

**Coastal Resilience Advisory Committee
Tuesday, August 10, 2021
Via Video Conference and Recorded**

Members Present: Mary Longacre, Fritz McClure, Sarah Bois, Peter Brace, Jen Karberg, Gary Beller and Joanna Roche (Peter Brace joined the meeting at 10:21 AM and left the meeting at 12:08 PM)

Members Absent: Matt Fee, Ian Golding

Staff Present: Vince Murphy and Holly Backus

Consultants Present: Trevor Johnson and Devon McGhee and others from One Architecture and Stoss.

Speakers: Trevor Johnson and Devon McGhee from Arcadis Group.

CALL TO ORDER.

The meeting was called to order at 10:01 AM. Roll Call made.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA.

Covid Announcements were made by Chair.

The meeting was recorded and the recording is available on the Town's YouTube channel. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XbOEYKqsh0w> A change to the agenda to allow the Arcadis Group to make their presentation first was discussed and Agenda was approved by unanimous vote.

DISCUSSION.

Follow-up on July 27th Presentation.

Mary Longacre had several comments about the presentation on July 27th. She stated that Joanna Roche was correct when she referred to sea level rise of 4"- 9" by 2030 and that the impact is more important than the year it will occur. She also suggested adding a Tier for 2030 risk and a change in the term "Safe Growth."

Vince Murphy, based on comments, see attached, by Doug Rose (public), suggested that the meaning of "Safe Growth" may be unclear and to some may be perceived as a statement about development. After discussion Trevor Johnson agreed to change the term to "Minimal Coastal Risk."

Joanna Roche suggested the Committee develop ten talking points that focus on short term concerns.

Project Update - Discussion of Preliminary Island-Wide Coastal Adaption Framework by Trevor Johnson and Devon McGhee - Draft of Resilience Strategies for Downtown Nantucket, Nantucket Harbor and Madaket. The link to their slide presentation is included in these minutes. <https://www.nantucket-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/40021/Preliminary-Recommendations-Downtown-Madaket-and-Nantucket-Harbor-PDF> Draft recommendations were presented for the short and long term in these specific geographical areas.

Draft regulatory and by-law change recommendations will be on the agenda for August 24th meeting.

Comments & Questions.

Gary Beller - Will final plan make a recommendations for action by 2030? Ans. Yes, but not for long term because there is too much uncertainty.

Fritz McClure - Will costs be given for short term projects? Ans. Yes

How will large scale projects be financed? Ans. Will require state and federal money; Nantucket will not be able to finance some. Also some of the proposals could not be permitted today under current regulations.

Sarah Bois - Could there be multiple points of defense for Straight Wharf? Ans. Yes, but it would be expensive and require approval of property owners (most of the wharf is privately owned). What happens outside the "line of defense" on Hulbert Avenue and Easton Street? Ans. Private action will be required. The Town will provide public safety access on public [property].

Jen Karberg - In the short term do we need to do the entire downtown or could it be done in parts? Ans. Need to do entire area at one time.

When is the decision point for long term recommendations? Ans. The Coastal Resilience Plan will provide a roadmap to 2070 - 2100, but the conversation needs to start now.

Joanna Roche - How do we get this information to stakeholders? Capital Committee has \$250 million in projects already. Ans. We need to finalize the plan and then communicate to stakeholders.

Fritz McClure - Where and how will at risk properties be re-located? This involves most of Madaket eventually and all private property. The possibility of re-location seems remote to me.

Peter Brace - the Area Presidents of the various Civic League associations need to be advised and involved in the discussion.

Trevor Johnson - The design life of roads is typically 20-30 years, but the recommendation for re-design of Madaket and Polpis roads should not be incremental in this case. The design should be for 50 years.

There was not sufficient time for additional comments. Additional comments should be forwarded to the consultants via Nantucket.CRP@arcadis.com.

Adjournment.

A meeting for the continuation of this agenda will be scheduled for Tuesday, August 17th at 10 AM. The meeting adjourned at 12:10 PM.

Email conversation between Doug Rose & Vincent Murphy

Tue 8/3/2021 9:00 AM

Vincent Murphy

RE: Comments re Arcadis Island-Wide Resilience Framework draft submitted to CRAC 7/27/01
To 'Doug Rose' <chippersdad074@gmail.com>

Hi Doug,

Very many thanks for your thoughtful and thorough comments. These are very useful. I have forwarded them to the project team so that your comments can go towards improving the CRP that is being drafted.

Point taken about “Safe Growth”. Just to point out that it is safe in terms of coastal resilience. Nothing else should be taken from that. The CRP will only really deal with the coastal areas. The CRP is a part of the future planning for the island, however, the Master Plan, which is currently working its way through some form of redevelopment, is the main driver of where and how we as a community may move forward with the type of growth you discuss. Overcrowding, development rate (island wide) and housing density are not part of the CRP brief. <https://www.nantucket-ma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/1281/Town-of-Nantucket-Master-Plan?bidId=>

Vince.

Vincent Murphy
Coastal Resilience Coordinator
Natural Resources Department
Town Of Nantucket
131 Pleasant Street, 2nd Floor
Nantucket, MA 02554
Office (508) 228 7200 Ext 7608
Mobile (520) 955 2179

From: Doug Rose <chippersdad074@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 2, 2021 3:33 PM

To: Vincent Murphy <vmurphy@nantucket-ma.gov>

Subject: Comments re Arcadis Island-Wide Resilience Framework draft submitted to CRAC 7/27/01

Hi Vince,

I'd like to submit a couple of comments/suggestions relating to the draft Island-Wide Resilience Framework presented by Arcadis at the 7/27/21 CRAC meeting. Specifically:

- The Arcadis presenters did a nice job of explaining the draft content, and addressing questions throughout. The public should be encouraged to watch the presentation on

youtube. But acknowledging that not everyone has 2 hours to invest, the summary documents need to be as crisp and clear as possible, so as to minimize misinterpretation.

- Example: To echo the comments of Gary Beller and Mary Longacre, I agree that the final plan maps could be made clearer by adjusting the color coding, perhaps with a simple “hot <—> cold” color spectrum representing relative severity of risk. Suggestion from a career powerpoint nerd: zones could be pale colors, while structures within each zone could appear as dots of darker/more opaque versions of the same color, perhaps something like this:

POSSIBLE COLOR CODE FOR "RISK MAPPING"		
	zones	structures
extreme risk	5	5
	4	4
	3	3
	2	2
low risk	1	1

- In the same spirit of clarity, word choices are critical as well.
 - Example: on the Design & Planning Recommendations map, seeing the mid-island area characterized as “Safe Growth” will be misinterpreted by some* to mean that Arcadis is a proponent of continued (over)development. While Trevor did a nice job in his presentation of explaining the true intent of those words, few people will ever hear that explanation. Given the highly charged debate over if and how much growth the island can sustain, I would suggest that these low risk areas not be designated for any specific purpose.
 - * note: I say it “will be misinterpreted” because it’s already happened in at least one Facebook group :)
- Further to that point, in her live comments on slide 22, Devon McGhee of Arcadis stated *“We don’t want people to retreat and leave Nantucket entirely and take that tax revenue with them. We want to create areas that are inland and at lower risk that are really attractive to them to relocate to, so that we can keep that tax base here and maybe even grow it over time.”* My personal feeling is that the concern over preserving/growing tax revenues has received disproportionate weight in the long term debate over the pace of development, and now over the effects of sea level rise.
 - Example: proponents of the Sconset Bluff geotube project often point to Baxter Road property tax revenues as a significant factor in any risk/benefit calculations. My understanding is that these revenues are actually pretty insignificant relative to other costs relating to maintaining/expanding the project.
 - Many Nantucketers (myself included) are convinced that the island is already overcrowded, and that our future master plans should not be based on the assumption of a continued build out of the island’s undeveloped lands to support the town’s projected revenue needs. No doubt this has big implications for town

government (e.g. budget choices, tax rates, etc), but we should not let the tail (i.e. the town's need for tax revenues) wag the dog (i.e. quality of life on Nantucket).

This is hugely important work that you are doing. Thank you for your service to the island community.

Respectfully,
Doug Rose
Seasonal resident/non-voting taxpayer
22 Fair Street

This email was scanned by Bitdefender