

87 COMMENTS

Newest

Hoist Committee

2 months ago

I received a call that someone thought the below post was hoist committee meeting – it is not John Grillo and i discussed going down to the club Sunday evening and having a drink.

I shared w/John that it would be a good chance to catch up with a few folks that had questions, since I'm never around during the work week.

I then remembered earlier criticism that some informal discussions from last summer were not advertised to the membership, and thought it would be a good idea to just put it on the forum so anyone that wanted to swing by could.

Parker Hadlock

0

Reply

Hoist Committee

2 months ago

A few hoist committee members will be at the club this Sunday evening from 6 to 7:30 if anyone wants to swing by and voice any concerns.

Now that most folks are vaccinated , we want to seize the opportunity to discuss / work the issues. Hope to see you!

0

Reply

Hoist Committee

2 months ago

Forum contribution by the Hoist Committee; 4-30-21

After receiving some recent questions, we were reminded of a humorous quote of Angus King: “Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but they are not entitled to their own facts”.

The following includes some corrections or context...not to change an earlier contributor's opinion, but to ensure some inaccurate statements are not subsequently taken as facts by others. We also have included some additional information that may be insightful:

1. The boundary discussion with our northern neighbor has nothing to do with the hoist project. The hoist has been deemed completely on HYC property by both survey and legal opinion.
2. The concern over the viewshed of the neighbors is real and exactly why we reached out to the Fosters in fall of '20 for their input. Here are the facts: The hoist is a single pole, approximately 18” in diameter, and approximately 16’ tall and painted grey to blend in. In contrast, the mast on most cruising sailboats that use the floats are over 50’ tall (3 times the hoist).
3. The reference to the boatyards offering their services needs some context. The boat yards are open for business to all at a cost. In a previous post we demonstrated that the Hoist has a 2 year payback on the Clubs’ 20k investment request. We also demonstrated that a boat yard solution completely fails to meet the club objectives of increasing access, volunteerism and teaching.
4. The photo below is a crew of HYC graduates at Severn Sailing Association in MD launching their own boat at a fall regatta. This facility has 3 hoists, and has enjoyed safe operation by its members for decades. Another club much like HYC in VT has also had a hoist for decades operated by its members to sustain its one design fleet. The Hoist Committee has instituted precautionary measures

far in excess of any club we know of, and will add any additional requirements deemed appropriate by the board including limiting use to off peak hours to ensure the complete safety of the hoist operations and the membership.

(sorry – photo would not post in this forum but is on a poster board at the club)

5- There was a question regarding opportunities for race class students to crew w/ members who race. This precisely frames the origin of the Hoist proposal. There are precious few opportunities because there are very few boats racing. Invigorating one design sailing will provide more opportunity for the race class students and the target HYC race class students who have aged out and no longer have the opportunity to race and continue to build their skills.

6- The reference to the HYC Youth regatta as an example of “all that we need to do” is both correct, and incorrect. The Youth regatta, an ambitious undertaking started by the Drake Family, is an example of HYC at its best and how it fulfills the mission for that age group. However, many of those same sailors have no opportunity to continue racing or even sailing after they age out of the youth program. The key stepping stone missing at HYC is that NEXT step into affordable and competitive one design sailing. Lets take the next step to serve our youth sailing program and its graduates.

7- Some demographic statistics that we hope you find meaningful. The average age of a racing student aging out of youth sailing at HYC is around 16. The average age of the PHRF Wednesday night fleet is over 50. Any organization would look at this age gap as a sustainability issue. Fortunately, the model to follow is up and down the east coast and interior lakes. Anywhere there is an active vibrant one design fleet, there is a hoist that minimizes the barrier to entry, and that increases participation.

8- Finally, we are also reminded of the almost decade long debate over NIKE’s multiple attempts to gift millions to the town of Freeport in the honor of Olympian Joan Benoit Samuelson. This generous gift was to provide a substantial contribution for athletic facility so our kids could compete, only to be turned away by those with less vision, and the cost was too great for the town to bear. Yet, after multiple attempts it was finally passed with substantially less donation and higher cost to the town years later. The real cost was the lack of success of our teams for many more years while the debate unfolded. Teams who could not practice reliably or compete at a high level led to the loss of athletes to other schools where they could compete. The success of the artificial turf is now obvious to anyone that follows youth sports as Freeport regularly has championship contending teams for the first time in years. The added success has led to a sense of community and pride in the Freeport Schools that had been lost for decades.

There are parallels to the Joan Benoit Samuelson Field saga and the HYC Hoist debate now in progress. Lets just help our kids learn and compete at a higher level, like our founders imagined!

Thanks!

1

Reply

John Grillo

3 months ago

Some Thoughts About Using A Boatyard Hoist For One Design

- Hoisting will have to be scheduled and depends on yard activity
- Boat may have to be travel lifted with straps and prone to strap abrasion
- More than likely not available after 4 p.m.
- Not available Saturdays and Sundays

- Lunchtime availability questionable
 - A One Designer who will probably not bottom paint might need weekly cleaning and partial hoisting- boat yards are not apt to be able to meet this need
 - Those of us who get one or two things done annually at a boat yard might not understand the difficulty in asking for repeated service, such as the hoisting that has been proposed.
 - I visualize most of the requests for hoisting to be around end of work day/weekends and other times when the One Designer has time from their job.
 - Working with the yard during the hoist might be frowned upon as is working on your own boat.
- Summary: The boat yard option, to me, has not been developed with a real grasp of the needs that the One Designer may have. If a One Designer was told he/she needed to use the boat yard as their means of splashing in/out, I think it would dampen the spirit and encouragement we are trying to facilitate with the HYC Hoist Proposal.

Thanks for taking the time to read this,
John Grillo

1

Reply

David Dickison

3 months ago

HYC Hoist –forum comments

We appreciate the generous donation proposal by the Burwell family, the tireless work of the HYC Board during the past difficult year, and the time and effort put forth by the hoist committee. We have the utmost respect for all of these individuals and are particularly concerned about the undue criticism our commodore, Adam White has endured.

Documents provided by the hoist committee and HYC Board indicate the decision to move forward with a hoist was made in 2019 after the Burwell family offered HYC a significant donation to honor the memory and legacy of Jack Burwell. A hoist committee was formed and began work on project details, including applications for local and state permits to build the hoist. It appears that the committee worked for several months prior to presenting an information packet to the general membership in the late fall of 2020. The hoist permits remain pending.

We feel that hoist permit approved (if it occurs) will appear as an “implicit endorsement” of the hoist that could mislead members (voters) who have not had the time or interest in learning the background and impact of this project. It could be argued that all members are responsible for reading HYC emails but it is difficult to quantify the degree and depth of membership awareness of this project. The limited participation in this forum supports this point. It is imperative that the club investigates and reports findings on this issue prior moving this project to a vote.

The Burwell’s stated commitment is for \$15,000. They have indicated the funds are earmarked only for the hoist project and if the club decides against it, a much smaller donation will be offered (see forum post dated 3/3/21). The total estimated cost is \$60,000; \$15,000 from Burwells, \$20,000 from HYC club funds and the rest apparently from specific earmarked donations. We are aware the Board is working on policies and procedures to clarify how donations will be managed in the future. In our opinion, the nature and cost of this project should have prompted much earlier open discussion with membership.

This feels like a cart before the horse situation. Comments in favor suggest the hoist is the primary link to re-establishing a competitive one-design racing program. Although planning committees have been established, at this time there has been no clear written strategy on how a one-design program will be developed, what resources (financial/operational) will be required and if there will be enough

volunteer participation to maintain such a program. Board members are well aware of the challenges around consistent volunteer participation in HYC projects and programs. Through the efforts of a concerned member, a potential alternative and cost-effective solution to an HYC owned hoist has been identified – a partnership with a local marina. This could be pursued while the one-design program is developed with later reconsideration of a hoist installation.

Despite FAQs provided by the Board and hoist committee, we believe many hoist details such as neighbor relations, space and traffic impacts, use guidelines, safety issues and longer-term maintenance and operational programs and costs have not been fully clarified.

Although we are not in support of the project at this time, we hope the Board and hoist committee value our perspective as much as we appreciate their well-intended efforts

Respectfully submitted,
David and Sandra Dickison

1

Reply

David Kent

3 months ago

May I ask you to take the time to read about my thoughts concerning the current issues facing our yacht club? My family has been a member of the club for years and for that same period I have been a state district court judge. Please consider my insight learned as a judge over the years as it relates to the situation that is developing at HYC.

It is no secret that a significant number of HYC's neighbors are militating against HYC's Hoist Proposal. We are now in the period where the disagreement with the neighbors moves to town, state and federal agencies for consideration of the Hoist Proposal. (By the way, in the first town hearing the club lost the use of some dock space and one float must be moved.) I have seen this kind of process unfold hundreds, if not, thousands of times. The further we head down this road the more intransigent the parties become, people become arrogant and logic and civility take an exit. I think of the parallel to a landlord-tenant case in court. There might be a little "right" on both sides, but the court has to order one party to stop offensive behaviors or order the other party "to move out." Such cannot be the case here. HYC and our neighbors are together for the long haul. We are in their neighborhood and we should be good neighbors. We need their tolerance and understanding for the inconvenience we cause.

The neighbors see the hoist as an eyesore in their front yard impacting their view and as a device that will cause a significant increase in traffic congestion and activity at the club and also as a violation of an agreement between the club and the neighbors when the parking lot was enlarged. You may agree or disagree with the neighbors, but the fact is, the issues need not be fought over. Members of the club have negotiated with Brewers Marina to do all the work that "our" hoist could do at a very inexpensive price. A price that would take years and years to equal the investment HYC would make for a hoist.

So, I beg you, as members are becoming angry with one another and the collegiality of our club becomes frayed, write or call the Commodore or board members and tell them to stop the hoist proposal as irreparable harm is taking place to the morale of our club and our relationship with the neighborhood. Through Brewers, we have already discovered a way to allow one design sailing to prosper and we can certainly find many alternative and appropriate ways to honor the memory of Jack Burwell without a hoist.

If you wish to correspond about the issue I remain open to you.

Sincerely,

David Kent

3

Reply

Vicky Smith

3 months ago

Dear Club members and Barney,

I would like to take this opportunity to apologize to Barney for the remarks I made in a prior post, approximately 11 days ago with regard to the permitting of H float.

In retrospect, I believe that my tone was aggressive and that my remarks were not constructive. A credo that I try to follow, but failed to do is: “You can say what you mean but not say it mean”.

I respect that Barney has done an exponential share of work on behalf of our Club; I appreciate that many good people here at HYC believe that we can agree to disagree- but in a kinder manner.

My apologies to you Barney.

Sincerely,

Vicky Smith

6

Reply

Barney Baker

3 months ago

Reply to [Vicky Smith](#)

Thank you Vicky. I appreciate it and know how passionate you and Steve are about the club.

6

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

3 months ago

CONDUCTING AN INFORMED MEMBERSHIP VOTE

At the April Board meeting on 4/13, the Board is apparently considering moving up the hoist vote 3 steps. Now the vote may be ordered; BEFORE all permits are approved, BEFORE the detailed Hoist Proposal is given to members to evaluate, and possibly BEFORE an in-person membership discussion event. My two posts below this one, earlier this week, explain this Board news. Members MUST have the Board approved hoist Proposal in their hands, time to digest it and then the opportunity of a well attended face-to-face discussion of the merits and viability of this project before a vote.

The Board has yet to announce exactly how it will conduct a membership vote. After that 4/13 Board meeting, a Board member called me on another subject but switched over to how a vote might occur. He said it could include a show of hands at a membership gathering. Mentioning a “show of hands” prompts me to post this.

Some members have been discussing the best way to get an informed and meaningful vote since late fall. There appeared to be a loose consensus then of the elements to include:

1. A membership vote must come several weeks AFTER members receive the hoist project Proposal and participate in a group face-to-face hoist viability discussion.
2. At a minimum, our Bylaws apply, including a minimum notice period. Due to the extremely controversial nature of this proposal, we should also take additional steps to ensure the vote outcome does represent the will of our 250 members. It is the most consequential and expensive undertaking in our club’s entire history.

3. One member, one vote.
4. Not a “show of hands”. The hoist project has become adversarial. A member’s hand vote might be influenced by which nearby friends might see their vote. I am aware that some spouses actually disagree and would vote differently.
5. Any vote method employed only at a club gathering would only be a small fraction of our 250 members. When have we ever had half that at the club or anywhere together?
6. The club has used free services like “Survey Monkey” to poll opinions. A one word question to answer, yes or no. Automatically tabulated with an audit trail. A suggestion, might be useful.
7. Consider the age range of our members. A lot of us are older and not totally fluent with electronic methods (like that above). Perhaps use Post Office mail (with a pre-addressed return mailer) for all ballots or at least as a backup for those who won’t or can’t respond electronically.

Respectfully,

Bob Harroff

3

Reply

Ray Ramage

3 months ago

Reply to [Linda & Robert Harroff](#)

Survey Monkey is easy technology and even our most challenged should be able to use it.

2

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

3 months ago

HOIST PROPOSAL AND VOTE SEQUENCE

We Must See the Hoist PROPOSAL BEFORE a VOTE

The hoist Presentation was made to the Board end of 2019, but that is not the hoist Proposal which the Hoist Committee refers to. What is their Hoist Proposal and what’s in it? I don’t know, but it has to be more than dimensions, capacities and a wharf design. It must include information to convince the Board that they have thought this project through very carefully, in order for the Board to approve and recommend it to the membership.

So, where is this hoist Proposal? When informing our Commodore last fall that key hoist decisions were being made solely by the committee, he responded that was not possible because the Hoist Committee has not submitted their hoist Proposal to the Board. Without being informed by the Proposal, the board could not discuss the viability of the hoist at a board level. Why not ask for their Proposal? The Hoist Committee will not submit it to the Board until all hoist permits are approved. Parker confirmed that several times to me and offered his reason.

Catch-22. With these circular statements, the Hoist Committee has been hamstringing the Board.

MEMBERSHIP VOTE SEQUENCE CHANGED

Adam’s vote sequence has never varied, until now. My email to Adam 3/7/21, subject “Hoist Vote”; I wrote ” My memory is that your hoist vote sequence will be; all (6) approved hoist authorizations and permits are in hand, Hoist Committee sends a Proposal to the board, board review/ clarification/ feedback to Hoist Committee, final Proposal (if needed) to board, board approval of proposal, send Proposal to membership, and then finally, a membership authorizing vote. Is that still the plan?”

Adam’s answer to me around 3/13/21, ”Yes, that’s what will happen.”

Except at last night's Board meeting, Barney Baker recommended that the membership vote happen instead BEFORE key permitting agency approvals which reverses Adam's consistent vote sequence above. Following Barney's recommendation, Adam said the vote sequence will now precede some permit approvals per our lawyer's recent guidance. That lawyer response is consistent with maximizing the chance of obtaining 6 hoist permits ASAP, benefiting Hoist supporters. And that was likely the lawyer's exact brief from the Board. I rather hope the action the Board takes will maximize the chance of an informed membership vote outcome.

So let's playback. The Board is apparently now considering a MEMBERSHIP VOTE before all permit approvals, before it and members can evaluate the key Hoist Proposal, and likely before a well-publicized in-person group membership discussion on hoist viability. State Covid guidance now allows that.

2

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

3 months ago

IMPORTANCE OF ADEQUATE TIME FOR MEMBERS TO EVALUATE THE HOIST PROPOSAL

Continuing my same 3/7/21 email to Adam, subject "Hoist Vote";

I wrote, "I believe it is very important for project credibility that adequate time is allowed for both board and member review and assimilation of this complex and consequential project Proposal. For some members, this will be the first time they will appreciate its full impact on the club and may wish to discuss it with others. And that would include digesting and exchanging new comments on our forum. We should also anticipate that revealed project details could lead to concerns which will require explanation and satisfactory answers. These exchanges always take more time than expected and we would not want members to believe they are NOW being rushed to vote.

Accordingly, I would like to suggest a MINIMUM of 4 to 5 WEEKS between a Board approved hoist Proposal sent to members and the member vote date. I believe members would appreciate this."

Adam's answer, "I can't commit to that." Could we please set not a vote period notice which simply aligns with optimum permit approval timing at the expense of informing our membership. What is an adequate notice period, considering all the above which has to occur?

1

Reply

Barney Baker

3 months ago

I have just read the redrafted post by Vicky Smith and appreciate the changes made. However, it continues to misconstrue the message of my previous post which clearly indicated a desire to direct animosity away from our neighbor over the need for Float H relocation. ["I am confident there will be an amicable property line agreement at some point with our neighbors who cannot be faulted for looking after their own interests."]

To set the record straight on property boundary/Float H issues:

The HYC deed does not define our northern intertidal boundary, Instead we have relied on a line interpreted by the Maine Bureau of Public Lands (BPL) to define the northern edge of our property. A detailed survey of the HYC property completed in Jan 2021 repositioned this BPL line such that Float H (where the 420s are berthed) now extends across the BPL boundary. To rectify this situation,

HYC has been working towards an intertidal agreement with the abutter that can be presented to BPL to allow for the current Float H location.

In 2006, Float H was built by HYC to replace the ‘aircraft carrier’ from its permitted location south of the HYC docks. At that time, the Submerged Lands Lease was updated but approval from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and the Town for the shifted float was not well documented for which I take responsibility. In March 2021, because of the BPL line location change and the lack of clear documentation for Float H, ACOE and BPL requested the float be installed back in the original ‘aircraft carrier’ location pending an intertidal agreement and updated permit approvals.

4

Reply

Peter Selian

3 months ago

Reply to [Barney Baker](#)

Barney,

Could you provide a brief summary of the generic descriptions of:

“Property Boundary”

“Intertidal Boundary”

“Submerged Lands”

“Submerged Lands Lease”

“Property Line Extension”

and any other terms that tend to confuse me? (MLW, MLLW, MHLW, LMW, LLLHW, etc)

I think LMW = unexpected rock?

How do the boundaries link together (or do they)?

Can they overlap?

What documents / agencies define the boundaries?

Thanks,

-Peter

0

Reply

Barney Baker

3 months ago

Reply to [Peter Selian](#)

Here are the definitions as I see and use them.

PROPERTY BOUNDARY- line between properties defined by deed. Could include intertidal boundary.

INTERTIDAL BOUNDARY- line between properties from high water to low water as defined by deed or by an agreement between abutting property owners.

SUBMERGED LANDS- all property seaward of the mean low water line is owned by the State of Maine and referred to as Submerged Lands.

SUBMERGED LANDS LEASE- Agreement with Maine Bureau of Public Lands to use Maine waters for an annual fee. HYC has authorization for pier extensions, gangways and floats that are in deep-water (seaward of the MLW).

PROPERTY LINE EXTENSION- Method by which abutters might agree on a common Intertidal Boundary is by the extension of an upland property line through the MHW mark to the MLW mark.

MLLW (Mean Lower Low Water)- Elevation 0.0 (Chart Datum)

MLW (Mean Low Water)- Formerly was the statistical zero elevation , but with new data, now varies with location. It is still close to 0. Retained because of its use to define property and regulatory interests. Submerged Lands are tied to MLW.

MHHW- Mean Higher High Water- Statistical high water based on data set or epoch.

HAT- Highest Annual Tide- In Maine is defined as the highest predicted tide elevation. It defines the edge of the coastal wetland.

0

Reply

Barney Baker

3 months ago

Before there is a stampede to my defense, I wanted to attempt to defuse any acrimony that may appear to be getting out of hand. I am not sure what prompted this outburst in the post below, but I can assure everyone that I had intended my post to be informative and non-confrontational. I can understand how frustrating the permit process has become for some. I do think that there is light at the end of the regulatory tunnel if we can all hold on to our dignity and respect a little longer.

Barney

8

Reply

Vicky Smith

3 months ago

To address Barney's remarks below: See Permit Update

Regarding the H dock, Barney (and as a proxy for the Club and Hoist Committee) has stated that the Parker family's challenge of the northern boundary has caused the permitting issues and this needs to be directly addressed by the Club.

To quote Barney:

"The reality is that it is float issues, associated with our northern property boundary, that have mired and delayed the permit process to date. There is no benefit in seeking separate permit approvals for the hoist and floats."

"The 'float issues' are convoluted but can be summed up as follows: The northern abutter has challenged HYC rights to proposed and existing floats that extend towards Strout's Marina. Until an Agreement with our neighbor can be reached on the location of the Intertidal property line, the regulatory authorities have requested HYC reduce the proposed inflatable float extension and relocate the 420 float that has been in service since 2006 to its former location as the 'aircraft carrier'. I am confident there will be an amicable property line agreement at some point with our neighbors who cannot be faulted for looking after their own interests."

But HYC can be faulted for looking after its interests when it fails to reach an agreement with the neighbors. Any resulting anger directed at the Parker family is misguided, and this needs to be broadcast to membership. I respectfully request that Barney retract his remarks on the Forum. The forum should not be used to deflect blame away from the club's lack of communication with regulatory agencies; the Parker family is being used as a scapegoat.

I feel that this post is wrong and this is a serious matter- the Forum was not designed nor should it allow defamatory remarks.

The club was aware of DEP and Army Core concerns about H float last May 2020 as these agencies had no record of permits. We did not address them then and he did not address them in September 2020 when these agencies reminded us. It is my understanding that to this date, the agencies are still waiting.

***The Parker's also said they were willing consider an annual agreement (like the one offered to the neighboring the Link family) in November 2020 and February 2021 to allow the H float to go in. The Parker's again said that they were willing to discuss an annual agreement for Float H at the CWC meeting this past month.

Members of our Club have been abusive to the Parker's in the past with claims that they killed the trees. This continues the legacy of arrogance towards our neighbors and this behavior has not been lost on other surrounding neighbors. We have had enough.

If this Club wants resolution for the permitting of this float- then address the DEP and the Army Core, do what they say to work things out with the Parker family like you did with the Links, and get on with it and get this float in the water.

We have only ourselves to blame if that float doesn't go in for 2021- HYC has had plenty of time to do it.

-4

Reply

Adam White

3 months ago

When we started this forum, we were still in the depths of a pandemic and trying to find new ways to communicate. Members felt they were not being heard and others felt they weren't hearing enough when it came to the Burwell Hoist Proposal. The idea was that the forum would be a space where everyone could come together and discuss their opinions in the absence of in person meetings. We did not create a timeline for the forum, but as things start to open up and people are vaccinated, we feel we can close the forum. It will remain open until an upcoming workshop in mid-April, between groups of differing opinions. Hopefully this will be an opportunity for all to be heard and this information can be presented to the board both pro and con, with a larger club wide outside discussion in May. If you have read the comments and seen how many people have responded, only about 3-4% of the membership is sharing their point of view here.

Please everyone respect each other's point of view as they are all important to the process. We don't always get things right but we always try!

2

Reply

Anne Parker

3 months ago

It appears from the Commodores March news letter, permits for the HYC requested Hoist are moving slowly. The survey of property and shoreline ownership have been completed !

I'm writing because I am concerned about regular, monthly communication To ALL HYC members. They need to be fully informed about everything happening on the waterfront (not just the Board and Hoist Comm.)

In the March newsletter there was reference to Peg Selin's research on HYC working with both Brewers and Strout Pt. Boatyards. They have offered us use of the lifts ! Please read that proposalit was in a HYC email on Feb 28 th.

We have an amazing harbor!, 2 of the best boatyards on the coast and

we are talking a minimum investment of \$ 60,000 plus to build a Hoist !
More thought needs to be given to Pegs proposal as an alternative
Volunteers not trained operators would be moving sailboats on and
off trailers , to be put in the water. (not accessible at low tide).
Trailers need to be removed ! They will travel up through the Village
neighborhood ! (families,children, animals, bikes, strollers and neighbors
abound

Sailing Program...most children attending have parents who are not
HYC members. Once the children reach the “ Racing Class” what are the
opportunities to sail/race against other yacht clubs !

Parent members who race , do they invite the racing class students to
sail with them , how often during the summer race season !

There are 2 HYC junior members who weekly race at PYC, Falmouth
in J-24s . Do they bring crew with them weekly from HYC.

Young families who are HYC members ! Many have young families
and own small power boatstheir time on the water is limited
REMEMBER !

Every summer HYC hosts a Regatta , inviting many yacht club
sailing program participants, Opti and sailing dingys are raced .
Probably close to 200 children and their parents attend .It is HYC
biggest volunteer gathering of the season almost everyone from HYC volunteers their time.
It’s all about sailing , sportsmanship, learning and making new friends.
NO HOIST REQUIRED .

Junior Membership :Encourage this program for new young members
(21 to 29) to join. Annual dues could be less and possibly waive any
Other fees . Opportunity to recruit sailors

How do we honor Jack Burwell and his family (many of the younger
members today never had a chance to know him) for the generous gift.
We have a very generous gift , we need to honor Jack

Take young people, men, women, create a sailing program just for them,
to learn sailing , racing , competition, sportsmanship.... Recruit and
encourage kids from the regular HYC sailing program as well .

Jack was always about a love of ocean sailing, working hard ,having
fun, sharing knowledge , bringing young people along with him and a
role model.He never gave up and was a wonderful friend

..

He was a charming prankster !

0

Reply

Janice Mildram

3 months ago

Reply to [Anne Parker](#)

Agreed. Thank you, Anne, for reminding readers about the club’s commitment to young people. To me, this
means small , easily manageable boats, like we have now. Thank you to the forum for providing this space.

-1

Reply

Barney Baker

3 months ago

PERMIT UPDATE

I have the enviable position of the 'HYC volunteer' that signed up to coordinate the necessary permits for the hoist, a process that has been made complicated by unrelated 'float issues' that have developed from a scrutiny of prior HYC float approvals and property boundaries. This post serves to inform the membership on developments in the permit process that will affect us this summer.

First, I would like to address Mary & Bill Fosters (and more recently Steve Smith's post) suggesting the hoist be 'decoupled' from the permit process that is currently underway to facilitate approvals for the floats in time to use this summer. I wish it were that easy! The reality is that it is float issues, associated with our northern property boundary, that have mired and delayed the permit process to date. There is no benefit in seeking separate permit approvals for the hoist and floats.

The 'float issues' are convoluted but can be summed up as follows: The northern abutter has challenged HYC rights to proposed and existing floats that extend towards Strout's Marina. Until an Agreement with our neighbor can be reached on the location of the Intertidal property line, the regulatory authorities have requested HYC reduce the proposed inflatable float extension and relocate the 420 float that has been in service since 2006 to its former location as the 'aircraft carrier'. I am confident there will be an amicable property line agreement at some point with our neighbors who cannot be faulted for looking after their own interests.

The next permit meeting is with Coastal Waters Commission on April 14 at 6PM for consideration of the proposed waterfront improvements. The Commission has indicated that they are looking at the proposed float only and will defer the Hoist to the Freeport Project Review Board. With Coastal Waters approval we should be on track to complete review (hoist & floats) with Maine DEP and the Army Corps of Engineers on the applications that were filed last July.

2

Reply

Vicky Smith

3 months ago

I also respectfully ask that the Hoist Committee respond to the comments given my David Kent "When is a promise not a promise". Where is the integrity of our Club?
27 days ago and no response. Why?

-1

Reply

Vicky Smith

3 months ago

Parker- I formally request that you and/or the Hoist Committee adhere to the promises made by the Hoist Committee and the Board when this forum was established.

*The Membership was told- both in the Commodore's letter and in various communications , that this forum would be made available so the Hoist Committee would address any and all concerns in a respectful way.

*All questions need to be answered in this forum- not in a private call as you have proposed in response to Peg's letter below. There is not other forum.

*Please be respectful- not matter what your position is. Your reply to her remarks insinuates that she has the "facts" wrong. You stated:

"Please give me a call and I will give the factual basis of any area of concern".

*I want to hear (and I believe I speak for many others) what you define to be "factual" in your response to her. I hope your remarks going forward do not imply that legitimate questions are not based in fact.

Thank you
Vicky Smith

0

Reply

Stephen Smith

4 months ago

Dear Board (not hoist committee),

Please unbundle the hoist issue from the float permit application.

I would just like to echo the comments made by Bill & Mary Foster. The float issue needs to be resolved quickly for the benefit of the members and the sailing program. I don't really understand at all why the hoist committee is driving this particular bus. I have heard the arguments that it would be cheaper and easier to handle both issues with one application. But these are very separate issues and should be treated as such.

Looking forward very much to seeing everyone on the water.

Steve

2

Reply

W. Parker Hadlock

4 months ago

Peg –

Parker HADLOCK here

Please give me a call and I will give the factual basis of any area of concern you have with anything posted by myself or the Hoist Committee.

I look forward to meeting you!

1

Reply

Peg Selian

4 months ago

Earlier this week I wrote to Adam, Stuart, and a few others about why I'm "triggered" by responses from the Hoist Committee, the latest being from last week's email to the membership that I'm now sharing on this forum. This does not mean I'm opposed to the hoist. This is about their role and responsibility as communicators to membership. Up until now, it's been my expectation they deliver logical, objective, and evidence based statements, both pros and pitfalls. Where I believe they fall short, they appear to have one goal, to sway the membership to endorse a lift at HYC. I base my opinion on their tone, choice of words, their continued misleading statements, leaving the members thinking that their message (marketing) is heavily based on their personal biases. This only renders lack of credibility and effectiveness of their efforts. Now, if this has been their role and goal from the start, this should be communicated and understood by all. In which case, we need another committee of people with "alternatives."

This leads me to sharing my mixed feelings about the forum. All good intentions, as with everything in this matter, it's in my view, the forum has created, in some ways, an unhealthy, time consuming arena for debate between the Hoist Committee and various opposing individuals. Who's the arbitrator, mediator, to manage the content and emotions that run high? I believe we need an impartial person or committee to oversee this if the Hoist Committee can't.

So here's one of many examples that was my trigger, it's the \$1000 quote by the HC. From the forum a month ago and now their latest from last week's email....

One month ago...

Private boatyard costs are an obstacle for many. A recent invoice for the launch and haul of a J22 exceeded \$1000, not to mention the inconvenience of being limited to the boatyard schedule and the inappropriate use of travel lift slings on a paint-free race bottom. If a skipper chose to attend 4 regattas in a season, that is a \$4000 impediment

Last week..(March 11th, 2021)

We reported earlier that we are aware of an actual local J22 launch and haul fee that exceeds \$1000 each season with no maintenance included. If we had a 10-boat fleet and no travelers, this is \$10,000 per year cost yielding a 2 year payback for the \$20 K club investment. A good business case in any arena.

We are fortunate to have quality boatyards in our harbor, but a boatyard does not “get at” the core of robust one-design fleet logistics efficiency or cost

Nice to read they acknowledged we have a quality boatyard in our harbor. I agree. However, in my view, they want to convince membership working with our neighboring boatyards is cost prohibitive, they don't “get at” what is required to support one design, etc and therefore one might interpret we shouldn't pursue this avenue and instead implement the necessary hoist. Well, I did and was successful. And why not evaluate both, boatyard and hoist solution? John Brewer, as I've noted in a few communications since I began these discussions with him last Fall, is willing to support HYC in any way he can, from offering both his travel lifts, his crane at Strouts, gin pole, his crane to step masts, if the gin pole method is not appropriate, and willing to work with our schedule with proper notice. At the bottom of this post, I've noted the rates I've secured with him and Handy Boat. As for regattas, John at one time spoke of “sponsoring” one to help with deferring the costs, just as he continues to do for Youth Regatta at no charge.

Here are more examples from the latest March 11th email...

Many of the committee members have used these same hoists from Maine to Florida and everything in between.

There is no active one design racing at HYC, almost no active one design racing in Maine, yet there is extensive one design racing at clubs that have a hoist. Just a sampling of venues frequented by HYC members include Marblehead MA, Mallets Bay Vt, Lake George NY, Noroton CT, Newport RI, Severn Sailing Assoc MD (note...many of these clubs have MULTIPLE hoists demonstrating the success that they endeavor to repeat).

we have had boatyards beside the club for decades, yet we have a declining/defunct one design fleet. All the other clubs with hoists with robust one design fleets also have boatyards nearby, but they see the benefit of a hoist.

My view:

1. “almost no active one design racing in Maine,” I know otherwise, PYC for one.
2. At the beginning, it was declared these hoists were up and down the Maine Coast. Now they're communicating Maine to Florida and everything in between. The only club I know of in Maine is Centerboard Yacht Club and it's not on their list of “7.” If you know of others, please let me know. The CYC hoist is used for stepping masts only and here's what they have to say...”We have had issues in the past with members using the hoist to step masts. One untrained operator dropped their mast but fortunately nobody was hurt. We now keep the hoist locked and have trained hoist users you can not step your mast without a trained member present. We went so far as to establish a “Hoist

committee” and if you want, I can put you in touch with the committee head”
A disclosure of some of the challenges and how they’ve been addressed.

3. The “7” facilities the Hoist Committee do mention (none in Maine,) it’s evident to me why a hoist works for them, for example, Sail Newport at Fort Adams – <https://sailnewport.org/about/> Note: they are “home to New England’s largest public sailing center,” well funded, and a prime location for a hoist. Lucky them! If you view their video on the home page, you’ll see their hoist in action. No doubt a hoist is nice to have at any yacht club. With that, this sailing center charges for the use of their hoist for both members and non-members (<https://sailnewport.org/facility/boat-hoists/hoist-payment/> .) Their rates are very comparable to what our generous local boatyards are offering us. Am I campaigning we don’t need a hoist at HYC, not at all, one could argue the more the merrier, right? Nice to have, absolutely. Will HYC reach the caliber of the sailing centers that do have hoists and should we try? If we could widen and dredge the river, boot out some of the residents, maybe, but none of those are options nor should they be.

My point here, our local yards are willing to work with us, I have secured very affordable rates and resources with them (see the bottom of this thread), beginning this Spring. Travel lift vs lift without straps, all are options with them. Should we give the local yards a period of time to prove one-design will be revitalized before investing in our lift? It would be prudent, in my view. Does this mean we should toss the hoist, no. I do see the benefit as Kathy Keegan laid out in a letter to the Board Nov 2020 regarding our whalers, stepping masts and Falls Point subsidizing this labor. I do not agree however, as stated by the HC, a hoist by itself will revitalize one-design at our club. However, I do concur with them that a lift offers self sufficiency, 24×7 access, and potentially aid in the attraction of some one-design sailors. What I mean by the latter, some competitors base their decisions on the services, condition, and tools available to launch and haul in the area they are competing.

Once upon a time, we had an active one design fleet(s). People such as Cliff George and other institutional members can speak to this. Why the decline, we should expand our focus on this and not limit to a hoist as a solution.

Maybe HYC ought to consider needs based one-design sailors, add a line item to the budget as a means to subsidize them, much like our scholarship program that assists young kids who want to learn how to sail, but are constrained financially. Many ideas and ways to incent one-design competition here in Freeport Maine. Focusing on just a new hoist at our club is a missed opportunity. Besides, if permitting is not granted, the hoist is moot, but not the boatyard nor our friends at PYC. And that’s another point, I view us as a low-key club with friendly competition and a whole lot of fun. People, believe it or not, look forward to that. If anyone wants the intense, serious competitiveness, PYC has many offerings. It’s fun there too!

4. we have had boatyards beside the club for decades, yet we have a declining/defunct one design fleet Are they suggesting this is because we don’t have a hoist? Could there be other reasons why we have a declining/defunct fleet? I’m certain they could offer other reasons that are sound, why aren’t they?

5. All the other clubs with hoists with robust one design fleets also have boatyards nearby, but they see the benefit of a hoist. – As I said above, a hoist is definitely nice to have when you have the footprint, landscape, funds, vast selection of one-design fleets, all the things HYC is either constrained by or don’t have.

Initially, I said I don’t view myself as being contrarian, nor do I wish to play that role, but by virtue of highlighting their falsities, I am. I will say, I’m exhausted and irked with the time it takes in refuting their communication and asking once again the Board to take control of this matter.

How the Board takes control? Easy to say, and frankly I don't know what the right answer is in moving forward. I keep going back to needing a group of objective people who can preside over the Hoist Committee and an "alternative committee." We are 17 plus months into this and deeply divided. Something has to change. I do not advocate using the forum, unless there's a moderator. I believe the next step is to receive a final proposal from the HC and proposal from an "alternative committee". Then let membership decide between these two. Anyone willing to step into these roles, if they agree with this approach, I encourage contacting the Board.

Bottom line, John Brewer and his family are strong community minded people and he's expressed often he wants to help HYC in any way he can is open to suggestions. I believe our new arrangement with Brewer and HBY is an opportunity and step in the right direction in re-building the incentive for one-designs to compete here in Freeport Maine. The fact the Hoist Committee could not at least acknowledge partnering with our local boatyard is an advancement to this goal, I take personal offense to this and wish not to receive any future communication that in any way suggests our neighbors aren't there for us. Their repeated pattern to counter with misleading statements is the basis for why I initially asked the flagship officers to issue a warning. It's insulting to my intelligence and a colossal waste of time.

Lastly, I remain uncertain about whether the communication to date is coming from the committee as a whole or one or two people spearheading the communication. What I can say about a few of the Hoist Committee members...Jack Thomas, I will always be grateful for how he stood up for my son Jacob, a true Corinthian. Barney Baker, very fond of him and his wife Caroline, and appreciate all his tireless efforts on permitting needs of the club. Spencer Drake and his wife Cindy, also fond of and Spencer's been one of my mentors at HYC and their daughter Katie, a former instructor to my kids and an inspiration. I'm fond of Henry too through the YR, friendly exchanges at the club, etc. Sue Haddock, always enjoy her company and lively spirit. We're a social club of friends and family founded on trust and integrity. I'd like to continue embracing this.

All that said, here's the arrangement and the rates I have secured with Brewers and Handy Boat:
Spring launch \$100

Fall haul \$100

Mid summer haul \$150.00

Back in on a different day \$150 (away regatta, etc)

Bottom wash as needed \$50 added to Fall haul and mid-Summer rate.

If the boat stays in travel lift (or crane) and requires bottom washing, \$200 round trip (haul, wash, launch.)

Brewers is making an HYC account for these customers. Initially, we'll collect a check when services are rendered and record these payments to this account.

John Brewer is leaving it to the owners discretion to schedule their Spring launch and Fall haul at \$100. Handy Boat is requiring one coordinated day in the Spring and Fall for the \$100 rate. This is currently scheduled May 15th by PYC (Tim Tolford.)

Please contact me (Peg Selian pegselian@gmail.com 207-233-0423) to reserve your initial one design launch haul needs with these yards. This is primarily to avoid John Brewer and Craig Brimicombe having to discern if your boat qualifies for these rates. Going forward, you can coordinate directly with them, just pay cash when service is rendered.

-Peg

1

Reply

John Grillo

4 months ago

On The Precipice of Change

Change in every organization brings out the best and the worst of us. It's scary and challenging. But here we are. Do we want the club to be a comfortable parking lot with access to moorings or do we want to facilitate and encourage young adult sailors to compete at club, interclub and national levels? Don't get me wrong, we can still be that comfortable club that I get a benefit from as well as you. But don't you think something is missing? We have an active group of some of the finest sailors in the club who are proposing a way to help HYC jump to the future by leveraging a gift and facilitating a project that will enhance and fulfill HYC's mission.

We have been hearing all the negatives: We don't want to look at it. We don't need it. Too dangerous. We can pay for it somewhere else. Too expensive. We promised not to do anything forever. It won't work. The presenter is not telling the truth.....

My question to anybody who wants to listen is: Where do you want to be on this issue in a couple of years. Looking at our club and wondering why we don't have active/competitive sailing? Or, Looking at where we have come and how your support has helped us to get there.

At this time we have one member who has purchased a J24. We have another contemplating a purchase. We have a committee that is deciding on how to proceed. Maybe it'll be the J24, I don't know. There are those that want to include some of the Sailing Program racers on their one-design boats. This would be great!

Support our bold proposal to launch HYC into the future and fulfill the mission of the club beyond our great Youth Sailing Program.

Think about your objections, they have all been answered, and ask yourself if change is your enemy or can I put the future of the club in my vision.

John Grillo

1

Reply

Hoist Committee

4 months ago

The hoist committee recently received an email from a member that had a number of very good questions and we thought it would be a good idea to share these questions and answers for every one here on the forum to read.

1 – I believe Strout's and/or Brewers has the ability to lift a one design with a pick point without using straps. Might be worth a discussion with them.

Brewers does not have that capability

Strouts has a crane w/ capability, but they do not use it in this way and there is a reason for this.

Picking / booming / cabling / signaling / landing / owner involvement during this operation / owner cleaning while on the boatyard crane / I do not see a boatyard agreement to this short term or long term

The hoist committee has people in this business....and the mobile crane idea is a last resort....some club members have voiced safety concerns....nothing is safer than the hoist we proposed!

2 – I do believe a financial arrangement with HYC can be had at a reasonable price point. Comments about hull washing throughout the season was new for me....certainly that presents a wrinkle in terms of costings but still feel it should be part of the conversation with the boatyards.

Cleaning is essential – not optional

3 – The actual cost borne by HYC would be on a per use basis.....so if the club starts with two boats only the cost associated with two boats, etc. moving forward. The ten boat goal is fine but the timing and the real expense outlay is unknown. I also propose that HYC bears the annual costs associated with the one design in/outs during the season. I'm guessing the initial few years will be less than 3K in actual costs.

The clubs investment of 20k leverages another 40k gifted.....I don't know how you strike a better use of capitol better than that?

In my business, we never rent things we will use long term – never.

Your suggested 3k per year = \$250 per month

Alternately a 20k club investment at 4% on a 30 year note = \$100 per month....much better deal with residual value as it has a 40 year.

4 – There will be tide considerations with our own hoist as well as timing issues with Brewers

And strouts has tide issues also but not as severe...and they work 8 to 4....

5 – Might suggest if we were able to outsource the hoist, membership might rally around raising capital funds for boat purchases which could expedite the build out of a fleet.

Club owned boats typically do not work out well, historically and currently – look at the care and maintenance of the sonars we havethey are not competitive in any way, all the boats will have different speeds as they are so out of spec....and that will singlehandedly defeat one design sailing. And if that is not enough, they will never be competitive at a regional event...were our teams really start to improve.

Related....10 boats at 15k each is 150k....we are just looking for 20k and borrow patch of shoreline....

6 – I guess I look at a hoist rather unemotionally.....it's a utility need...is there another way to get to the same place and have more resource to further the end goal of establishing a one design fleet.

Food for thoughtwhy do clubs w/ thriving fleets have hoists....there is a direct correlation and those of us that sail in that circle have experienced itan hence not so Unemotional

This hoist also says who we are and want to be....

7- A gentleman from PYC commented in his opening paragraph..." We have a satisfactory arrangement for hauling and launching our boats at Handy Boat Service"...this is PYC with an operational budget that dwarfs HYC.

This gentleman is a statesman.....and they have a 250k obstacle due to geography....and they do NO bottom cleaning....people swim on their boats to scrub or pay a diver every week or 2.

8- What is your timeline expectation of a one design boat fleet at HYC? You don't want HYC to own the boats..... so members do? How many? How soon?

HYC has a group currently heading up this search and we thought another spokesmodel might be just the thing.... but I will share this....the hoist has accelerated the one design discussion and makes ownership more viable for many

0

Reply

David Kent

4 months ago

Reply to [Hoist Comittee](#)

Hi All, The above post lacks credibility.

There is no need for a hoist at the Harraseeket Yacht Club.

I spoke with John Brewer, in person, about the matters raised in the above post and he assured me that seven days a week he and his yard are ready willing and able to launch one design boats in the same manner and with a financial arrangement as done by the vast majority of yacht clubs. John has already negotiated a favorable financial arrangements with a club member similar to PYC's plan.

To my knowledge there are only three yacht clubs on the new England coast that have the hoist capability: Marblehead, Newport and one in Connecticut. They all do dry sailing and have much larger footprint and land facilities than HYC.

We also do not need a hoist to clean the bottoms of a non-existent fleet.

Respectfully, David Kent

1

Reply

Mary & Bill Foster III

4 months ago

I guess it behoves me, as one of the five family owners of the Foster cottage just above the yacht club, to inform you that the majority of these owners have stated their opposition to the proposed boat hoist, and as abutting property owners that opposition will be officially lodged with the appropriate local, state and federal authorities.

As a longtime member of HYC I have always supported the club in its' endeavors and am personally of two minds about the hoist. On the one hand a tribute to Jack Burwell is a fine idea, and a boat hoist at a yacht club is a common and expected part of any yacht club landscape. On the other hand you have to question the practicality of this hoist at this particular yacht club. The prospect of trying to safely back a boat and trailer through the length of a parking lot possibly filled with cars, trucks and people and out onto a platform over the water as opposed to simply launching off the beach when the tide is right, as the members have quite successfully done for years and most likely will continue to do, is certainly debatable. That and the fact that the proposed hoist will undeniably be a big ugly structure positioned at the far end of the parking lot directly in front of our cottage makes it hard to support. The owners, of course, are also concerned with any possible negative effect adding this obstruction to our view of Casco Bay will have on the value of our property.

With these thoughts in mind I would hope that the club can find a way to unbundle the hoist from the float permit application. An improvement to the clubs' dinghy float situation is critical. The hoist, at best, controversial and possibly an impediment.

-Bill Foster

3

Reply

Barney Baker

4 months ago

Permitting for Floats and Hoist has been restarted.

HYC is on the Freeport Coastal Waters Commission agenda for consideration of a Wharfing Out permit for the proposed hoist and float expansion. The Zoom meeting starts at 6 PM on Wednesday March 10 (see Town website: <https://www.freeportmaine.com/coastal-waters-commission/events/18091>) for more information.

The Wharfing Out Permit is one of many permits (Town, DEP, Submerged Lands and the Army Corps of Engineers) that will be obtained before a membership vote is taken on the hoist. The original 15Jul2020 Wharfing Out application application and a 4Mar2021 Supplement will be posted in the Burwell Hoist Documents area of the HYC website.

Notice of future public meetings to consider permit approvals will be posted on this Message Board.

4

Reply

Hoist Comittee

4 months ago

A recent email from PYC one design sailor Tim Tolford

Hello to my friends at HYC. The report you have seen by my friend Ann Parker is correct in that we have a satisfactory arrangement for hauling and launching our PYC boats at Handy Boat Service.

However, the one-design fleets in Falmouth have desired their own lift facilities but have never been able to come up with a viable plan to do so. We would need a solid pier over 200' in length to get the water depth we need, the location would be difficult as we have tall cliffs to work from, and our mud bottom makes a foundation almost impossible.

The use of a hoist for the boats we use is the best method both in quick turnaround times, less stress on the hulls, eliminates use of toxic anti-fouling paints, provides the ability to keep the boats rigged during the hoist, improves the chances these boats would travel to regatta further afield increasing the sailing abilities of their crews, and reduces the space needed for the entire operation. Unfortunately, our geographic constraints prevent us from utilizing a hoist in the Falmouth area. Knowing your clubs location, I see a club hoist as a boon for the local one-design fleets as well as some smaller power craft and larger dinghys. Anything that makes getting more people into sailing and boating is what our clubs and sailing associations need. I would have you continue in your efforts for this worthwhile project.

I was so glad to hear of this project in memory of my good friend Jack Burwell. We first met sailing Lightnings in the '70s when as crew for Dave White, my task was to monitor Jack at all times before we lost him once again. This continued into the J/24 fleets where I really got to know Jack and we maintained a wonderful relationship for decades afterwards. I see this lift as a fitting remembrance of the Burwell families love of one-design sailing at Harraseeket YC and beyond. I wish HYC well in this project, I am envious of what you are doing. All my best and I hope to see you on the water this upcoming summer.

Tim Tolford

2

Reply

Hoist Comittee

4 months ago

So there is no confusion here is a response from the Burwell family to clarify their proposed gift:

We enjoyed the opportunity to speak to the Board at the last HYC Board Meeting to directly share our families full support for the Hoist Project.

During this meeting, a participant asked if we would entertain an alternate use of the proposed monetary gift. While Charlie did say that we would consider it at a much smaller scale, we thought we were quite clear that this gift was for the Hoist in the memory of Jack.

We learned of a recent post in the Member Forum suggesting that we are supportive of an alternate gift, to which we feel like we need to clarify: Our family is committed to gifting the club \$15,000.00 towards the construction of this lift. It's our intent that this gift be used only for the purpose of constructing the lift, nothing else. In short without the lift there will be no gift.

If the membership decides not to move forward with the lift project, we will adjust our offer and make a non-monetary gift to the club. In this event we would like to make a product donation, based on an identified need, to the junior sailing program with a maximum value of \$1500.00 in the name of Jack Burwell.

Thank you,
Marilyn, Charlie and Meredith Burwell

2

Reply

W. Parker Hadlock

4 months ago

As I read a previous account of one members point of view regarding the Club's obligations to our neighbors, I realized that the author's frame of reference was understandably inaccurate as the transaction referenced was 6 years before he became a member of HYC. For context, I feel compelled to share the following that I believe will provide insight and accuracy to the discussion.

In 1971, My dad was instrumental in seeing the value of the rock fill coming from the sewer installation project in South Freeport. He and other like-minded members saw how this rock fill could be utilized to more than double the size of the parking lot at HYC at a very low cost. These members commenced with the plans and permit to take advantage of this unique opportunity to further the mission of the club.

At that time, the clubhouse was a dilapidated chicken coup sort of structure that was likely to be replaced in the coming years. Gardner Brown, who lived in what is now the Iszard property, raised a concern that if and when a new structure would be built, it would likely be located at the edge of the new fill, further out into the harbor and in the view shed of the neighbors.

The Board agreed to limit the building of such a structure (at that time there was not even a notion of a design) to assure the neighbors that any new club house structure would remain in the current location so as not to block the view of any of the abutters. I remember these discussions as the board meetings in that period were often held in our living room, that also looked over the waterfront.

Circa 1978, the old chicken coup clubhouse was swallowed by a winter gale and was soon replaced with the new structure, the actual clubhouse that we enjoy today. The new club structure was built on the original in-shore location, fulfilling our obligations to the permit authorities, and our neighbors.

Ironically, Gardner Brown was likely one of the most devoted one design sailors at HYC, next to Jack Burwell, having facilitated both the start of the Ensign, Etchells and Rhodes 19 racing at the club. He would have unquestionably been one of the most active supporters of the Hoist project if he had lived to see it as it facilitated the objectives of the club, and in no way blocked his view of the waterfront.

I also remember that not all the members were for this idea of club parking lot expansion, or the new clubhouse, as the club suited them and their uses just fine as it was. However, as has been the

tradition at HYC, each generation has benefited from visionary members that have shaped facilities and programs that have evolved from the humble beginnings in the loft of the Soule building at SFYB, to where we are today, still fulfilling the club's founders objectives. An equally important tradition is that those that did not see the vision themselves did not stand in the way of those that could. Some in the current HYC family are not ready for the hoist, but like the parking lot and clubhouse, I am confident future generations will applaud this foresight and that we did not waiver from the club's objectives.

2

Reply

David Kent

4 months ago

WHEN IS A PROMISE NOT A PROMISE?

Yesterday, I was invited to a meeting between HYC and a neighbor. The topic of the meeting was the results of the club's land survey and how that survey impacted upon the dock/hoist layout that is being proposed. The survey showed property lines that projected outward from the shore. It was clear that there are conflicts with our neighbors between the dock layout, and the property lines, and setback requirements. In addition, documents were discussed that showed the history between the club and our neighbors that has a bearing upon current plans. I will attempt to explain what I saw and heard.

Back in 1971 the club wanted to expand the parking lot to be about double in area. The neighbors, particularly those who owned homes that overlooked the project raised objections concerning the "aesthetics," "ugliness," and the project as an "eyesore" both from the land as well as from the water. All of the parties discussed the matter and the club offered to provide a conceptual plan that showed no structures or buildings. All the parties came to an agreement, later ratified in the approval from the Army Corp of Engineers, with the club gaining the right to fill and enlarge the parking lot and the neighbors receiving the promise that no structures would be built on the expanded portion of the parking lot. That promise was documented in several letters from the then Commodore who gave these assurances for the club. The final approval for the parking lot expansion given by the Army Corp of Engineers memorialized the club's commitment as follows:

That no building or other structure may be erected on the fill authorized by this permit unless such building or other structure is appropriately identified and described in the plans and drawings attached hereto; . . . (no building or structure was identified) . . . neither the fill itself nor buildings or structures erected in accordance with the plans and drawings attached hereto may be dedicated to any different use than that contemplated at the time of the issuance of this permit unless a modification of this permit is authorized by the Secretary of the Army or his authorized representative.

The club is now seeking to build a platform and hoist in violation of the promise given to the neighbors and as prohibited by the prior approvals. At the same time the club is asking the neighbors for an agreement to allow our dock system to encroach on their ownership as shown on HYC's survey.

The neighbors are simply asking the club to honor the promise made by the club. Our club is still within their one family neighborhood and it seems the neighbors have a legitimate expectation that our club will honor its promise.

Sailing World: The drive to play hard and play fair extends to all aspects of life, so embodying the Corinthian spirit is an exhaustive life lesson and exercise.

1

Reply

Adam White

4 months ago

Reply to David Kent

No one would doubt your obvious dedication to HYC and tireless work on behalf of the membership. It is also clear that you do not support the hoist.

The meeting you were asked to join the other day was part of ongoing negotiations authorized by the Board of Directors with our neighbors, on behalf of and for betterment of HYC. As with any ongoing negotiations, the

facts and information discussed as part of those discussions are best kept between the parties involved. The posting of this information while these discussions are ongoing does not help the Board in its efforts to reach any mutually beneficial outcome for both the club and the neighbors and furthers this divide amongst the membership.

The document that you are referring to is the 1971 permit that HYC obtained from the Army Corps of Engineers for the parking lot fill. It clearly indicates that additional work is not allowed without further regulatory approval which is consistent with the permitting work in progress that includes the hoist.

Unfortunately, this breach of confidentiality on behalf of the negotiation process only serves to discredit the club and its position and does a disservice to the membership and HYC as a whole.

Adam White
Commodore

0

Reply
Peg Selian
5 months ago
Hi all,

I've been working with Handy Boat, PYC, and Brewers collaborating on a solution to provide an affordable means to launch and haul one design boats for HYC members beginning this Spring. I've presented this offer to Adam and Stuart MacDonald and the plan is to announce this in the Commodore Corner of the February newsletter. After the announcement, I will follow-up with the Spring date, fees, and logistical plan. For now, yes, Brewers is supporting the launching of one designs \$100 per boat in the Spring. HB is welcoming HYC one designs as well. Masts are to be stepped by owner or volunteers. This process has been in play at PYC for a number of years and has worked very well. More details will follow.

4

Reply
Anne Parker
5 months ago

I had the opportunity on Tuesday , the 16th to speak with Tim Tolford, long time member of Portland Yacht Club . He is also a long time friend of Jack Burwell. Tim and I had a discussion about the proposed Hoist and gift from the Burwell Family .

Tim had worked with Peg Selian and he shared with her how PYC every late Spring and again in the Fall worked with Handy Boat to put both Classes of sail boats in the water for summer racing .The agreed upon fee was charged \$ 100 for each boat ,for summer and then again in the Fall . The whole boat launching took 3 to 4 hours each season !

Peg Selian is working with Brewer's to develop an affordable model for one design boats, very similar to the PYC/Handy Boat partnership. More details will be out about this soon but it looks like a wonderful solution to support one design sailing.

Another program PYC started a few years back ,by offering a Intermediate Yacht Club membership to encourage new , younger Members ! They charge no initiation fee and the Annual dues are approximately \$ 600 a year .The age range for Intermediate Membership is 23 to 30. . When you turn 31 you can choose to Transition into Regular Members.

Also the majority of the sailing program participates of the PYC are from families of nonmembers , similar to HYC. HYC is an all volunteer club focused on family ,seamanship, racing, Club events and volunteer support. Things to think about as we move forward .

2

Reply

Vicky Smith

5 months ago

Greetings,

Would the Hoist Committee please post on the website (not on the member forum but as another option to select) all the drawings of the hoist and the platform that have been submitted for permitting? The membership should have the opportunity to see all the drawings and the various measurements.

Also, Peg Selian has worked out an agreement with Brewers for boat hoisting at reasonable rates.

Thanks,

Vicky Smith

1

Reply

Admin

Edward Brainard

5 months ago

Reply to Vicky Smith

Vicky – The documents are available on this page <https://hyc.cc/burwell-hoist-members/>

2

Reply

Adam White

5 months ago

I received this hand written letter from Marilyn Burwell

Dear Commodore White:

It has come to my attention that the club is somewhat divided on the proposed hoist to be funded in part to honor my late husband, Jack.

I think that this is such a wonderful opportunity for Jack’s legacy live on at HYC . For those who may not have known him, Jack was very passionate about building this little club up, competing with the “big guys”, and was one of the first members to take sailboat racing to the “next level”. Jack was also very passionate in his mentoring others get to that next level as well. We think this hoist could help provide that opportunity to support the next generations of competitive sailors who have the drive and desire to succeed, and to make our club proud.

Thank you for your consideration!

Marilyn Burwell

2

Reply

David Kent

5 months ago

It was interesting to hear Charlie Burwell at last week's Board meeting say that the family would be willing to consider an alternative to the hoist as a gift. Previous posts have questioned the potential of a different gift to memorialize impact Jack Burwell had on the lives of young sailors. Perhaps, serious thought should be given to that direction.

0

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

5 months ago

I have completed 4 posts. Please read them in reverse order presented here, starting 2 days ago.

0

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

5 months ago

A CASE TO DELAY THE HOIST VOTE, Part 2- A recommendation

After thinking about how we sold the project to members in 2020 and listening to both sides, I conclude that on our current path members will not be accurately informed before a member authorization vote, which could be sometime in spring. As a result, I ask: "THE BOARD TO CONFIRM THAT THEY WILL NOT DECIDE ON SENDING THE HOIST PROPOSAL TO A MEMBERSHIP VOTE UNTIL THE MEMBERSHIP CAN SAFELY MEET AS A GROUP AT THE CLUB TO DISCUSS THE PROJECT IN-PERSON. I understand this will require us to wait until we can do this safely, given sensible virus restrictions.

I am not saying the path we took to get here was wrong. We made decisions based on the best pandemic information we had in 2020. Nothing needs to be defended. What's done is done. Is there anything to be learned? As the club's most expensive project in history at \$60k, plus a significant new planned initiative to promote one-design keelboat racing, this is the toughest decision we will ever make. Here are some points to consider and questions the board should be able to answer before ordering a vote.

WHAT REASON PREVENTS US FROM DELAYING THE VOTE?

Is there a reason which prevents us from not scheduling a vote until the membership is allowed to catchup. In October, Adam told me there was no reason, like a scheduled event. What has changed?

ARE WE SEEING THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF EXHAUSTION?

This project started with the best interest of the club in mind. Period. Are we now starting to see the result of communication without real-time dialogue? Tensions have surfaced and we are reacting instead of listening. Hoist supporters do not appreciate opposition to their great idea. Though supporters are truly "putting out all the information we can think of" there is distrust and even disinterest to the point of subject exhaustion. A non-supporter just said, "I give up, I don't care what they do anymore." That signals of a serious problem. A vote delay could ease tension and promote non-confrontational communication.

WHY NOT EVALUATE GIFT ALTERNATIVES- THEN OR NOW?

I am guessing most members assume the gift was originally intended as a hoist. That assumption could favorably dispose members toward the hoist. Why is that important? If the initial gift conversation did not specify a hoist, then a discussion of alternatives at the board level would have been reasonable. Either way, it in no way detracts from the fact that the Burwell's fully embrace the hoist project. For members who want a one word answer to whose idea was it, they can answer that themselves from Parker's following January 12 entire written comment sent to me;

“Jack Burwell wanted to do something significant for Jr Sailing, and Marilyn (Jack’s Wife) asked Parker Hadlock, a family friend and mentee of Jack’s to help them determine the right gift, in Jack’s name, that would fulfill his wishes. Parker understood Jack’s passion for one design sailing and that Jack had always wanted hoist at HYC to facilitate the sport in general and youth sailing in particular, and Parker made that recommendation to Marilyn. The Burwell Family liked the idea and after developing the concept further, with some other member support, then pitched the concept to the Board in November of 2019.”

WHY ARE WE DRIVING TO A VOTE DURING A PANDEMIC?

Why are we insisting on doing project education and final authorization during the most contagious part of a global pandemic crisis? Once we feel safe from Covid risks and emotions have cooled, the board can organize the best way to have large group in-person member discussions.

HOW CAN THE BOARD KNOW IF MEMBERS ARE ADEQUATELY INFORMED?

How will the board possibly know ELECTRONICALLY that members are accurately informed and miscommunications are settled? If we can’t answer that now, shouldn’t the board delay the vote now?

ADVANTAGE OF A GROUP MEMBERSHIP MEETING AT THE CLUB

My earlier post, Part 1- How did we get here” went through how a large membership airing and discussion of the project at the club avoids some of the one-way electronic and one-on-one communication problems. It is also the only way for members to envision the whole project (rather than rely on their memory of the club layout) and demonstrate issues that have defied written explanation, like parking impact.

A project authorization membership vote delay would not stop everything. It would halt spending except in support of permitting. And it doesn’t mean we can’t continue planning to reinvigorate one-design racing.

IF WE ARE TO HAVE A HOIST, LET IT BE ON ITS MERITS.

Respectfully,
Bob Harroff
725-2476

1

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

5 months ago

A CASE TO DELAY THE HOIST VOTE, Part 1- How did we Get Here?

This is not coming from a pro nor con hoist perspective. I have put any hoist viability thoughts aside to present an objective look at our situation and a recommendation. FYI, I have not engaged with anyone trying to sell a pro or con position. To make it easier to digest on this Member Discussion format, it is offered in a Part 1 and Part 2 format. An original version of this was sent directly to each Board Member prior to the January 12 board meeting. And from my earlier post, I have only reluctantly decided to post this here when no discussion was allowed in that board meeting.

Somehow some members have ended up in two camps and despite efforts to ease tension and distrust, they are not diminishing. How did we get here? We made reasonable decisions amid massive Covid uncertainty. Nothing needs to be defended. But let me string together how we sold the project in 2020. Later in Part 2, I will explain my reasoning for asking the Board to not schedule a

hoist membership vote until members can safely meet as a group at the club to openly discuss the project.

COVID GREATLY LIMITED OUR ABILITY TO ACCURATELY INFORM MEMBER GROUPS

The March Spring Party was to be the principal way to rollout this project. I don't know whether a full discussion was planned. Whatever the plan, it is clear the limitations we always face in that venue- limited member count, none from out-of-state, hearing problems, side conversations in the back, drinking, etc. Unfortunately, but wisely, it was cancelled due to Covid. So our board made a reasonable decision to rely on; one-on-one selling, our very capable website, and emailing to sufficiently inform members. There was really no apparent alternative and everyone expected it to work.

OUR RELIANCE ON ONE-WAY ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION

Electronic methods are quick, yet sometimes are incomplete and no substitute for a real dialogue. Given our average age, not everyone is willing and able to; read & respond to HYC emails, search websites, or is comfortable submitting a written concern to a club leader. The website Q&A was a good idea. It answered simple questions well, yet for others, the single brief response left them unresolved and sometimes led to deeper unaddressed concerns. Our brand new Member Discussion forum is surfacing opinions well yet could have the same issues above as it is not a real-time interactive conversation. Despite the ever increasing amount of hoist information out there now, many of the same questions and concerns re-surface. Then there is the phenomenon of “dueling emails”, where after several reply exchanges, clear in-context communication was never achieved. The above can leave members feeling frustrated and exhausted. A Hoist Committee leader recently posted that all the negatives have been answered, just not accepted. Does this illustrate a serious disconnect? With respect, yes, many questions have been REPLIED to, but only the person asking will know if it was answered. THERE IS NO WAY TO KNOW IF A CONCERN HAS BEEN ACTUALLY ANSWERED UNLESS YOU DIALOGUE WITH THAT MEMBER.

ONE-ON-ONE IN-PERSON DISCUSSIONS

What could go wrong with these? Occasionally miscommunication has happened. Sometimes a completely opposite answer is given to another member. So which is true? Part of this is the inevitable result of no single hoist committee person being aware of what is said. If members are told different “facts”, trust is lost, the vote could be compromised, and regardless of the vote result, 2021 could be difficult as some friendships fray. ALL OF US ON BOTH SIDES SHOULD BE CAREFUL WHAT WE TELL OTHERS IN OUR ZEAL TO MAKE OUR CASE.

FACE-TO-FACE DISCUSSIONS IN 2020

As some negative member feedback surfaced, a single group of about 20 members was invited to a club “Fireside Chat” discussion in August. A second discussion was held a little later with no additional invitees, though more showed up. Great idea but insufficient numbers. Speaking with 5 attendees, 4 felt their concern was not actually answered. Of course, no one expects such discussions to always end up in perfect agreement. No other group discussions in 2020 were attempted which was a missed opportunity. Face-to-face meetings have been the proven way to ensure there are no misunderstandings with important subjects. Any person can quickly clarify their point. If the answer still isn't clear, then another person with different knowledge can expand the answer, hence communication. EVERYONE NEEDS TO HEAR THE QUESTION ASKED AND HEAR THE SAME COMPLETE ANSWER.

UP NEXT:

Given where we are, the final part of “A Case to Delay the Hoist Vote” will be posted shortly to explain my recommendation.

Respectfully,

Bob Harroff
725-2476

-1

Reply

Daniel Freund

5 months ago

Reading this very, very lengthy blog, I witness educated opinions, real vigor and generally respectful behavior...we are all lucky to participate in HYC. Paraphrasing my good old friend Paul Liscord, 'citizens need to match their vigor about freedom with equal parts of responsibility'. Many of our fellow HYC members are so doing.

I am in favor of the HYC Hoist but as an Associate member, I can no longer vote. However I shall contribute to the building fund.

2

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

5 months ago

The Elephant

When discussing the hoist, there is an elephant in the room- even in Zoom board meetings. The elephant's name is Jack. He is even sensed by those who weren't personally impacted by Jack Burwell's life- like me. As Linda and I listened to 15 annual awards ceremonies, past commodores always said a sentence or two about Jack the person. A few said more words to flesh in the larger story of his life. It made me proud we joined such a club, rather than one which named an award after a benefactor.

We have now read numerous heart felt remembrances recounting how Jack help shape the person they became. These outpourings stand on their own and cannot be diminished. Possibly like others, it feels strangely sacrilegious to ask a question about something with Jack's name on it. The proposed undertaking involves a lot more than bolting a crane to a new wharf. It will affect the club physically, financially, our activities focus, the type new member we desire, etc. All views should be respected. In my two postings to follow, I will attempt to disconnect the above emotions from the complex issues of the decision at hand. If we are to have a hoist, let it be on its true merits.

Up next, A Case to Delay the Hoist Vote, Part 1- How did we get here?

1

Reply

Linda & Robert Harroff

5 months ago

I will be doing several postings soon. They explain my reasoning for asking the board in late December to order a delay in the hoist project authorization vote until members can safely meet as a group to discuss the project in-person.

I learned about the hoist project when dock talk started late July. There were a few inconsistent answers to members. I met with Parker in September and then Adam to hear their thinking behind the project. I expressed concern to both that unresolved questions and some misstatements were causing members to pick sides and were not helping project credibility. Why couldn't we attempt more Covid allowed in-person member meetings with the limited good weather we had left, before people hardened their positions over the winter? Nothing happened. If either wanted to involve me in

brainstorming how to better engage members- just ask. Adam said they wouldn't need any ideas as they planned to do a general membership Zoom meeting.

When nothing happened through December, I sent Adam a draft of my "Case to Delay the Hoist Vote" and then a final copy after several exchanges to clarify. It was obviously very inconvenient timing, considering the tremendous amount of work some have devoted to progress the project. I asked it be included for discussion on the January Board Meeting agenda. When it didn't appear on the agenda I sent a copy to each Board Member. At that January meeting, I was allowed two minutes just prior to adjourning before Adam stopped me and said to just put it on our new member forum. I said, 1) I was not trying to convince members of anything, only to make a case for the board to consider taking an action which might ultimately be in the club's best interest, 2) it was an opportunity for Board Members to challenge anything I presented and hear a few examples of misstatements, if needed, without most members hearing them, and 3) I wanted to sense the Board's reaction to this information. Adam then agreed to discuss it at a special Board Members-only Zoom meeting which apparently will not occur as the expected date has come and gone. So I will reluctantly put this case on our forum.

With Covid gathering restrictions in early spring we had to adapt and were hopeful the available project communication methods would do the job. It should have worked, it could have worked, but in my opinion it wasn't sufficient. So there is really nothing we did in 2020 that needs to be defended. In the following postings, let's first look at the results of how we sold the project. And then I will put forward my reasoning to delay the vote (not stop the project nor permitting).

0

Reply

Ross Cudlitz & Donna Albury

5 months ago

The addition of the hoist is a favorable amenity and necessity for the club to continue to grow by serving its members and youth programs looking ahead. Our ability to host small events is critical to promoting our name and mission for one design racing for youth and potentially Sonar Fleet 26. The visual impacts are minimal and compatible with a functional boat club anywhere on the coast. Any well timed properly addressed minor parking and traffic movement inconveniences are far out weighed by the generous opportunity and future vision this affords HYC. Growth and change can be good if well managed.

4

Reply

Ted & Susie Gribbell

5 months ago

With the club's mission to promote boating, power and sail, and seamanship...the hoist offers a terrific opportunity:

To launch/haul boats with less tide dependency, boost the sailing program and increase our ability to host regattas.

To aid members' mast stepping with boats that "fit".

To help with emergencies where a small boat is in need (member/non-member/visitor).

The hoist would be an asset all around — offering water access and furthering the yacht club mission.

4

Reply

Ray Ramage

5 months ago

The Burwell family is quite generous in proposing this gift. However the hoist needs considerable additional funding and annual maintenance.

I would prefer that HYC spend money improving our infrastructure; grounds, clubhouse and perhaps paving the parking lot. I realize this has little to do with youth sailing but I would rather see a general improvement of our facilities.

0

Reply

Gigi & Dana Leonard

5 months ago

After reading all the input, reviewing the documentation that was sent to members, and discussing pros and cons ourselves, we feel that some other option than the hoist should be considered for the Burwell gift. The points put forward by David Kent and David Kaufman seem the most cogent and lead us to this conclusion. We fail to see how the addition of a hoist would significantly benefit Youth Sailing at HYC, and we believe there would be significant negative impact on club operations should a hoist be put in place.

If it is determined that the club wishes to fund launching and hauling of members trailerable keel boats in certain circumstances, this would be better and more cost-effectively done commercially off site. We believe that, even if the club must forgo such a generous donation as \$20,000, we should do so rather than proceeding to install a hoist. However, we hope that other proposals that better benefit Youth Sailing and are acceptable to the Burwell family will be proposed for this donation.

At some point we need to vote on the Hoist Proposal. Prior to the vote, we should consider other options that would better promote Youth Sailing at HYC.

Dana & Gigi Leonard

2

Reply

Vicky Smith

6 months ago

Good morning members,

I have had a chance to re-read all the comments below, and I request that the Board schedule a general vote on this project only after the Membership can gather together and meet in-person to discuss all aspects of the project.

I know that I am repeating myself, but I feel that this is critical.

I believe that it is best to have Members actively listen to those on both sides and engage in a constructive verbal discussion of the salient points. The goal is to clearly disseminate all information in real time, and to hear each other out in an open setting. It may take more than one gathering; but this allows all interested Members to attend and hear the pros and cons as a group. It gives us a chance to truly listen.

Of course, current global events have precluded an open gathering, but HYC should not adhere to an arbitrary time-line on such an important decision. No prudent member would approve such a momentous project until all sides have been given the time and space to speak. We are not held to a time element that requires a decision; we will meet when it is safe to do so.

I want to believe that the Board has the best intentions to seek the will of the people. I do believe that this is the primary responsibility of the Board, to encourage the membership to reach a consensus based on the equitable exchange of views. The Board must strive to be neutral on this issue as it best

guides the Club through “choppy waters”. We all share a love for this club and I believe we all want to support the HYC mission– even when there are differences in this interpretation.

I am encouraging the Board to adopt this approach, which I hope will lead to a respectful outcome of a vote.

To this end, I am asking the Board to announce their intentions on a vote by the February Board meeting. I also ask that all members be encouraged to attend this meeting to hear the Board’s plans on the scheduling of a vote. Too many people are anxious and do not know the time-frame of the Board on this issue.

Thanks again

0

Reply

Hoist Committee

6 months ago

To the Flag officers and membership of the Harrasseeket Yacht Club

When John Amory hired me at the age of 16 to run the junior sailing program at HYC in 1964, I thought I was a pretty hot sailor. I had won some championships in Turnabouts, crewed on some big boat races and knew a lot more knots than I knew a use for. What I didn’t know anything about was adult one-design racing.

Enter Jack Burwell and his gorgeous, home-built wooden Lightning. He showed me and many other young sailors a path to adult sailing. Not only did he take many of us kids along to sail in other venues opening the wider world of sailing to us, he did it with a joyful, if occasionally raunchy, humor, treating us as the adults we aspired to be. He was a great mentor to me and many others. Years later when we both were sailing J-24s he was my favorite competitor, modest in victory, gracious in defeat.

Now you have a chance to honor Jack’s legacy by installing a lift that will encourage the kind of junior to adult one-design that was his joy. But it is not only his legacy that will benefit, but generations of sailors to come.

Win Fowler

3

Reply

Hoist Committee

6 months ago

The Hoist Committee appreciates the comments posted on the HYC website titled Burwell Hoist Member Discussion. We have learned from this exchange and would like to occasionally share our thoughts with all HYC members.

For clarity, the Hoist committee is not focused on topics that predate the Burwell Memorial Hoist Proposal such as:

- The permitting process for the proposed float expansion predates and is separate from the hoist discussion. We understand this includes sensitive activity (neighbor relations / surveys / attorneys etc.) and any questions about this subject matter should be directed to the Board of Directors.
- The process by which the club accepts a gift. The Board of Directors is making policy in this regard.
- The process by which a One Design Class is selected. There is a separate committee established for that process. The committee is working on a rollout of its findings in the coming months.

We also think it is helpful to all of us to regularly restate the HYC Objective to inform the discussion on the roots of our club in the eyes of our founders:

- The objective of the club shall be to encourage and promote the sport of boating and the science of seamanship and navigation particularly for the instruction of the youth of this area and to do all things necessary or incidental through volunteerism to the accomplishment and fulfillment of said purposes”.

The following responses to comments & questions are intended to further the understanding of the goals of the Proposal and how it fits with the HYC Objectives:

- The hoist committee encourages continued open, honest & civil discussion regarding the hoist and understands that some members may not support the hoist.
- Some members have commented that their concerns go unanswered. In November, a complete information package was sent to the membership via US mail, email, and posted on the website too. In that 35-page package was the description of the project and a section of frequently asked questions posed over the previous 6 months. Also included in that package was the personal cell phone number of every Hoist Committee member. We encourage club members to call ANY of the Hoist Committee with ANY questions.
- Some members have observed that the reasons to have a hoist are varied and that somehow makes the original mission questionable. We would offer that many people see the value of the Hoist in slightly different ways. The wishes of the Burwell Family were to make a substantial gift that would enhance youth sailing at HYC. Facilitating One Design racing provides a higher skill level of sailing which provides a platform to mentor eager young sailors in the sailing program, as well as those who have aged out of the sailing program by providing the “next step” in this life sport. This is precisely what Jack Burwell did for many in the club.
- Several HYC members have observed that the roll out was “uneven” or poorly done. That is a fair assessment, and we ask that the membership be tolerant. The Hoist Committee planned to roll the project out at the icebreaker in 2020 and planned more group discussions and information sharing across the spring and summer. That plan was thrown off course by the pandemic. Many of us were trying to keep our businesses safe and functioning and the Hoist was not our top priority at the time.
- Some commented that the Hoist Committee did not draw on the membership for input. That would be incorrect as the Committee is made up of past commodores, sailing program directors, experienced one design and offshore racers, new members, seasoned members, employed members and retired members.
- Some question what evidence is there that a hoist would foster a group of young sailors or a one design fleet. The evidence is all around us! There is no active one design racing at HYC, almost no active one design racing in Maine, yet there is extensive one design racing at clubs that have a hoist. Just a sampling of venues frequented by HYC members include Marblehead MA, Mallets Bay Vt, Lake George NY, Noroton CT, Newport RI, Severn Sailing Assoc MD (note...many of these clubs have MULTIPLE hoists demonstrating the success that they endeavor to repeat). We have Google maps of each of these successful facilities if anyone would like them sent to their email address.
- The question above provides an opportunity to restate how the hoist facilitates One Design, youth sailing and ultimately our Club Objectives:
 - o Facilitate those wishing to expand their horizons and increase their skill by providing haul & launch capability on their schedule without a prohibitive cost to attend regional and national regattas.
 - o Our youth sailors have an opportunity to participate in and be taught what is required to compete in everything from Wednesday night racing to National Championships including boat preparation, time management, teamwork, extreme sailing conditions and sportsmanship just to name a few.
 - o The traveling competitors from HYC increase the skill in the local fleet, the added venues increase

participation in the short term and sustain participation over the long haul.

o We attract a member type with active interest, mentorship skills to teach others, in a “do it yourself” backdrop of volunteerism...all basic tenets of the founders’ Club Objective.

- Some have noted that we do not have room for boat storage, or deep-water, and there is a mooring shortage. These are all true facts. This statement causes us to ask, “is the membership giving up on the club objectives because it hard to do?” We think our founders would be disappointed in us if we just did what was easy. The answers to these concerns are:

o Boat storage was never the goal, nor a necessity as the boats are intended to be active locally (in the water) or traveling.

o We are tide constrained, but that was a compromise in cost, permit and club uses, and a ½ tide hoist gives 12 hrs. per day of access (and even more if a retractable keel boat is selected)

o Freeport has had mooring limitations for at least 30 years, yet somehow we manage. Many members would alter the use of their mooring if they changed boats, and some of us will just die off and provide space for others. We are endlessly creative on how to more effectively use the asset limitations we have.

- There are some misstatements in the forum. We offer the following corrections:

o Every club mentioned above as having a hoist provides it for member use without an official “operator” and many of us have used those hoists personally. Using these hoists are exceptionally simple, and they are specifically chosen for that reason. Despite the simplicity we will institute a certification in an abundance of caution.

o Traffic congestion comes up often and that tells us we have not framed the use well enough.

Imagine 2 boats decide to go to an away regatta for the weekend. Some weeknight they haul and load after work. Three people can haul and prep a boat to travel in ½ hour easily. The trailer is on the hoist pier and the tow vehicle takes one parking space for this period w/ no net effect on the club logistics. Like our float privileges, the membership relies on commonsense and courtesy to make all of our varied usage patterns work and this will be no different.

o Private boatyard costs are an obstacle for many. A recent invoice for the launch and haul of a J22 exceeded \$1000, not to mention the inconvenience of being limited to the boatyard schedule and the inappropriate use of travel lift slings on a paint-free race bottom. If a skipper chose to attend 4 regattas in a season, that is a \$4000 impediment.

o There is no ancillary equipment storage at the club. Every owner of boat wishing to use the hoist must have the lift strap for their own boat. Part of the certification process will be to teach members who are new to a hoist to set up their lift strap correctly.

The Hoist Committee has the long-term goals of the club in mind — formed by decades of experience in One Design Sailboat racing and youth sailing. We all are the beneficiaries of the “pay it forward” investments of the previous generations at HYC. This effort for HYC is the opportunity to keep that forward-thinking tradition.

Please keep the questions coming and have a great February.

1

Reply

Stafford Soule

6 months ago

The hoist has certainly resulted in animated discussion within the club, but that’s not what I’d like to talk about today. I’d like to step back and highlight a silver lining perspective of the great progress that has resulted and to recognize and celebrate the work of a few of people, in particular. In all of the passionate discussion, great work can be sometimes overlooked. Here are a few highlights.

- When it became apparent that we were at an impasse last summer, Adam and Stuart initiated facilitated sessions for the Board to revisit our mission and to identify gaps that prevent us from

achieving it. While this may seem like an easy step to take, trust me, it is not. Having done this several times during my career, the mention of a facilitator can often meet great resistance from those involved. I applaud all those involved for embracing this approach.

- This work identified gaps in our bylaws that needed to be addressed. Adam established a committee to draft a Gift Acceptance Policy and a Capital Policy. These policies have been completed and will go to membership for a vote at a future meeting.
- Part of the Board discussions also recognized the demise of our one design fleet. Adam formed a One Design Fleet Committee headed by Peter Selian to try to determine the root causes of this decline and how to best reestablish one. This work will be very informative about what is most important to re-establish a fleet at HYC.
- Faced with the challenges of communicating during a pandemic, Adam commissioned a team to create this very discussion forum so that members could freely express their points of view. As a reminder, the purpose of the forum is to be able to hear different perspectives from members regarding the hoist and how best to move forward with the process.
- I'd also like to call out Barney Baker's heroic work in the permitting process. I imagine that he thought that, going into this, it would be a simple process that he has done many times before. However, the process took many twists and turns including the need to permit a couple of existing floats, address issues with the neighbors, and work with lawyers and surveyors to ascertain our RTI and littoral rights. I can't imagine the hundreds of hours that he has put into this. I've watched Barney donate his time on this type of work at HYC for 20+ years. He is both skilled and dedicated.
- And, whether you agree with them or not, the Hoist Committee has put in a ton of time designing a hoist with good intent for our younger sailors.
- Finally, I'd like to thank the HYC members on both sides of this issue. While it is certainly uncomfortable at times, the passion expressed is all about what is best for the Club. We need to bottle this passion and align it behind a common goal.

So, where does this leave us? Adam has mapped out a plan that is logical to me.

- Continue to collect member respectful thoughts on this forum.
- Wait for the survey results to understand what our options are. Concurrently, wait for a legal opinion to determine our Rights, Title and Interest. Until these are determined, it would be impractical to proceed down any particular path. The outcomes from these will have a major impact on the options available to the Club.
- Once we understand our options, work with our neighbors to repair our relationships with them. Not only should we be good neighbors, but we need to come to a common agreement so that we aren't fighting battles for many years to come.
- At that point in time, the Board will be in a position to assess all of the input from members, the Hoist Committee and the One Design Committee, match these against our available options, consider possible paths with our neighbors, and develop a recommendation to take to membership.

The bottom line for me is that I need to have patience with the process and let it run its course. I need to continue to provide feedback on this forum respectfully. I need to support Adam and the Board with any needs that they have. I need to give them the space to do their work and trust that they will do what is in the best interest of the Club. I know that it is so hard to patiently sit back and wait for the process to unfold but that is what I need and plan to do.

7

Reply

Hugh Bowen

6 months ago

Hello All, I am a proponent for the hoist. In my life/business I live by the motto: "better to have tried and failed...". There is no doubt the hoist would aid the sailing program, especially during the

annual regatta. Whether or not it would help propel one's sailing career beyond is not really important, it's important that it COULD help, its mere existence and this process will put membership and youth in the mind set of encouraging such exploits beyond the sailing program. I also see countless other uses under proper training/usage. A hoist would provide an excellent addition to our infrastructure.

3

Reply

Vicky Smith

6 months ago

Dear Fellow members,

After reading the postings below, I am grateful for the time, respect, and consideration folks have put into their remarks.

I do not believe that the considered remarks given by those that are questioning the use & validity of a hoist are based in fear. Nor do I believe that it is "chatter" as it has been called in a prior posting. These are realistic concerns many members have. I think that we can all agree that a hoist will significantly change the way the Club and the grounds will be used.

As you know I do not support the hoist, but I know those who believe in it and I respect their viewpoints. I feel both sides believe their viewpoints advance their hopes and vision for the Club. I also feel that the proper dissemination of information has been completely hampered by the Pandemic. I can see that both sides would find this to be difficult and frustrating.

I ask that the Board postpone the Hoist vote until everyone has had a chance to meet in a face to face forum, where all remarks can be heard in "real time". I ask that we consider how all Members can best be informed— it supports the democratic process. I agree with a previous remark- if people feel they have been heard, I think they will be willing to support the outcome of a vote.

I ask that we take all the time necessary to consider all aspects, it will serve us well as we move forward as a group of people who share a love for our Club.

Thanks,

Vicky Smith

1

Reply

Vicky Smith

6 months ago

Dear Hoist Committee, I am not sure where to find the Hoist schematics, would you be able to post them on the website? Thanks

0

Reply

Stafford Soule

6 months ago

Reply to Vicky Smith

Hi Vicki. I am not on the committee, but if you scroll to the top of the discussion forum, under Burwell Hoist Member Discussion the word "website" is highlighted and is a link that will take you to a letter from Adam and then several documents related to the hoist, including the site plan.

2

Reply

William Creighton

6 months ago

Greetings,

I have read the postings below... and observed/listened to a variety of discussions over the past months. Until now, I have felt that as a newby to the club, I could not offer much of use, nor perhaps, even be welcome to participate in a conversation where past experience and knowledge of HYC history seems to be held in high regard. But after observing this week's inauguration, and in particular Amanda Gorman's moving call to action, I feel moved to offer a perspective. But since I am a new member, I feel it worth painting a brief picture of who I am for those who do not know my story.

I grew up attending the Manchester Yacht Club (Manchester, Mass) youth sailing program. I capsized Turn-abouts as a 5 year old. Went on to Lightnings, then 110's. I was never much bitten by the racing bug, but the lessons in seamanship were seeds that went deep into fertile soil. I spent 4 glorious summers at the Alamoosook Camp near Bucksport where I learned to sail the Schooner Alamar under the guidance of Carl Chase. I spent most of my adolescent years on a variety of craft in Penobscot Bay (cruising, gunkholing around in outboards... whatever) I went on to work for Carl right after high school, rebuilding, then sailing, the Schooner Nathaniel Bowditch for 3 years. I worked at the Benjamin River boatyard for a year or two, fished commercially out of Stonington. I reared two daughters in Deer Isle and South Bristol, teaching them to sail an O'Day 17'... Eventually I moved on to a Morris Leigh 30 (now cared for and loved by Jeff Stenzel)... and later to my Pacific Seacraft 40, Toda. I started and (for ten years) ran the Sea Tow franchise in the Boothbay Region. I have made two transatlantic passages, and numerous offshore voyages between Maine and the Caribbean, and Maine and the Maratimes. My younger daughter sailed competitively at Tufts, and then went on to campaign for and ultimately complete the Mini Transat (a sole race from France to Brazil in a 21' watermelon seed with a rig the size of a toothpick!) She then went on to campaign a class 40 for two years. I lay this out to let you know that I think I know something about boats, and boating.

Most of the negative posts that I have read here, reflect the same thing: fear. Fear that the routine parking will somehow be altered. Fear that there will be liability. Fear that someone might be hurt. Fear that money might be spent in one way when it ought to be spent in another. I get that. Fear is the most singly dominant cultural norm presently at play in this nation, and in many parts of the globe. It has great power. At its best, we derive some perceived sense of safety from it. At its worst, it stifles our creative ability to be who we are or can be. There's not a lot that can be done with fear if people are committed to being stuck in it. One cannot argue it away with logic, because our frontal lobes (the neocortex of the brain) becomes inaccessible to us when we are following the dictates of our amygdala's. The best one can hope for is that one might choose to self-soothe. But if we are committed to remaining fearful... we will do so.

I see the potential of a hoist at HYC as a magical and wonderful thing. We can only imagine the ways in which it may serve to enhance the boating experience for members of the club, and broader community. (When Emma was training in her mini, it was REALLY hard to find places to launch a trailered boat with 6' draft... even though only 21' long. Unless she wanted to spend big bucks ... which aspiring sailors rarely have!) Who knows what young kid will be fascinated by the action of launching by hoist and go on to become a crane operator... or boat yard manager... Never mind the opportunities for racing and regatta activities already described by others who know much more about that whole world than I.

The bottom line... I think the hoist is a fabulous idea. It offers opportunities for both inter-, and independence for the members of the club and those around us in the community at large who have fewer and fewer points of access to the water and boating activities. It offers opportunities for

learning. It offers opportunities for self sufficiency. Whatever the fears, let us use them as a source of growth and opportunity rather than a shrinking and diminishing of our potential.

“The new dawn blooms as we free it
For there is always light,
if only we’re brave enough to see it
If only we’re brave enough to be it”

Bill Creighton

2

Reply

Peg Selian

6 months ago

All,

Parker, I’m sorry you feel the way you do regarding my last post. It was not my intention to call out your integrity. What you wrote in your post about how this gift transpired, is spot on. What is not said, other ideas are welcomed. The Board nor membership had the opportunity to explore other recommendations when this was first introduced, because it was understood as not an option. I don’t have strong feelings either way with the hoist, despite what some people think, other than ensuring the entire membership fully understands all the facts surrounding the Burwell gift. In my view, we should be given the same opportunity to explore other proposals, as the hoist has been given, and when all proposals are fully vetted, then make a final vote. If, in the end, the membership wants a hoist, I will fully support it. I’m simply requesting we have other recommendations for consideration, before making this commitment. Whether we put this matter on hold, continue as a work in progress, either way, if agreeable to explore other options by all, it will require more time, resources, another committee following process and policies that have recently been developed, etc. We have several other initiatives that we’d like to pursue for the betterment of our club. The Hoist has been fully consuming for well over a year. It is my desire the Board make a motion(s) on how to proceed in the February 2021 meeting.

As for the Hoist critical to fostering one design – this doesn’t make sense to me. If there were several Maine Yacht Clubs with hoists, maybe it would make it easier to participate, but not revitalize at HYC, in my view. PYC tried, but they couldn’t, so it’s not about getting other clubs on board with this concept. Trust me, I’ve spent enough time launching-hauling J24’s from local town ramps. If this exists at HYC only, that’s not going to help me in other venues. My suggestion, encourage a one design that has a retractable keel such as a J70 that doesn’t require a lift, I believe that’s the vision to pursue for revitalizing one design at HYC, in my view.

Finally, it’s my deepest belief everyone in this club wishes the best means to preserve Jack Burwell’s legacy that he so deserves and one day, soon, we can raise our glass (or whatever) to this amazing club and how privileged we are to be a part of this extraordinary community.

-Peg Selian

2

Reply

W. Parker Hadlock

6 months ago

All – we received this letter from Tony Parker, skipper in the Congressional cup years, Americas cup crew, and reigning East Coast Champion in the J24 class.

I grew up in South Freeport. My Dad, Harry Parker, co-founded the yacht club with a wonderful group of like-minded parents who felt that teaching their children a love of sailing and the sea was an important part of raising their children.

Our whole family lived at the club. It was integral to our lives, plain and simple.

I have had sailing all of my life. Because of my sailing grounding at HYC, I became New England Junior Sailing Champ, captained the sailing team at Harvard, sailed in the America's Cup trials, raced my J24 for 42 years and have done at least 16 Bermuda Races. And without what HYC offered, I would have had none of that.

The goal of any club is to make sailing as accessible as it can to everyone, particularly children. Having a hoist will increase that access. I am a believer in the words, "If you build it, they will come."

I think it will open up opportunities that even the proponents haven't thought of. It will promote more sailing, the reason why the club was built 73 years ago.

I would urge you to support the plan to put in the hoist.

Sincerely,

Tony Parker

3

Reply

John Grillo

6 months ago

Dear Fellow Members,

It probably doesn't surprise anybody that I've been thinking a lot about the proposed hoist project. I have to say that right from the beginning I have been impressed by the people involved in putting forth this idea. They are some of our best and most competitive sailors in the club. Don't get me wrong, we have great sailors at HYC. What I'm talking about is something different. These folks have competed regionally and nationally on one design boats and PHRF. What we have at present is a unique situation. An eagerness by a very experienced group to vitalize our club with the addition of a tool that will assist in the development of a venue for our young sailors who matriculate from the sailing program to keelboat competition and the financial contribution to make this tool easily achievable.

This proposal comes from the best of all possible motives....moving the club towards the further enabling of the mission.

I have obviously heard all the negatives related to this project. They have all been answered but not accepted. Some continue to lobby their viewpoint to bring others along to their way of thinking. It has become a war of e-mails and it seems to be getting us nowhere.

This proposal is a bold form of thinking that needs people to trust in the folks moving it forward and think about how much this would benefit the club. A tool, such as the hoist, and the group that is working on bringing competitive keelboats to the club would revitalize HYC. Opportunity, distinction, fun and engagement of our post sailing program youth.

I am not a one-design sailor. Everything I learned about sailing I learned at HYC. The folks driving this proposal are my mentors. They have lived the past and see the future of our club. I trust them and am willing to let them lead us to what is best for HYC.

Not being a one-design sailor myself I have had to understand the need and uses of the hoist. There is no question in my mind that the following are great reasons to move ahead:

– A useful tool for the membership...dinghy launching/retrieval

- Small boat mast stepping- We have 27 small sailboats on the membership roster. Many could benefit from doing things themselves
- We are a do-it yourself club. No question this would make things easier
- Coach boat launching during regattas or other times
- No commercial use
- We already have most of the pledged and contributed part of the funding
- The Club’s portion is \$20,000 Not 60K as others have put forth

There is a lot of chatter about why we shouldn’t do this. It seems to be coming from several places. Traffic, it won’t work, too many things could go wrong, not in my back-yard and outright blocking of our permits from non-member neighbors. Every single one of these issues have a solution and most have been answered. No question that the project would be fine tuned and definitely, a work in progress.

Whatever you can do, or dream you can, begin it. Boldness has genius, power and magic in it.”

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

John Grillo

4

Reply

Susan Hadlock

6 months ago

Hi Adam,

Hope you are doing well.

Please find below an e-mailed letter I received from a close friend mine and our family. He and I were discussing the lift and he offered to write a letter to the HYC membership:

Charlie Burwell

Esteemed Board Members and General Membership Harraseeket Yacht Club,

It is with great honor & pleasure that I am able to write to you on behalf of the memory of my dear friend, and loyal Harraseeket Yacht Club member, Jack Burwell.

I understand that you may be considering the construction of a one design hoist in memory of Jack. I could not imagine a more fitting memorial that would serve as both a reminder of club loyalty & devotion, as well as an incredible tool to help advance one design sailing for the fortunate youth of your esteemed Club.

I, myself, am a lifelong sailor and as a youth, I was incredibly fortunate to have men like Jack Burwell around to give back to the sport. The tools were laid out in front of me to access my lifelong passion and excel in sailboat racing from a club level all the way to The America’s Cup, Round the World Races, and multiple World Championships. My access to seamanship, navigational skills & tools, and lessons, only teachable at sea, were afforded to me through the foresight & generosity of those who preceded me.

I understand that this is a large undertaking, but I urge you to thoughtfully consider how the addition of such a hoist would benefit your current & future members.

If you are to decide to move forward with this project, please count on me for a modest donation.

Thank you very much for your time & consideration.

Sincerely,

Josh Belsky

(Josh Belsky has competed in multiple America's Cups and hails from Rye, New York. He was a pitman on board America3 when it defended the 1992 America's Cup. Belsky sailed with Team Dennis Conner when they lost the 1995 America's Cup. He then was on board EF Language (skipped by Paul Cayard) when they won the 1997–98 Whitbread Round the World Race. Belsky then joined Cayard in AmericaOne Challenge for the 2000 Louis Vuitton Cup. Josh later joined Alinghi and sailed with them when they won the 2003 America's Cup and successfully defended the 2007 America's Cup.)

2

Reply

W. Parker Hadlock

6 months ago

All –

The hoist committee agreed upon an ethos that we would NOT respond to individual member comments, but rather learn from them and then respond as a group to answer concerns or adjust our course, or both.

Peg Selian's accusatory letter to the board, and copied here, causes me to break w/ this ethos as it attacks my integrity, and I was encouraged to respond directly to the forum (as i did w/ the Board in the wake of Peg's letter) by members of the Hoist Committee.

For the record, below is what precisely transpired with regard to the origin of the Burwell proposed gift:

“Jack Burwell wanted to do something significant for Jr Sailing, and Marilyn (Jack's Wife) asked Parker Hadlock, a family friend and mentee of Jack's to help them determine the right gift, in Jack's name, that would fulfill his wishes. Parker understood Jack's passion for one design sailing and that Jack had always wanted hoist at HYC to facilitate the sport in general and youth sailing in particular, and Parker made that recommendation to Marilyn. The Burwell Family liked the idea and after developing the concept further, with some other member support, then pitched the concept to the Board in November of '19.”

Not once since the initial board meeting roll out over a year ago has Peg asked me a single question directly about the hoist project. I would have thought that with so many of us with roots in the club supporting it, more questions would have been asked about why we think it is important to the mission of HYC.

I would also be pleased to hear directly from any members any day after 5pm (838-8162) to have that discussion. The hoist committee would like to return to a conversation about the merits of the project as it relates to the objectives of the club, AND how we can mitigate concerns raised. I believe we would all benefit from that dialogue.

Have a nice weekend!

-1

Reply

Stephanie Paine & John Pier

6 months ago

It is my understanding that the original Burwell gift though incredibly generous would pay for only a part of the hoist project. Perhaps, the gift could be redesignated for another worthwhile cause as it seems that the club is quite divided and it will cost membership money (I understand quite a bit) either through donations, fees, or savings to pay for a hoist.

0

Reply

Eileen Peterson

6 months ago

The Burwell family's generosity in honor Jack's memory has found itself in the middle of a conflict with questions being posed and markedly differing opinions that require answers and resolution, and perhaps a review of our mission and passions as a membership. How lovely of Jack's family and what a difficult situation all at once. Is this yet another consequence of this pandemic when we cannot meet in person to discuss and find agreement? I have read comments and hold many of the concerns expressed. As a member of the House Beautification Committee, I will add one further bit of information that has not been shared for consideration by the membership: we will need to create additional greenspace to replace that which would be eliminated by the hoist due to maximum shoreland threshold of 20% non-vegetated. While a small area, roughly 163 sq ft, the new greenspace would be required by the project review board and would be created within our physical footprint. Thank you for the forum and the opportunity to read and comment. That is all I wish to say right now.

2

Reply

Peg Selian

6 months ago

I received a letter from an HYC member addressed to Board Members. Although, I no longer sit on the Board as of Dec 8th, 2020, I took the opportunity to reply to this letter....

You are correct in that the Burwell family did not mandate their gift be a hoist, but they support the idea of a hoist. This became a recent revelation for me after I pursued inviting a Burwell family member to join the Board meeting tonight. Unfortunately, that's not how it was presented to the Board in Dec 2019 and Jan 2020. I asked the question specifically of Parker in Dec 2019 and he couldn't answer the question, but promised to follow up in January. John Grillo reported in our Jan 2020 meeting the Burwells' have requested a hoist and no other ideas are to be considered. There was also urgency in Parker's presentation on Dec 2019 that if we didn't act quickly, we may lose their gift. He wasn't sure if there were tax advantages to this gift. The timing of this presentation was not optimal for many reasons, one being we needed our Dec meeting to pass the budget. And, as a board member, I had no heads up about this idea nor background information beforehand to properly comment in our Dec meeting other than deferring it. With that, it was clear we needed to hear from members and the next step was for Adam to write a letter to all conveying this gift, establishing a Q&A forum, and further follow-up at our March 2020 icebreaker party. Adam wrote the letter (Feb 10, 2020), Q&A was established immediately following the letter, but Covid19 came along and you know the rest.

I agree with many of your points in this letter. In my view, this began to derail when a few people's passion, possibly personal agendas, influenced the Burwells' generous gift to the Club resulting in just enough misinformation (not all due to electronic communication) and hence the unintended consequences. We have life long relationships that have been strained, if not severed. Trust, ethics, in my view, have been compromised and I don't believe it was done intentionally. I'm in no way saying it's a one person or a group of people, but more a lack of process and policy at HYC. The latter has now been established, hence why I'm encouraging the Board to take a stand by voting on this gift using these new policies and processes as the basis. It's been well over a year where the Hoist committee has had many opportunities to deliver what they need to the Board and membership. The time and money to send each member a packet must have been significant, as well. At what point do we say enough? My hope is the Board vote to put this on hold until the hoist committee can regroup,

refine their proposal, and present it again through the process and policies we've now created. Ideally, I'd like to rename the committee to "Burwell Gift Committee" and present all options, which could include the hoist. Just because we vote today, does not mean future proposals can't be made. In the meanwhile, all the extraordinary HYC members can redirect their energies by fostering the spirit of what we value so much, the camaraderie, friendships, family, sailing-boating, gatherings at the clubhouse, on the water, etc. If we have to spend another year or more where this is front and center of our club, the future of our club could be further compromised.

0

Reply

Mark Peterson

6 months ago

Comments on the Hoist Project from Mark Peterson:

I appreciate this forum to offer comments. One of my concerns has been that a balanced view of the project has not been widely conveyed to the membership, and this space provides that for members willing to spend a little time making inquiry. The Hoist Project is an important milestone in the club's evolution, and I hope the full membership is able to appreciate the pros and cons in a meaningful way.

I have followed the development of the Hoist proposal since Adam White brought it to my attention nearly a year ago. I offered email comments then and have generally kept abreast of the project development since, however, I have felt that the project had a momentum all it's own and much of the rationale justifying the Hoist was a foregone conclusion. That said, I appreciate that there has been a concerted effort by many to slow down, back-up, look at the process and assess the merits of the project from a broader perspective.

The comments below address this broader perspective and I agree with all of them. David Kent's comprehensive and eloquent comments make so many key points that must be considered, perhaps the most important being that there is no evidence that a hoist will attract younger sailors nor be the elixir to establish a one design fleet. David Kaufman and Al Voskian made the same point and added that the entire hoist function could be outsourced to Strout's/Brewers more effectively, with much less cost and risk. Many comments were made concerning worthy alternate uses of the \$60k currently estimated for the project – I liked Tom Leach's idea of a Laser fleet and/or an endowment for the Youth Sailing Program.

Just about everyone commented on the elephant in the room – our little parking lot footprint is entirely too small to support this project and the attendant boat/trailer/gear and storage congestion whenever a keel boat is launched or hauled (not to mention more than one boat). Despite the hoist committee's assertion this will not be a problem, I respectfully counter that it will be a major problem. Safety concerns, hoist operation training, moorings for a one design fleet, ongoing maintenance requirements are all valid concerns. And while some discount the aesthetic impacts of a hoist as superficial, I believe it would have a significant detrimental effect at HYC. My recurring thought is that the hoist will likely be used by a limited few but will impact the club use by many – do we really need it?

Finally, again like many have commented below, I think we need to revisit and not forget the objectives of the club to encourage and promote the sport of boating and the science of seamanship and navigation. These were the foundational tenets of the YSP experience that our children enjoyed in their happy journey from recruits to senior sailing instructors at HYC. Today in their late 30's they both have a joy and intense passion for boats, sailing and being on the water that has nothing to do with competitive racing.

Respectfully,
Mark Peterson

0

Reply

Vicky Smith

6 months ago

I believe there has been a lack of transparency from day one of the project.

There are two areas where there has not been a full disclosure to the Club of the activities of certain members that represent our Club to regulatory agencies.

A. Permitting for the docks

1. Why were the docks put in without proper permitting? Who's responsibility is it to make sure that HYC complies with all legal requirements set by the appropriate regulatory body for the permitting of docks?
2. Why did the Club pay for a new survey?
3. Why hasn't the HYC replied to the questions submitted by the DEP since last August?
4. Why has the Club ganged the Hoist permit with the dock permits? What would be the cost of the permitting for the Hoist was done separately?
5. The DEP has asked the Club to "work things out with abutting neighbors" why hasn't this been done?
6. The Club was asked last December to post all upcoming meetings with permitting agencies on the Club calendar. Why hasn't this been done as of today?

B. Hoist:

1. Did the Burwell family initially offer a gift to the Club specifically for the hoist? It is my understanding that the family approached the Club with a gift without a specific designation. The purpose of the Gift is to honor Jack.
2. Was a hoist suggested to the Burwell family by a Club Member without the approval of the Board?
3. Do we know if the Burwell Family would be happy to have the funds used in another way?
3. Were the Burwells later asked to write a letter endorsing the Hoist project?
4. Did Marilyn Burwell sign the letter herself or was her signature attached without her knowledge? Who put her signature on the Letter?
5. Why was the Land Use designation changed for the Club from Residential Waterfront to Commercial/marina? Why doesn't the Board know who initiated this change? I asked this at the December Board meeting and I have not been given an answer.
6. Now that the Club land is listed as Commercial/marina- does this permit the Hoist to be used for commercial purposes?
7. If one Club member does a job for another Club member using the hoist, and there is an exchange of monies (on or off Club property), does this mean that the Hoist is indeed used for commercial purposes?
8. Does this leave the door open for future commercial use of the Club? Drive through seafood window? Calling number 57!
9. Why has the Club hired an attorney? What is this costing the Club membership? Has the Board been made aware of this hiring and the expenditure?
10. The Club in it's original charter with regard to the parking lot- is not permitted to add onto the parking area with any built item- this includes a hoist structure. IS the Hoist Committee aware of this?
11. How much has been spent on this project so far? Is there any money left of the original donation after permitting fees, Club-wide mailing, survey, attorney?

12. Is all this expenditure prudent when the original donation was never vetted by the Board for the best use according to all members (in a majority vote)?

-4

Reply

Tony McDonald & Denise Caron

6 months ago

Kaufman and Kent have nailed it. Furthering the points they eloquently stated:

— We already have a hoist. We have three of them. Brewer's, Strout's, Town Dock

— We don't have a one design fleet. We are lucky to get 4 Sonars on the line on any given Wednesday, a big night is 5-6 Sonars. Meanwhile other Sonars sit on their moorings. Another hoist doesn't change that dynamic.

— A hoist can be a dangerous item in unskilled hands. Lots of liability for little to no positive gain.

I would absolutely love to see a robust one design sailing program at HYC. Over my 35+ year experience with HYC I, like many of you, have seen the focus on racing slowly ebb. This trend is not unique to HYC as PHRF has struggled to compete with other sources of entertainment for the youth who are so fundamental to a healthy racing focused club program. Someone needs to be out there scrambling around the pointy end, shinnying out on a spinnaker pole to free a line, etc. and its just not going to be an older person. Young sailors are the critical ingredient in a strong racing program leading into big boat racing.

So perhaps the question is how do we re-create that racing program focus at HYC? I don't think its a hoist. I also belong to the St Thomas Yacht Club where we have a VERY active racing program running a fleet of IC24s. These are a class built from J24 hulls with a modified deck dropped on top and for all intent and purpose they are the same as a Sonar. Very very similar feel and experience. At STYC, the CLUB owns the entire IC24 fleet of 11-12 boats with the exception of 2 privately owned boats. I assure you, these are not brand new squeaky clean boats and they all have some age on them but are reasonably (but not overly) maintained. The result is a fleet very comparable in overall condition and composition to our Sonars in the harbor (club and private). If there actually is the latent interest out there that would support participation in a revived one design program at HYC, perhaps we simply take this generous gift (with the family's permission) and buy 2 or 3 additional sonars and see if having "free boats" available to use gets more boats on the line every Wednesday night? If it does, that's great and we can see where it all leads us. If not, we know that the demand is not there and we can sell the boats ultimately or just use them as club boats for day sailing by members. It should be noted, at STYC there is an additional fee beyond membership to be part of the group that is allowed to utilize the club boats, around \$1,050/year. A lot cheaper than owning a boat.

The old saying "build it and they will come" may work in some cases but I don't think installing a hoist at HYC will move the needle and it definitely has downside. With that said, I applaud the work the hoist committee has done and would fully support whatever direction is indicated by a full vote of the membership.

2

Reply

Janice Mildram

6 months ago

Reply to [Tony McDonald & Denise Caron](#)

Do we have a 420 "one design" fleet? I have heard that 420 's have been, and are still very popular with college teams.

0

Reply

Stephen Smith

6 months ago

One other thought. Has the membership as a whole been notified about this forum? (I heard about it from another HYC member). Also, do members/posters see updated comments?

0

Reply

Admin

Edward Brainard

6 months ago

Reply to Stephen Smith

Steve – Elizabeth’s member email mentions there will be a forum, but didn’t have details. I’ll follow up.

1

Reply

Janice Mildram

6 months ago

Reply to Edward Brainard

yes, mention about the forum was in the December (draft) Board minutes. They were done up promptly,. And probably at the January meeting there will be mention of it. Thanks to the Board for putting the information out there.

0

Reply

Eileen Peterson

6 months ago

Reply to Stephen Smith

It is Sunday 1/10 and I am just beginning to read comments now and then I will add my thoughts. I did not get an email re. this forum but heard about it and the upcoming board meeting from others, like you Steve. I will try to inform others if this forum for discussion which I do think is a terrific idea. Lastly, it was no easy feat to even log in as an HYC Member so others are likely struggling with this too.

0

Reply

Stephen Smith

6 months ago

Happy New Year everyone.

I share many of the concerns expressed by other members in the posts below. I thank the hoist committee for their work on this. I am concerned that this has become a somewhat divisive issue, and I think this forum is an excellent idea.

For anyone interested, the following link is to a photo that I took at the recent site visit. It shows a pole that was put in place by the committee to demonstrate the planned height and approximate location of the proposed hoist. If the link doesn’t work (you may need to have a dropbox account) I would be happy to email the photo to you. You can reach me at steve@mvppartners.com.

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/zh53yrhocoe98d4/hoist%20height.jpeg?dl=0>

I hope this information is helpful.

Best

Steve

1

Reply

Heidi Bishop

6 months ago

John Karp and Heidi Bishop

We truly appreciate what a group of awesome folks we are so lucky to be members of. We further appreciate how much hard work with great intents has gone into this proposal. It demonstrates the passion we all have for HYC.

Having heard from folks on both sides of this proposal, and further with John having sailed out of the Eastern Yacht Club in Marblehead (Yeah I know, Lah Tee Dah... but I was yacht crew so was around most of the time to see this...) for a full season where their youth sailing club, the Pleon, has a hoist similar to the one being considered. The space needed to maneuver and park tow rigs and trailers is huge on both normal and especially race weekends, and would not be practical at our club, thus holding a travel regatta of a keelboat one design fleet will not be realistic. Leaving the keelboats rigged on trailers was a major part of the convenience for enabling the Eastern's one design keel fleets, and we do not have the room to facilitate this.

We have heard no explanations of where such rigs would be parked. The streets are a non starter, Thornton's field is a long way off and the French school is overcrowded on summer weeks already. We have not heard any insurance quotes, nor any property tax costs on hoist and associated improvements.

We have already lost two spaces to the Sonars in areas being claimed as unused, but where I have had to park by the adjacent rental property.

Such boats will need dock space or moorings now and then, with club moorings usually full already and dock space already limited this seems to be a likely issue as well.

We believe Al Voskian and David Kaufman have a wonderful point in proposing a pilot period of at least one and preferably two seasons where we subsidize the launching at Brewers. John currently serves as Treasurer of Owl's Head Museum and they use 4.5% of our capital fund per year to support operations. If the club and the Burwell's place \$40,000 in a TEMPORARY (read: revocable if the study doesn't pan out) gift account to bear interest and that is invested carefully, this could yield adequate income to support such a draw which equates to @\$1800 per year. We could do a one year rider to add to this if it is exceeded in demand. The boats which use this service would need to be individually tracked to see how much each uses the service as well to gain meaningful data.

With due respect for other's opinions, we see too many complications, too much impact on parking and club for comparably few users to support this project. We did have a healthy Sonar fleet in the past without such a facility.

2

Reply

Al Voskian

6 months ago

HYC's Objectives from the By-laws: "for purposes of encouraging and promoting the sport of boating and the science of seamanship and navigation, particularly through programs of instruction for the youth of the community at large."

My strong concern with the hoist proposal is that it is being portrayed as essential to fostering younger adult members' continued sailing activity in class boats. But the only basis for this I have seen or heard is the assertion of the committee without evidence, while the complications of availability of moorings, maneuvering vehicles with trailers through a tight parking lot, disposition of the trailers after launch, etc. are dismissed as "won't be a problem" or given conflicting solutions. While members of the committee admirably want the hoist to "pay it forward" to today's youth for the great experiences of their youth in class boats when Jack Burwell was active, it should be noted that they had those experiences at an HYC without a hoist.

Other posts have listed some of the many other ways even the \$20,000 from the HYC treasury could be effectively used to further “programs of instruction for the youth of the community at large” (or promote the science of seamanship and navigation, which seems to be perpetually off the radar). A trial where HYC subsidizes keel boat launch retrieval at Brewers and/or Strouts Point should be run as a proof of concept before investing \$60,000 in a hoist construction project.

Respectfully submitted,
Al Voskian

1

Reply

Janice Mildram

6 months ago

Al Loeschner and Jan Mildram :

Our thoughts on the Hoist Project. :

Though a lot of time and energy has been spent on plans for the Burwell Hoist, we still feel that this hoist will not give enough positive return to the club. Dave Kaufman, Dave Kent, and Tom Leach , below, elaborated on their concerns, and we agree on all those points.

We are concerned , especially with our club’s small footprint, that there will be too much disruption. Eluded to in a prior letter is about other vehicles coming and going while the hoist is in use. Let’s consider that point in more detail. Specifically, there are only 22 feet between the ends of parked cars, going across the parking area. If we put an 8 foot trailer there, with some 3 feet of space on each side of the trailer for breathing room, now we have only 8 feet left of space, north to south. Unfortunately, that is far below the amount needed for any car to exit its parking space. And unfortunately again, the length of a vehicle plus its trailer would be minimum 30 feet long. That could block 3 or 4 cars on each side, for a total of 6 or 8 cars prevented from entering, or more critically, leaving, during that time. It would be awkward for members to get off their boats, and be ready to leave, and have to wait around for the hoist operation to be concluded. There could even be an emergency in which people need to leave ASAP. Though there are some benefits to the hoist, we feel that this disruption is a serious disadvantage.

We are also concerned with safety at the hoist, related to a ‘ cone of safety’ coming down from the top point of attachment of the slings. The impressive professional drawing shows that there is one foot of space between the end of the hoist and the railing on the walkway. (Visualize a line hanging from the end of the hoist as it becomes perpendicular to the railing.) When we visualize, now, a boat hanging there, from the end of the hoist, then half of the beam would be towards the railing. In some cases it could hit the railing, or even worse, be over the railing. Think: members, happy little ones, and four legged friends, now having to take a risk to walk by the hoist in operation. One could say that the boat would not be allowed to be out at the end of the hoist, but that would be hard to enforce, in our opinion. Unfortunately, this would be another disruption to the club, and members’ morale.

Thanks go to the club for providing this forum. This hoist is a big ‘forever’ commitment. Though we feel the hoist is not appropriate for HYC, we will certainly honor a thoughtfully-implemented member vote.

Respectfully,
Al Loeschner and Jan Mildram

1

Reply

Janice Mildram

6 months ago

Reply to [Janice Mildram](#)

self-edit: There may be more than one foot of space to the walkway railing. Let's consider, though, whether masts could hover over the walkway. That would be a worry.. Sincerely, Jan and Al

0

Reply

Thomas & Catherine Leach

7 months ago

Tom Leach, my Hoist Project thoughts:

Let me begin by saying that I concur with the thoughts of David Kent and David Kaufman.

Additionally, I feel that while this proposal may be beneficial for the sonar fleet, it's unclear if there are also benefits for the HYC Youth Sailing Program (YSP) and members.

The objectives of HYC are: "Our primary purpose is to encourage and promote the sport of boating and the science of seamanship and navigation, particularly through programs of instruction for young people. Our club was founded with that mission which has been carried out for over 50 years with commitment and volunteer help of our members."

My thoughts are based upon these objectives and are organized by the cost, benefits and related issues.

Costs

1. \$60,000 is a major investment for HYC. \$20,000 is to be contributed by the generosity of the Burwell family, with \$20,000 from HYC and remaining \$20,000 from member contributions.
2. Parking is already at its capacity and beyond. HYC has a small footprint and is often at its physical limits. The impact of the hoist reduces useable space. When the proposed hoist is in use during a mid-tide and higher, congestion would become an issue, especially on weekends. Vehicles parked in the hoist area may be blocked from entering and leaving those spaces when the hoist is in use. What will the duration and frequency of hoist operation be (refer to David Kent's thoughts on hoist operations)? Multiply that times two, if another member is waiting for their turn, should the tidal conditions create preferred times for operation.
3. Annual maintenance will be an on-going cost.
4. The training and supervising of hoist operators is important to consider for safety. Volunteer time will be required of those few that are able to provide training.
5. Space under the proposed hoist will be reduced decreasing the number of docking spaces available for members and the associated revenue for HYC.

Benefits

HYC should consider the actual benefits of the proposed hoist.

1. How would the YSP use the proposed hoist? Would it be used for launching 420s, Optimists or chase boats? It would seem that the ramp would be a more suitable platform.
2. The Sonar fleet at HYC may be diminishing. HYC's two Sonars did not join the fleet during 2020.
3. Launching YSP chase boats may be easier and safer from the ramp.

Other concerns and questions

1. Are there alternatives for the proposed HYC \$20,000 project contribution that would have greater benefit to the club?

- What unmet needs exist for the YSP? What are the unmet infrastructure needs of HYC (possibly ramp improvements)?
- The use of the hoist is for one-design keel boats, but expansion of this type of fleet is limited to mooring availability in the harbor.

2. The aesthetic impact of the proposed hoist should be considered. The views of the harbor and the views of HYC would be impacted.

3. How many YSP individuals would join the existing Sonar fleet? Those individuals would be the more advanced YSP people. Non-members would be able to join the Sonar fleet temporarily during the terms of their program enrollment, using HYC Sonars.

Possible Alternatives for the generous Burwell gift

1. One possibility could be a fleet of Lasers. The turnout for the Laser Regatta in the fall of 2020 was impressive. Lasers have very large regional, national and international fleets yielding a vast opportunity for one design sailing and racing. How about a “Burwell Laser Fleet” at HYC?

2. Another possible use of those generous funds, could be an endowed fund for supporting YSP not currently offered. For example, supporting more YSP participation in area and regional 420 regattas. These funds could be invested in a safe, growing fund to provide monies for the future for the YSP.

3. Other possibilities might surface from discussions with the YSP leadership.

Whatever outcome should evolve, the Burwell family should receive such recognition annually in the HYC Yearbook.

Thanks for considering my views and I will gladly go along with whatever HYC membership decides on this important decision.

2

Reply

Peg Selian

7 months ago

My perspective....undoubtedly, the hoist committee and a few others are deeply passionate about a lift at HYC in the memory of Jack Burwell. The enthusiasm, tireless efforts, and perseverance in sharing their visions with the Board and membership have not gone unnoticed or on deaf ears. In response, the Board realized they lacked a process in how decisions are made, such as gift acceptance, capital improvements, annual budgeting, etc. With that, we completed valuable work that should foster consensus among the Board, then membership, while employing a process where collective decisions are based on fair practices and policies.

It's been more than a year since a presentation was made to the Board proposing this hoist. Several picnic table group chats, scores of written and verbal communication delivered over the year and with all that, in my view, we're not making much progress between what I see as two camps at HYC, people who are advocates and people who are diametrically opposed. In fact, I'm seeing a recurring pattern each time communication like this is distributed. It feels like we're in a deadlock. I recommend the Board consider voting among themselves 'go, no-go, or on-hold' applying the new gift and capital expenditure policies as a basis for the vote. If the Board is in favor, why not communicate this and send it to membership for a vote? If the Board is not in favor, well, I think that would be worth knowing. If the outcome of the vote is a no-go or on-hold, the hoist committee can

still do their work, refine their business case that is more meaningful, and if permitting is granted, they can make another proposal to the Board and allow the process to run its course. I see this being very similar to L.L.Bean's decision to put on hold the P&S agreement for the Desert Rd land until there is a clearer, more comprehensive business plan that is agreed upon by the town and local residents.

In summary, I'd like to hear from the Board how they would vote on the hoist today and not just vote for further assessments. I'd like to know how the membership would vote. If nothing else, it might give the hoist committee validation of their vision or pause. This vote does not have to be the final vote, consider it like the primaries, it's a preliminary vote. It's a means to hear from the entire membership their position as they understand the hoist today. I'd also recommend members comment on why they voted as they did. Otherwise, the Board will continue to forward the hoist committee communication and the opposition will continue to challenge this communication and for how long do we remain in this perpetual cycle?

Respectfully,
Peg Selian

1

Reply

Janice Mildram

6 months ago

Reply to [Peg Selian](#)

I agree about taking the vote in careful steps! jan mildram

0

Reply

David Kaufman

7 months ago

Alternative Ideas for the Hoist Project

How lucky are we to be kicking around the pros and cons of a potential 60K capital investment in HYC.

I fully appreciate the many hours of work done by the Hoist Committee and thanks to the HYC board for creating this forum to allow open discussion from membership. We all care deeply about HYC.

First: The Hoist proposal has merit on its face. But I am left returning time and time again to question why does HYC need a hoist? This 60K investment (20K Burwell gift, 20K HYC funds, 20K member contributions) is a major capital project for HYC. In addition to the construction and purchase cost of this hoist there will be ongoing costs and maintenance associated with this equipment. Impact on our small physical footprint, safety concerns surrounding operation, trailering up and down driveways, parking issues, etc. all have impacts on HYC. It is a significant structure. How many members will be using this? How many times a season? What is the Return on Investment? We have operated for over 70 years without a hoist and launched and hauled, skiffs, engines and the like.

We have multiple opportunities to outsource the entire hoist function. There are two and perhaps three existing hoists/lifts adjacent to us on the Harraseeket River as well as Royal River Boat and Yankee Marine in Yarmouth, if needed. HYC should approach Brewer's, Strout's, the Town of Freeport and work out/negotiate a per lift usage cost plan that would establish a recurring annual line-item expense in our P and L. As an example, HYC could budget \$3000 per season for drop-ins and haul-outs. Shoot for approx. 20 round trips, possibly more. We could adjust the budget each year. Our actual expense would only reflect the number of lifts used. Mission accomplished without

construction, operational safety issues, no trailering issues, AND capital funds remain in the club. We have the full function of a hoist with none of the extraneous issues.

Second: Building a hoist will encourage or initiate an expansion into a one design racing fleet.

We could immediately allocate a portion or all the capital funds and buy several additional sonars to build up our current two boat fleet, or look for another class, or purchase a fleet of lasers for the YSP. There is nothing that prevents HYC pursuing a one design program immediately, if the club so desired, the hoist capabilities having been resolved.

Third: This Hoist Project is meant to further the skills and seamanship of our youth sailors in our YSP. Not sure where the hoist further advances seamanship or sailing.

We could use all or some of the capital funds and come up with any number of exciting capital purchases to enhance our top-drawer, Youth Sailing Program. Our YSP program is regarded as one of the finest in Maine and has been in operation for decades. Pre-Covid, YSP was handling over 100 sailors to rave reviews. An outdoor amphitheater, a media room, media equipment, a clubhouse bump-out, lockers, sailing software, teaching programs, engines, dollars for regional travel regattas, new boats, fleet of lasers, featured speakers, instructor certifications, etc. to name a few. Have we asked the Youth Sailing Program to provide HYC with a Wishlist? Any of these plus countless other options are all on the table AND HYC's winch needs are taken care of.

Fourth: The Burwell gift was meant to be for a hoist.

HYC approaches the Burwell family and explains that there may be an alternative investment plan... that would provide more benefit to our young sailors at HYC, still resulting in a naming opportunity and recognition for Jack's significant role with HYC and in his memory.

These are my ideas and opinions. When the time comes for HYC's full membership vote, I will participate. At the end, outcome determined, I will embrace the resolution, as the will of the club.

With respect and good will –

David Kaufman

2

Reply

David Kent

7 months ago

My Hoist Thoughts

As you may know, some of the club membership have been involved in a debate concerning the wisdom and need for the construction of a pier and hoist. From my point of view there are three issues that all members ought to consider. Most of what follows was asked last summer of the hoist committee and yet these concerns go unanswered. It won't take much more than answering some basic planning issues that demonstrate proper planning prior to this major decision. Personally, I have three areas of concern. Other members may have different issues.

The first area of consideration is that the concept of a hoist was prompted by the generous offer of a gift to the club by the Burwell family. The idea seems to be that gift should be a lasting legacy of Jack Burwell and that goal is promoted by the passion of those who believe that a hoist will fulfill that purpose. The second consideration is the process of developing decision criteria by which the club would decide to go forward, or not go forward, with this project and the information flow that would allow the membership to weigh in on the decision. The third consideration is that of the wisdom of the hoist project and the way in which it enhances the mission of the club.

Here are my thoughts on the three considerations.

As to the first consideration, the membership ought to recognize that the construction of a hoist is a big decision. While some may question the financial burden both immediate and ongoing, that is an objective issue that can easily be understood. However, my concerns are different as not all gifts are necessarily purposeful for those who receive them. Unfortunately, the memory of Jack Burwell is so meaningful to some members that their objectivity in evaluating the pros or cons of having a hoist at the club seems to be questionable. To me, the varied and changing reasons justifying the need for a hoist causes me to believe that the decision to go forward was made long ago, and now we simply have to smooth that decision with the membership. So here I must differ, there are objective issues that ought to be studied and their resolution determined so as to foster confidence that the club is making a reasoned and reliable decision as to the erection of a hoist.

The second consideration was that of the process of informing the membership and drawing from the membership their experience, expertise and concerns so that the decision criteria may be structured and properly evaluated. This would allow the membership to trust the validity of the final outcome. I believe that this process can still be salvaged but to do so may require that we wait until people can face one another in a group meetings without the COVID-19 threat. In the meantime, valuable information can be gathered and shared.

The third consideration are my thoughts about the pros and cons of the club having a hoist. Initially, the purpose was set out as the development of a one design keel sailboat fleet attracting a younger group of members. The goal is to provide an opportunity for sailors who have moved on after HYC's sailing program but may still want to participate in organized sailing events. This is where the passion of the hoist proponents comes from members who, as youngsters, were mentored by Jack who now want to similarly inspire others and believe a hoist will further this objective. There has not been any evidence put forward that a hoist will foster a group of young sailors nor a demonstrated need for a hoist to support a one design fleet. HYC had a Sonar fleet and it dissipated.

Now, let us suppose that we could find a group of young sailors who wanted to participate in one design activities, and that we could choose an appropriate boat and organize a program. We do not need a hoist to accomplish these goals. Therefore, let's consider some of the unintended consequences of installing a hoist. The club has drawn plans that show the location of the proposed hoist. These plans can be seen on the club website or in a mailing sent out by the "hoist committee". The hoist committee is not the HYC Board.

1. How will the hoist be used? The purpose set out by the proponents is to launch and retrieve one design keelboat sailboats although no "dry" sailing is proposed as is used at other clubs that have boat storage and hoists. Boats will not be stored at the club. Any fleet will have to find moorings. Obviously, there would be other uses for a hoist.
2. However, the hoist will be available for only half of a tidal period. (half-high to half-low tide) This means that people planning to use the hoist will be time-constrained and therefore the potential for conflicts and parking lot congestion are multiplied as there has been no plan put forward for managing or coordinating the use of a hoist.
3. Almost no yacht clubs have hoists and those that do often have a club member or paid personnel who control and or operates the use. It is a mistake to think a yacht club needs a hoist to be successful. HYC is incredibly successful without a hoist. The sailing operation that some people want to compete with because they attract one design sailors does not have a hoist. They use a private yard similar to Strouts or Brewers to do their launching.
4. There is no plan to manage the congestion that will result from the operation of a hoist. Consider the steps necessary to launch a boat and what happens when two or three members arrive at the same time with boats on trailers.
5. The process of using a hoist is time consuming and requires several people. Consider the steps: A boat on trailer is backed onto the pad. Slings and a spreader frame are removed from some storage

place and attached to the hoist. The mast is removed from whatever carrying place it had on the trailer and set aside. The hoist is placed and adjusted over the boat. The straps are fitted to the boat (the safety of the whole operation hinges on this step being properly done and may require lifting one end of the boat then repeating with the other end to set the straps before lifting the boat). The Boat is lifted off the trailer and swung into position over the water. The trailer may then be moved away from the platform (to where?). The boat is lowered down into the water. The straps are removed and the boat and secured. The hoist is raised and the straps are changed to mast lifting straps and the mast is moved to the platform. The mast is lifted and lowered to the boat by the hoist. The mast is stabilized with shrouds and the hoist is unhooked and put back in resting position. Finally, the boat can be moved from the dock.

6. Generally, Brewers can launch a boat relatively quickly but they use a travel lift. The boats are then placed on a separate dock where their hoist sets the mast and that operation takes significantly more time than the launch. HYC's launching of a sailboat will use a hoist and same dock for both operations and may take, at best, an hour or more for a one design boat. So more likely than not only a few boats can be launched with a tide.

7. It seems impossible to believe that members coming, parking and leaving will not be affected by persons who are utilizing a hoist. The scheduling of activity is tide dependent so off-peak-hour parking lot utilization will not work.

8. The utilization of a hoist is rocket science. Issues of balance torque, inertia and heavy loads create a significant safety issue. Even people in boat yards who use this equipment have accidents resulting in injuries and property damage. There is no doubt that a locking device and training for those who will use a hoist will occur. But the few clubs that have a hoist also have a manager to schedule and operate the machinery.

9. A hoist is an "attractive nuisance" and we can anticipate that no matter how well secured, attempts by young people to mess with the apparatus will occur.

10. Storage facilities for spreaders and straps and ancillary operating equipment will need to be created.

11. A hoist is a piece of heavy-duty equipment that must be properly maintained on a regular basis to remain safe and reliable.

Proponents of a hoist see a potential to develop a one design keel sailboat fleet for young adults. There is no evidence that by having a hoist a new audience of sailors will be attracted and therefore the primary purpose of having a hoist is illusory. A fleet of one design keelboats has not been chosen and there is no place to moor any one-design boats.

There is absolutely nothing now that prevents the encouragement of young sailors by inviting those persons to sail or compete with mentor club members. The Wednesday night races provide an excellent platform for this activity as does the competition up and down the Maine coast.

Brewers offers its travel-lift for our Youth Regatta launching and retrieving coach boats. There is no reason to believe that Brewers could not launch and retrieve our coach boats. The cost is minor and we need not rely on putting our trailers in the water to launch these boats.

If the club decided to host an event for one design boats a hoist would suffer from the same launching difficulties that the club faces during the youth regatta. At the youth regatta you can either launch boats with the tide or retrieve boats with the tide but not both. This eliminates the necessity of a hoist to host events for one design boats.

Finally, these are the kind of issues on my mind, and I'm sure there are more, that ought to be discussed by the membership before a vote is called for. The decision is one that cannot be reversed in that if we go forward we will be living with the hoist forever. There's no rush so let's take the time to gather and share information. No rational business person would make such a long-range decision

with so little information or planning. I believe a thorough airing of all issues, pro and con, will bring people together and enable members to believe that the project is or is not in the best long-term interest of the club.

Sincerely, David Kent