

SLRC Meeting June 19th, 2024

Present:

Lauren Bruce, Jennifer West, Shri Verrill, Shey Conover, Donna Leone, Robert Kochan, Peter Rothschild, Chloe Joule, Bill Rosenburg, Fred Porter, Stephen Miller, Barbara Benware, Pam Filoramo, Sue Stafford, Nancy Alexander

Notes;

Draft minutes approved for [draft minutes from 6/12/24 meeting](#)

They laid out the agenda for the meeting and discussed why we set this meeting for one week after the Alternatives Analysis came out last week.

Nancy said that she had hoped the information was organized differently

Shri pointed us in the direction of the questions that emerged from the community discussion after GZA's presentation on June 12th

- There seemed to be some questions about what the phases will be:
 - Phase 1: Raise the elevation of the current road, Offshore wave attenuation, reef balls, and revetment
 - Phase 2: Build the bridge
 - Phase 3: Re-route the road and build elevated road
- These are outlined on page 17
- If the discussion were to be to move phase 1 forward, the discussion should focus around what type of revetment we would like to construct. We should use the framework of cost, longevity, and aesthetic to guide our thinking (AND environmental impact)

Nancy asked: What are the components of phase one that can be moved forward as quickly as possible?

Peter Rothschild asked if we move forward with phase one, do we create a disincentive for the long term solution? Does phase one make us less competitive for future grant applications? His other question is: Is it feasible to demolish the existing revetment and rebuild? This is with considerations to the level of exposure we would have while the revetment is under construction

- Shri noted that there are environmental social considerations.
- The funding aspect will depend on the funding that is available and how we make our case

- Nancy said that she thinks it doesn't make sense to dig up what we have done if there is a chance we may move the road. She doesn't want to get too far down the line on an investment we are going to move away from
- She said that she understood from GZA's presentation that rebuilding the revetment is essential and is our first line of defense to storm surge. Because of the increased nature of storms, GZA recommends starting over from the foundation rather than adding to a deteriorating base.
- Bob Kochan chimed in to share his experience as an engineer that GZA must have assumed that the existing revetment will not be able to hold back the energy of big storms
 - This is something that we would like GZA to reaffirm

Steve Miller followed up with a question on how the phased approach will impact funding. He asked, wouldn't it make sense for the Town/Committee to develop a plan that addresses Phases 1-3. This will increase public perception that phase one will be enough protection and will keep us competitive to grantors.

- Sue said she liked this point and thinks we could break down into phases that Phase 1 deals with storm surge and then articulate that the following phases address Sea Level Rise

Discussion on the revetment:

- There are several options for the Revetment including: Return wall/jersey barrier, larger stone,
- Is it possible that if you did the wave attenuation/breakwater first and then phased in a revetment rebuild?
 - She was thinking this does not make sense because of the hazard of having a barge drop large rocks in the water during the breakwater build before our new revetment is in place?
- Lauren noted that aesthetics were not considered in their chart of scored considerations
- There was a clarification that the revetment redesign includes both the South and Middle section
- Discussion on Gabions: Nancy said based on her research, the gabion were not rated high for longevity
- Sue asked that if we have the offshore wave attenuation, why do we need the reef balls?
 - Bob Kochan chimed in that reef balls are a short term solution while reconstruction breakwater. They will help hold existing sand and loose rock.
 - The reef balls could be helpful for compensatory mitigation
 - Fred Porter said that we should not only consider storm surge but we also have to address the amount of water that is coming up. He thinks we should raise the road up. He also asked if we are still thinking about diverting the road to the west?
 - Bob Kochan said there is wasted money here on construction no matter what.

- They said she was thinking about the revetment and wave attenuation as the 1 - 5 year plan, raising the existing road 2 ft is our 5-30 year plan, and the bridge is our 75+ year plan.
- Sue asked if the revetment can be built in phases? Shri said that we could build up the revetment to not the full 2100 height and then added the offshore wave attenuation, then we would not have to build the revetment as high
- Peter would like to know if there are more options for breakwater designs. Bob chimed in to say that yes there are a variety and that how far out they are placed depends on water depth.
- Donna asked about the diversion of the wave energy and if they put a breakwater in the southern section, is it going to deflect to the Northern section and erode the property.
 - The hydrological engineering in the next step of the project would answer this question.

Liv will compile the questions and Shri will communicate with GZA to inform the final report.

Community outreach events are scheduled for 7/2, 7/9 and 7/10.

Set next meeting date for 7/12/24 1-3 pm @ the town office.

Adjourn meeting.