industry and the farming industry. My email is [toneil@gloucester-ma.gov](mailto:toneil@gloucester-ma.gov).

- iv. Ellen Leaman (via chat): I thought that Tucker's presentation has merit.
  - v. Vince Mortillaro (via chat): Supporting the education and innovation collaborative provides the generational pipeline of qualified labor force. What would be more important than building the new generation of fishers & farmers?
- c. Valerie Nelson: These ideas are very creative. I wanted to remind people of previous presentations where it was explained that we are not investing properly. The point is not necessarily use, but that the key questions are the kinds of buildings. A structure here should be flexible in use and resilient to flooding impacts. I disagree that this has any possible goal for increasing tax revenue for the city. We have fed off maximum real estate development on the water's edge. We justify mansions on the coast because they bring in tax revenue. This isn't sustainable given sea level rise and flooding impacts. Putting more money into private investment in high risk zones isn't a good idea. It is not a responsible financial strategy for the city to seek tax revenues in vulnerable areas, which are short term considerations. Don't stop building entirely, but stop pursuing short-term tax gains.
- i. Ellen Leaman (via chat): Valerie always has some good thoughts especially about the tax base.
- d. Tom Burger: I am President of Pier 58, which is an idea for a civic and community center - a 100 million dollar investment that will benefit the fishing community and the larger regional community. This civic and community center would increase access for fishing uses and enable public access and enjoyment of the harbor at this site.
- i. Ann Molloy (via chat): Pier 58. Not even close to compliant. Pier 58 Lawyer.
  - ii. Duncan Hollomon (via chat): Would it be illegal, given the water-dependent use requirement?
- e. Debra: We need to remember that it needs to be economically viable. This site is unused for 60 years. If there were a water-dependent use that were economically viable, it would have been pursued in the past. This is a challenging site to develop. There's no information on what's underground. The bulkhead must be repaired and there's a high DFE. The city is already carrying a substantial debt for the acquisition of the property. If the city is unwilling to subsidize any future development, then we need a plan to allow private investment (if viable). Any RFP the city puts out should recognize the unique nature of I4C2 and consider potentially more flexible uses. Otherwise, we will never develop this site and we'll be back here discussing this site again in 10 years.

#### **IV. NEXT STEPS**

1. Zoë provided participants with next steps, including upcoming public and HPC meetings.
2. Gregg Cademartori thanked the participants and emphasized the need for common ground and consensus in any plans made for the I4C2 site.
3. This meeting included 8 harbor plan committee members, 4 additional City of Gloucester representatives, 6 consultant team members, 1 CZM representative, and 44 public attendees.