

Memorandum
Department of Planning and Urban Development
Planning Division

TO: Mayor Jill C. Duson and Members of the Portland City Council
FROM: Penny St. Louis Littell 
DATE: 060509
RE: **Maine State Pier**

On May 13, 2009 the City Council participated in a facilitated discussion on the future uses of the Maine State Pier. Valerie Landry, Landry and Associates, provided excellent guidance at the meeting and the Council's discussion assisted Planning staff in arriving at the recommendations contained within this memorandum.

The objective of tonight's meeting is to discuss and agree upon the long-range development and improvements/maintenance schedule for the MSP¹; to discuss the issue of submerged lands; to consider the operation of the Pier as a passenger port/cruise ship terminal; and to discuss the most effective marketing approach for the property to maximize return to the City while ensuring viability of uses in the area. In arriving at the recommendations contained herein, Planning has worked with the City Manager's Office, the City's Facilities Division, Economic Development Department, as well as Wayne Duffett, an engineer at TEC Associates.

General Condition of the Pier

Planning staff consulted with TEC Associates to better understand the current condition of the Pier and its immediate maintenance needs. Wayne Duffett, an engineer used by the City in its waterfront maintenance and who has years of experience on the Portland waterfront, conducted an assessment of the pier through visual inspection. His conclusions are contained within Tab 6. (He has also been asked to perform a dive but the results were unavailable at the time of this writing). Overall, Mr. Duffett found the Pier to be in good condition for its intended use as a deepwater berth. He does recommend ongoing maintenance of the Pier into the future as is identified in his report.

Based on the assessment of TEC Associates, as well as the uses proposed for the Pier as identified herein, the staff has identified immediate maintenance needs for the Pier. (Tab 7) As will be more clearly explained at the meeting, some of these maintenance items are underway, some are planned, and some are being recommended for inclusion in the next CIP. These numbers are not exact, nor are they meant to be exclusive.² They are

¹ Attachment 1 is a Definition of Terms used herein and throughout the oral presentation.

² For example, the costs do not include architectural changes to the building. The costs do not address expenses associated with the continued operation of the MSP as a passenger port (i.e. a new ramp system