

Rev. @
7/30 meeting
by SBPP

New CES **shall be** permitted:

- 1) Does it prevent storm damage to pre-78 structures, including reconstructions?
 - Yes, more than 3 dozen on both sides of road.
- 2) Protect pre-78 public infrastructure?
 - Yes, all of road and utilities.
- 3) Does design uses best available measures to minimize adverse effects on adjacent or nearby coastal beaches due to changes in wave action?
 - Yes, the slope, the height, the depth, the size of the rocks, the flared and tapered ends, the sand mitigation and monitoring, native vegetation, and the base layer of gravel and geotextile fabric all mitigate scour, down-drift starvation, and wave reflection.
 - 9.3cy/lf is right number based on agreed formula of the rate of bank retreat.
 - Robust/long life, not perpendicular, no anchors, no debris or breakdown, low maintenance. Ok if exposed. No danger to fish or animals.
- 4) Is another method of protecting buildings feasible?
 - No. Other methods would not work long term in this environment due to storm intensity and frequency, as has been demonstrated.
- 5) Are the protective planting used to reduce erosion?
 - Yes, the native plantings reduce wind and rain erosion and hold the bluff face at steep angles.
- 6) Is there an environmentally better way to control erosion problem?
 - No. The problem cannot be controlled through other means.
- 7) Is it appropriate to move threatened buildings or public infrastructure?
 - No, these structures have nowhere else to go on their lots and moving them a little would not protect them.
 - Moving now would be abandoning and relocating/recreating, or demolishing.
- 8) Is there an alternative to protect structure from imminent danger?
 - No, the alternatives will not protect these houses or the infrastructure from imminent danger. Many are at risk of loss in one season.
- 9) Is sand compatible with existing beach?
 - Yes, it could come from local pits or off island, but the grain size and other factors would be compatible.

10) Is the bank and bank height being protected?

- Yes. The bank and bank height are preserved by the CES.

11) Does it enhance storm damage prevention and flood control?

- Yes. Preserving the bank, breaking up wave energy, and adding sand to the system can all help with storm damage prevention and flood control.

12) Does it enhance the coastal bank's function of buffering inland areas and buildings from storm damage?

- Yes.

13) Is the revetment a water dependent use?

- Yes. It can only serve its purpose if installed at the toe of the bank.

14) Are there adverse effects on marine fisheries or shellfish beds?

- No. The revetment and sand mitigation would not harm them. The prior concern on this issue was related to off-shore pumping.

15) Does it harm wildlife habitat?

- No. Local wildlife will adapt around the revetment and thrive in the stable rocks and bluff face.

16) Does it harm wetland scenic views?

- No. The revetment will replace the state of destruction with lush bank and less construction.

17) Does it preserve and enhance recreational trails and public access?

- Yes. The bluff walk is preserved and public access, vertical and lateral, is increased. Even if the beach narrows, the public access is increased.