

Coastal Resiliency Advisory Committee
Tuesday, Jan. 21, 2020 at 10:45 a.m.
Community Room, 4 Fairgrounds Road
*Meetings are audio- and video-recorded

Members present: Mary Longacre, Sarah Bois, Gary Beller (by phone), Peter Brace, Jen Karberg, Ian Golding, Matt Fee

Members absent: Fritz McClure, Graeme Durovich

Staff present: Vincent Murphy

Others: Annie Stackpole-Menz, RJ Turcotte, Taylor Donovan, Guthrie Diamond

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:50 a.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Unanimously approved, 6-0. One abstention

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Dec. 17, 2019 minutes were unanimously approved 6-0

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

A. Continued discussion from 1/4/2020 on Request for Proposals for the Coastal Resilience Plan

Ms. Karberg reiterated CRAC's mission to Mr. Murphy and said that it's vital that the committee advise him and the Select Board. She added that CRAC needs to appoint one or two of its members to the review committee charged with review of proposals from consultant applicants. Mr. Murphy reminded the committee to get their RFP comments to him by Jan. 27.

Mr. Golding read his recent email to Mr. Murphy regarding the number of structures either moved inland from the shore or lost to erosion that he's verified. Mr. Murphy said he would review the sentence containing the number of structures he found, 30. He added that he might delete this

sentence altogether. Mr. Murphy said he understood Mr. Golding's point about the significance of the true number of structures lost to erosion, but he clarified for the board that getting the RFP written and sent out was the most important issue. Mr. Golding expressed extreme frustration in not having his research and numbers acknowledged. Mr. Brace said he supported Mr. Golding's numbers. Ms. Karberg said each person on the committee was appointed by their respective organizations for their depth of knowledge on coastal resiliency. To wit, she expressed frustration on behalf of the committee that members' comments and suggestions to make the RFP a better document were being met with such resistance by Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Beller asked about the difference between the previous RFP sent out that resulted in the hiring of consultants, Milone & MacBroom of Cheshire, Conn. and their subsequent production of a coastal resiliency strategies document, the predecessor of the Coastal Resiliency Plan (CRP), and the current RFP. Mr. Murphy explained the difference for Mr. Beller.

Ms. Bois pressed her case for including different timelines within the RFP including, 2030, 2050 and 2100, to aid in certain strategies that may be proposed for various coastal resiliency projects. Mr. Beller recalled that the committee agreed at the Jan. 14 meeting these three intervals would make sense. Ms. Longacre had concerns on how extending the CRP's timeline affect's the cost of producing the plan beyond 2100 affects the cost of producing the plan.

Mr. Golding suggested possibly basing the intervals on predicted sea level heights instead of years. Mr. Murphy, citing several sea level rise reports, noted that there's a constant flow of new information on sea level rise predictions. Ms. Bois suggested using the time intervals backed by best available data. Ms. Karberg agreed, adding that the data needs to be as localized as possible. She agreed that all three intervals should be used. She also said it was important to plan beyond 2100. Mr. Brace reminded the group that the RFP is just that, a request for proposals, and that once the consultant is hired, there'll be plenty of opportunities to change the course of process and bring in new information.

Mr. Golding asked the idea of building a solid pier in the vicinity of the west jetty for ferries to dock be included in the RFP.

Mr. Fee said the CRP must be easy to understand, show that it was well thought out and address people in denial. It stressed the importance of the plan being widely accepted by the community at all levels.

Ms. Bois clarified for Mr. Murphy that she agreed with his three timeline intervals but added that he needed to mention them more in the RFP.

Ms. Longacre suggested certain projects should be grouped under certain time intervals depending on the highest probability that completing them would help each situation.

Mr. Murphy clarified for the committee that the CRP is to be for the entire island.

Mr. Fee said it's important for the consultant to rate the value of projects by island neighborhood to help get sense of their positive impact and as a way to generate their costs. Mr. Golding said Miacomet Pond with houses on both sides is a good example for this.

Mr. Brace suggested possibly marking a line on buildings and land to show people where the water will rise to given the most conservative numbers. Ms. Bois, Ms. Longacre and Ms. Karberg said several island organizations had already began such projects.

Ms. Longacre wondered aloud anything useful to the RFP could be drawn from the Coastal Risk Assessment and Resiliency Strategies document produced by Milone & MacBroom. Mr. Murphy indicated that the document was inadequate and not what was requested, and as such, not well suited as a solid resource.

B. Discuss a recommendation to the Select board on Town review of development plans in coastal areas (ConCom jurisdiction, FEMA flood zone or others) to include potential Coastal Resilience strategies. Discussion of Committee members submission for suggested strategies

Mr. Fee said a strategy for working the planning for coastal resiliency into town review boards' and the Select Board's day to day efforts needs to be developed and diligently followed. Mr. Brace said Town Meeting

articles are likely to come out this and the CRP process. Ms. Bois envisioned a multi-level approach and Ms. Longacre agreed with her. Mr. Fee said the key thing is “to get this thought process into town government so it is the first think about” when sea level rise becomes a consideration in whatever is being worked on.

Mr. Beller said that CRAC needs to find a way to make coastal resiliency a part of the conversation whenever construction of a building, development of land or infrastructure, or renovations are proposed and are going through the review process. Ms. Karberg agreed.

Mr. Fee said he’s good with temporarily shelving this issue until CRAC can properly address it. Ms. Longacre agreed, adding that this issue needs to be addressed as soon time permits because development of Nantucket continues.

C. Discussion on Milone and MacBroom strategies report

In answer to Ms. Karberg’s related inquiry, Mr. Murphy informed the board that this document would be serving only as resource for the CRP process, that the CRP would supplant it.

Mr. Murphy said he would try to arrange have Chuck Larson present at a future meeting to help the CRAC interpret this document.

Ms. Bois asked why did the town pay for this document it wasn’t what it had asked for. Ms. Longacre said the town did ask for the right strategies.

Mr. Murphy explained again to the CRAC how the town’s RFP process to hire a consultant works.

Ms. Bois asked for the appendices to be provided and asked why there were no maps of the island in the document. Mr. Murphy said he would get the appendices for the CRAC.

Mr. Brace the lackluster quality of the document underscores the need for the correct information to go the consultant such as the number of structures lost to erosion.

Ms. Bois lamented the lack of consideration for extreme erosion areas of the island with low populations including Madaket, Coatue, Great Point and Coskata. Ms. Longacre clarified that the document was geared toward roads and infrastructure. Ms. Bois, Mr. Brace and Ms. Karberg

stressed how vital Coatie is to coastal resiliency. Mr. Murphy said there might be difficulty in making the CRP work for Coatie's, Great Point's and Coskata's property owners.

Ms. Bois and Ms. Karberg said these property owners are likely to work with the town on the CRP, but the protocol followed would likely be property by property.

Mr. Fee offered that the concept of an "advance" strategy, which he read about in one of several CRPs Mr. Murphy sent to the committee, building structures to keep water from the island, is something he supports.

Mr. Beller said he liked Section 4.2 "funding and resources", because it showed good ways to raise funds for the various projects to be spawned by the CRP. The committee agreed with Mr. Beller.

Mr. Murphy said he'd like the committee to make recommendations to the Select Board on certain funding methods.

Annie Stackpole-Menz said that the Smith's Point Association feels overwhelmed with sea level rise and how cope with it. And she asked how much funding there is for the CRP and then wondered aloud how the public would know if it's worth it to spend this money.

Mr. Golding asked for the appendices for this document.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENT

DISCUSSION OF TOPICS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

ESTABLISHMENT OF MEETING SCHEDULE

OTHER BUSINESS.

ADJOURNMENT

Unanimously approved, 7-0, at 12:31 p.m.

Text of email from Mary Longacre, Chair to Vincent Murphy CR Coordinator on Jan 14, 2020 for reference. Subsequently sent to all committee.

Hi Everyone-

As Vince and I met to plan the agenda for next week's meeting, he shed some light on the difficulty with the RFP process for the Coastal Resilience Plan. The CRA Committee was originally formed with the expectation that a draft Coastal Resilience Plan would have already been received BEFORE the Committee began meeting. We were only expected to help review the consultant's work and get it to where the Town could accept the plan; the Select Board did not assign a role for the Committee in creating the RFP for the plan. Creating RFPs is normally done by staff, it is not a process that can be well managed with public input.

The Select Board's charge (as sent by Jeff Carlson on 7/22/19) reads: "This committee will work with the Coastal Resiliency Coordinator to oversee and finalize the Coastal Resiliency Plan by:

- o Providing input as to Plan modifications/updates/finalization*
- o Recommending priority of Coastal Resiliency projects..."*

If you read that without knowing that a plan already exists, and not knowing about the Town's process of creating RFPs, then it is understandable to assume that the Committee would be included in creating one. I think we adopted our mission statement on 9/17/19 with that in mind by adding the word "development": "This committee will work with the Coastal Resiliency Coordinator in the development, oversight, and implementation of a Coastal Resiliency Plan..."

I wasn't told when I volunteered for the CRA Committee, and I suspect none of us were, that an RFP had already been issued and a contract awarded to Malone & McBroom to produce a coastal resilience plan. However when the draft of the plan came back from M&M in August,

Vince discovered that the prior RFP wasn't sufficiently detailed and the resulting plan from M&M was rejected. As he's told us, Vince worked with M&M to convert their work into a Coastal Resilience Strategies document, so that the Town would get something useful out of the contract. That document is nearly final and he hopes to see it accepted by the Town this month. But it is not a fully functional Coastal Resilience Plan. It will be a resource for the CRP but it lacks any recommendations for specific projects the Town should implement.

The rejection resulted in our timeline as a Committee being out of sync with the coastal resilience plan's development process. We were supposed to have had a coastal resilience plan in our hands to review and finalize when we began meeting in September. The miscommunication over the original RFP set us back almost a year in being able to do that. Hence Vince's sense of urgency in getting the new RFP out. And he thought we had been briefed at our first meeting in July about where things stood.

Vince has done a tremendous job in pulling together the current RFP. He's had help and review from Holly Backus, Chuck Larson, Jeff Carlson, and Greg Tivnan. Any changes he makes now would have to go back through review from at least Greg, so we need to quickly complete any suggestions we have and understand that they may not make it into this document. I'm grateful that Vince is opening up the process so that we can participate, but the risk is that the RFP is further delayed.

I hope in sharing what I learned from Vince today this note is helpful to others understanding where we are now in the CRP RFP process.