

CITY OF PORTLAND
Department of Ports and Transportation

Date: 14 June 2007

To: Councilors Jim Cloutier, Jill Duson, and Kevin Donoghue

Cc: Joe Gray, Lee Urban, William Needleman, Alex Jagerman, Ellen Sanborn

Subj: CDC Presentation Questions

This is a written response question that was asked in regard to MSP marine operations at the CDC meeting and prior to the meeting by the Councilors. The question posed was:

1. Councilor Cloutier asked if either approach makes the burdens or logistics either unrealistic or expensive to the degree that is likely to inhibit pier use for marine purposes?

In reviewing the infrastructure as planned for both proposals, we noted three main potential failure points which relate to the upland support of the pier itself.

a. The first issue was vehicle volume. All vessels require shoreside support which generates a large amount of activity on and adjacent to the pier. This includes truck traffic, fueling and routine deliveries. The operations involve a wide range of vehicles that will need to have to access to the pier. Based on the plan submissions, this will occur not from the head of the pier as it's done now but from the west, or the Casco Bay Ferry side.

In addition to the support activities, there is significant demand for tour buses handling passengers going on regional and local tours. Our normal size vessel carries about 3,000 passengers and 1,500 crew. About 2% of the passengers stay on the ship. The rest come ashore by foot or go to buses for tours. We normally handle between 20 and 25 buses per ship. These buses are currently queued on site and away from the traffic flow on the Maine State Pier. Passengers debark from the ship and walk to waiting tour buses.

The industry standard for a walking path to the tour buses should be less than 600-700 feet. This is mainly dictated by the age and sometimes physical limitations of those most inclined to purchase tour packages. The proposals have passenger pickup for the buses either to the west of the rebuilt pier building or possibly in the relocated Customs inspection area east of the pier. If the buses are staged in the relocated Customs area, that distance is almost 1100 feet. If the passengers exit the pier to the west, Casco Bay Ferry side, there is an introduction of 20 plus buses into the traffic pattern of the MSP.

This is in addition to an average of 20 cabs, five vans, limos and other vehicles that stage for passenger services which would also need to occupy this area.

Finally, there is a requirement for unencumbered access for ambulances and other emergency vehicles, frequently needed for vessel calls. This is a function of the most direct access, including adequate pier apron width and easy egress for large vehicles.

The heavy volume of trucks, delivery vans, fuel tanker trucks, tour buses, cabs, passenger vans, limos and vehicles for meters and greeters has a significant impact on the traffic flow for Casco Bay Lines. In the early stages of the Ocean Gateway planning process, we explored two solutions. First was to eliminate the building and expand the traffic pattern. The second was to move the operations to the east at Pier 2. The best choice given these considerations and vessel size, was the latter.

It can be assumed that if there is no support activity associated with the ship and small passenger loads, then there is no problem. From our seven years of experience on site, that never happens.

b. The second problem is pedestrian flow. Right now we direct passengers off the terminal via the head of the pier. We absorb the security lines and "massing" by using the parking area on site, which is a restricted access area. This is eliminated in both plans and potentially this will drop large numbers of passengers awaiting screening into the public park area as presented in the submitted designs. All of the lines and massing for returning passengers and buses waiting to go through security could be concentrated into the proposed public space. If on the other hand, passengers are directed to enter from the west, this could actually create a better condition for passenger lines. Passengers could enter the queue anywhere deemed best in the building and directed down designated corridors to a centralized screening area. While a small queue would be adequate for average loads of passengers returning, it would have to be designed for peak periods when buses are returning from tours. This can exceed 1,000 passengers in the span of an hour. Similar to the issue at the airport, you might have a screening line back to Ri-Ras on Commercial Street.

c. The third issue is related to the security logistics associated with the pier itself, and relates to the ease of transition from public to restricted use. Thirty plus days per year you literally throw the public off a major portion of the pier, sterilize it to meet security needs and then reopen it. It could take a day just to get it ready, so that is potentially 60+ days of restricted public access. The cost to the operator can be significant and restricting access will eventually cause an adverse public response. I also believe that given the US Coast Guard's direction to us for 12 foot high fences, the proposed movable fences need to be clarified as to type, structure, height and acceptability to the Coast Guard.

2. There are several issues brought up by waterfront staff that are of significant consideration:

a. Neither of the plans also account for passenger handling systems. One discussion was a fifteen foot wide apron, about half what is available now. We do not believe that any system now available can be fit into this size apron without some building connection.

b. Wear and tear on the pier by mega ships was addressed adequately by only one respondent.

c. Moving the tugs on a regular basis was assumed to be part of the regular operational scenario. A letter to your committee by the tugs indicated that this was an excessive cost and while they were willing to support City operations in this matter, long term they were not willing to do this regularly. A solution was only addressed by one respondent

3. Councilor Duson raised the question of the ability to “cold iron” ships in earlier correspondence. This provides a port to offer electrical service to ships so they can shut down their own generators and this dramatically reduce stack emissions. There is no provision beyond City operations at this time to offer this capability. This would have to be introduced by the CDC as a stipulation of final design.

4. Councilor Donaghue raised the question of facility management. In the port industry this is handled in several ways.

a. Full management by the owner: The owner of the facility, normally a public entity like the City or a port authority, owns and operates the facility. They provide all of the management, regulatory compliance, operational direction and support and administration including marketing. The owner retains maximum control and liability. Examples of operating authorities are St. John Port Authority and Halifax Port Authority. The owner receives the revenue and covers expenses.

b. Full leasehold: This is where the owner leases out the facility to an operating and leasehold entity. All control is in the hands of the lessee as well as the liability. Generally the owner is compensated on a fixed leasehold rate or on a per volume basis, i.e. passenger throughput. The New York City Passenger Piers are an example of this type of arrangement.

c. Shared Management: This is a situation where the owner retains a level of control but also needs to provide some services in support of operations. The owner is responsible for services such as capital improvements, security, and some passenger services. The private party handles operations, marketing, and on the ground management. An example of this is Massport.

EACH of these areas has its advantages and disadvantages. It really depends on the level of control the owner wants to exert over the business opportunity. It also must take into account that even with the best of arrangements, private corporations are profit driven

and often facilities are not maintained at the level expected by the owner, even with careful monitoring. Generally, the smaller the owning entity, the more control it seeks to retain due to developing business opportunities and political/community considerations.

5. Councilor Cloutier asked about the number of people required to handle operations on site. This can be broken down into several areas:

a. Operations:

1. Person in Charge (PIC)-the designated responsible person under the US Coast Guard regulatory framework.
2. Marine Operations Manager-Manages berthing and all operational requirements
3. Facility Security Officer (FSO)-Manages all requirements under Part 105 USC for the facility and insures vessel compliance
4. Facility Maintenance Supervisor-Coordinates all pier support including setup, pier services, utilities, passenger conveniences, cleaning and equipment preparation
5. Security Guards-works under the direction of the FSO; 4-6 personnel
6. Maintenance Workers-works under the direction of the Facility Maintenance Supervisor; 2-4 personnel
7. Ground Transportation Supervisor-Manages taxi and limo operations
8. Police-only under certain port security levels
9. Administrator-Tracks vessel service provisions and issues invoices

b. Vessel Support:

1. Ship's Agent-Represents the ship's owners
2. Chandler-Provides goods and services to the ship
3. Pilot-Provides harbor navigation services
4. Docking Master-Provides berthing management for the ship
5. Tugs-Minimum 2-3 as required
6. Stevedore-Provides supervision for the longshoremen who are responsible for line handling, gangway deployment and storing.
7. Longshoremen; 16

c. Passenger Support

1. Tour Supervisor-Manages the deployment of tour buses and tour operations
2. METRO Ground Manager-Manages METRO bus operations
3. METRO Ticket Agent-Sells bus tickets
4. METRO Dispatcher-Handles bus deployment
5. METRO Operators; 4-6 units
6. Tourism Information Agents-Personnel representing the Convention and Visitors Bureau and Portland Downtown District; 4-6.
7. Tour Bus Drivers-20-25 units

d. Regulatory Compliance

1. US Coast Guard-Inspection teams; 2-4
2. US Customs and Border Protection Inspectors-foreign inbound only;10-14

Total average onsite shoreside personnel can exceed 75 people. The terminal owner/operator is responsible for personnel under 5a above.

6. Requested Clarifications

Staff believes that the following items need to be clarified in regard to the proposals as submitted:

- A. How do the respondents intend to manage vehicle traffic?
- B. How and where will tour buses be staged?
- C. How and where will ground transportation be managed?
- D. How will impacts on Casco Bay Lines be minimized?
- E. How will passenger security screening be managed?
- F. How much apron will be retained for vessel operations?
- G. How will passengers board and disembark the vessel?
- H. What is the planned route for emergency vehicles?
- I. What are the minimum requirements for access control fencing in regard to height and type in the view of the US Coast Guard?
- J. What pier utilities will be provided for vessels?
- K. What provision is being made for secondary Customs vehicle inspection?

It is unfortunate that we had insufficient funding for the megaberth (Pier2-Berth 2 and 3). If this berth was available and was used for primary cruise ship operations, all of the operational issues at the Portland Ocean Terminal (Maine State Pier Berth 1) would be mute and the process would be much less complicated.

I will be happy to answer any further questions regarding these points.