

SLRC Meeting

In attendance:

Chloe Joule, Shri Verrill, Peter Wilcox, Shey Conover, Lauren Bruce, Nancy Alexander, Jennifer West, Peter Rothschild, Janet Petzel, Liv Lenfestey, Donna Leone, Sue Stafford

Quorum established. Draft minutes from 6/19 approved.

Overview of outreach events and questions: Nancy asked if it is possible to have a cost estimate for rebuilding the Narrows following the January 2024 storms. Fred responded that we still do not have those numbers as work is ongoing to repair sections of the island. Fred is awaiting the paving bill from Janet and will then have a clearer idea of the costs.

Sue inquired about the potential effects of the offshore breakwater on erosion, whether it might exacerbate it or have a positive impact. We currently lack specific details, but there is already increased erosion on Donna's property due to the existing revetment. This question will be referred to the engineers for consideration in the 30% designs.

Discussion ensued regarding how the end of the current revetment is eroding surrounding land, as well as how it has protected a large section from erosion.

Shey redirected the discussion to gauge consensus on the proposed recommendation resulting from the outreach efforts: Recommendation C1 emerged as the preferred option during community meetings. It includes a bermed revetment with reef balls, raising the road by 2 feet, and a phase 2 bridge solution for long-term stability.

Shri provided an overview of the responses received earlier from GZA. These included:

- Where would the bridge in the north Narrows be situated? If a bridge is selected as an alternative, how does it affect Phase I alternatives? A bridge would likely span west of the current roadway, over the marsh, pending future geotechnical explorations and bridge design considerations. The bridge's location in the North Narrows does not alter Phase 1 designs.
- If there were no house on Donna's property during Phase I construction, would this affect the 30% design? The absence of a house on Donna's property during Phase I construction would not alter the 30% design phase. However, it could impact construction logistics. For instance, if the land were town-owned, it could serve as a lay-down area for equipment or access, potentially easing permitting processes by removing private property from project limits.
- Is raising the road by 2 feet sufficient for Phase I? If the final design advances such that 60% completion is achieved by spring 2025, permit applications could be prepared and submitted shortly thereafter. State and federal permit reviews, particularly for projects impacting resource areas, typically take 12-18 months. Assuming an 18-month review period, bidding could commence around late fall 2026, with construction potentially

starting by early 2027, contingent on various factors like funding, permit-related restrictions, weather, and contractor availability.

- Will raising the road by 2 feet suffice in light of sea level rise (SLR)? Shri referenced NOAA data on SLR indicating that with a 2-foot elevation increase, we wouldn't see significant road flooding (up to 1 foot of water) until 2060.

Peter queried this, noting recent winter storms reached 14 feet. Shri clarified that while tides reached 11.2 feet, the surge added approximately 3 feet of water during the January 10th and 13th events.

Peter W. asked if Fred considers a 2-foot raise adequate. Fred indicated that based on his experience, a minimum of 2 feet is acceptable, though he's open to considering more, especially for the western side where the road dips.

Shri asked if there were any other outstanding questions on the designs before discussing which options to pursue.

Nancy stated her preference for option C1, with phases 1 and 2 proceeding, emphasizing the immediate pursuit of the bridge.

Peter Wilcox inquired about the purpose of reef balls and requested a cost estimate for option C1 without them, expressing skepticism about the bridge's construction timeline (earliest 2031).

Lauren highlighted how reef balls enhance competitiveness in grant applications, simplify permitting, and serve as a pilot project.

Lauren motioned to select option C1 with a phased approach, implementing berms, reef balls, and road raising immediately, while advancing the bridge for phase 2.

- All members except one supported this motion due to concerns and uncertainty about Reef Balls. Fred and Sue noted reef balls' potential to support bridge implementation, despite concerns over their longevity.
- Lauren noted that reef ball longevity could be addressed in subsequent engineering phases.
- Shri also stated that she has questions on reef balls, and will continue to seek answers as we move forward with the plans.

Lauren amended her motion to select option C1 with a phased approach, implementing bermed revetment, reef balls (pending further research), road raising immediately, and advancing the bridge as phase 2.

- The motion was unanimously approved.

They outlined the next phase process. The Select Board meeting is scheduled for July 17th, encouraging committee members' attendance.

Jennifer asked if a Q&A should be prepared for the meeting. Liv agreed to prepare one before the July 17th SB meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday the 23rd at 5pm at the Town Office to discuss the SLRC's transition after Liv's fellowship.

Motion to adjourn.