

SELECT BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting of June 29, 2021. The meeting took place via remote participation using Zoom. Members of the Board present were Dawn Hill Holdgate (Chair), Jason Bridges, Matt Fee and Kristie Ferrantella. Melissa Murphy joined the meeting as noted below. Also present from Town staff were Town Manager C. Elizabeth Gibson; Coastal Resilience Coordinator Vincent Murphy; Historic Preservation Planner Holly Backus; Police Chief William Pittman, Planning Director Andrew Vorce, Natural Resource Director Jeff Carlson; Fire Chief Stephen Murphy; Assistant Town Manager Gregg Tivnan; DEI Director Kimal McCarthy; Real Estate Specialist Ken Beaugrand; Deputy Public Works Director Stephen Arceneaux.

Representatives from Arcadis Design and Consultancy were also present as well as members of the Coastal Resilience Advisory Committee.

Chair Holdgate called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM and read a prepared statement as to how the meeting would be conducted via remote participation and the ground rules for any discussion and called roll Board members and staff present.

Ms. Mary Longacre, Chair of the Coastal Resilience Advisory Committee (CRAC) called the Committee's meeting to order at 4:03 PM.

Chair Holdgate noted the workshop will not feature Public Comment.

WORKSHOP MEETING WITH COASTAL RESILIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND TOWN STAFF WITH ARCADIS REGARDING BAXTER ROAD ENGINEERING FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT

1. Introduction: Recap of Project, Project Status and Overview of Anticipated Progress for this Workshop. Kate Edwards and Keren Bolter of Arcadis showed a presentation and reviewed project status to date as well as an overview of the most recent project meeting with the Board and the Committee from April, 2021.

2. Vision: Explore Desired Outcomes at Different Planning Horizons. Ms. Edwards reviewed the various desired outcomes for the workshop; and several on-line polls were conducted for the meeting participants, designed to determine various potential consensus points.

Melissa Murphy joined the meeting at 3:50 PM.

3. Alternatives: Review Preliminary Results and Considerations for Each Alternative. Irene Watts of Arcadis reviewed the current erosion control project along Sconset Bluff and how it is intended to function. She reviewed the alternatives development process and alternatives selection methodology. She also reviewed some examples of where some of these alternatives are in place elsewhere. She showed a list of five alternatives and reviewed each in detail. She also noted taking no action could be considered an alternative. Ian Golding of the Coastal Resilience Advisory Committee raised a concern about using the existing system as an alternative. Ms. Watts responded. Preservation Planner Holly Backus asked about the effect of dune nourishment in adjacent coastal areas. Ms. Watts responded; and noted there is not enough data to definitively answer the question. Ms. Watts reviewed a current proposal to expand the existing project, along with potential side effects and concerns. Some discussion followed. Ms. Watts reviewed Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) erosion projections for this area and reviewed how the projections are developed. Ms. Edwards reviewed relocation options and obstacles. She noted that one of the projections is for 2030 which is not far off. She reviewed cost estimates for removal and

relocation of Baxter Road and utilities, noting there are some associated costs not included, such as land acquisition and permitting. Ms. Watts reviewed an alternative for nearshore breakwaters with the existing project, including side effects. She also reviewed best management practices for bluff stability, geared toward property owners. She reviewed a chart of relative costs for each alternative. Committee member Jennifer Karberg asked about the use of breakwaters elsewhere. Ms. Watts said she would conduct some review of that and get back to that at a later time. Discussion followed as to a FEMA grant program for projects specific to hazard mitigation, which would mostly like include a project like this one.

4. Review/Discuss: Perceived Points of Disagreement. Ms. Edwards reviewed design tensions, key considerations and other feedback that has come up in the stakeholder focus group meetings. She suggested that ultimately there may be a combination of alternatives recommended. She reviewed a survey recently conducted by the Sconset Civic Association regarding whether the Town should support actions to prevent further erosion of Sconset Bluff, the results of which showed a strong positive response. Ms. Watts reviewed in detail the amount of sand that has been required for the current project and what has been placed at the project to date. She compared this with estimates as to what would have naturally occurred without the project; and, what has occurred with the project. Ms. Edwards reviewed recent events regarding the project, including legal action, Conservation Commission enforcement action and the Arcadis work. She also reviewed a chart showing preliminary estimates as to the loss of tax revenue as a result of erosion of Sconset Bluff. Dr. Keran Bolter of Arcadis reviewed an “adaptive pathways decision making process” to be used with another poll. She noted that there are a number of assumptions at play. She reviewed an example of this process used in a similar exercise by the Town of Falmouth, MA. She displayed a “pathways score” card used to evaluate the various alternatives. She also reviewed sea level rise projections as relating to Sconset Bluff.

5. Review/Discuss Potential Implications of Alternatives. Ms. Edwards noted that the cost analysis remains underway but that most of the alternatives seem feasible. Mr. Gary Beller of the Committee, questioned who would be responsible for paying for any of the alternatives. He said he is concerned about cost increases the longer relocation is delayed. Ms. Edwards said that the responsibility for payment remains open but that there may be funding options to explore including grants and betterments. Mr. Fee said that currently Sconset Bluff property owners are paying for the existing project; he added that there are varying abilities of property owners to pay, which will have to be explored. Ms. Karberg of the Committee commented that some of the alternatives could be combined to address various concerns that have been expressed through the feedback gathered from the sessions so far. Some discussion followed. Chair Holdgate said she would like to better understand the feasibility of a breakwater; she said if the Conservation Commission has already not endorsed adaptive nourishment, should it really be considered; she noted that some of the costs will have to include eminent domain actions which could be significant.

Mr. Fee and Mr. Bridges left the meeting at 5:15 PM.

Ms. Watts shared some information she has about breakwaters elsewhere and in what types of areas they are typically found. She noted there are various options. Mr. Golding asked about addressing environmental issues associated with hard armoring. Ms. Edwards suggested that participants put forward environmental concerns they have. Ms. Sarah Bois of the Committee expressed a need for more information to be provided on certain alternatives such as breakwaters. Discussion followed on various alternatives.

6. Adaptation Pathways: Potential Future Scenarios. Some discussion followed on this, with no specific actions taken but general agreement that discussion will continue as the project progresses.

Ms. Ferrantella moved to adjourn at 5:28 PM; seconded by Ms. Murphy. So voted by roll call vote: Chair Holdgate – Yes; Ms. Ferrantella – Yes; Ms. Murphy – Yes.

Approved the 7th day of July 2021.

**SELECT BOARD
JUNE 29, 2021 – 3:30 PM
REMOTE PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM
NANTUCKET, MASSACHUSETTS**

List of documents used at the meeting:

- Baxter Road Feasibility Assessment and Solutions PowerPoint by Arcadis