

The Coastal Resiliency Action Committee  
**MEETING MINUTES - TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 2021, 4:00 P.M.**

In accordance with the Governor’s Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G. L. c. 30A, § 20, relating to the 2020 novel Coronavirus outbreak emergency, **the March 30, 2021 public meeting of the Coastal Resiliency Action Committee shall be physically closed to the public to avoid group congregation.**

Alternative public access to this meeting shall be provided in the following manner:

1. The meeting will be televised via Falmouth Community Television.
2. Real-time public comment can be addressed to the Coastal Resiliency Action Committee utilizing the Zoom virtual meeting software for remote access. This application will allow users to view the meeting and send a comment or question to the Chair via the Chat function. Submitted text comments will be read into the record at the appropriate points in the meeting.
  - a. Zoom Login instructions:
    - i. Instructions and the meeting link for this specific meeting can be found at the following web address: <http://www.falmouthma.gov/CoastalResiliency>
    - ii. Please plan on 10-15 minutes of preparation time to log in though it may be less if you have previously used Zoom on the device you will use to access this meeting.
3. Additionally public comments may be sent in advance of the meeting to [concom@falmouthma.gov](mailto:concom@falmouthma.gov) at **least 5 hours prior** to the beginning of the meeting. Documents and audio or video files may also be submitted via email. Submitted email comments and documents will be made a part of the meeting record and may be read into the record, summarized or displayed during the meeting at the discretion of the chair.

Present: Charles McCaffrey, Chair  
Melissa Freitag, Vice-Chair  
Jamie Mathews  
Paul Dreyer  
Andrew Ashton  
Ed Schmitt, Alternate

Also present:

Mr. McCaffrey opened the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

Mr. McCaffrey: I had a conversation with Chris Neal and Linda Deegan re the Woodwell Climate Resource Center. They asked how they can help us. One thing they could help with is covering the shoreline futures – the good, bad or ugly. Also opportunities with graphics would help with presenting risks and options that are available. We can always use help with grants.

Mr. Mathews: Is the MVP grant still open?

Ms. Lincoln: Yes.

Mr. Mathews: Do we submit periodic reports?

Ms. Lincoln: Yes.

Mr. McCaffrey: They haven't announced this series yet?

Ms. Lincoln: No they haven't.

Mr. McCaffrey: We should look at priorities.

**Continue to discuss and vote priority actions from the MVP Workshop, Vulnerability Assessment, and prior Town studies.**

Ms. Lincoln: I sent out the last version of our report, dated last December, recently.

Mr. McCaffrey: I can't find it.

Mr. Mathews: I got it on the 10<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Lincoln: I just sent it to you again Charlie.

Mr. McCaffrey: We should use the outline as it exists and go through it. We are supporting data that WHG can provide. We'll ask for it. They should be describing the nature of the risks of flooding, etc. – a summary of the issues we're expecting. What directions the Town should take. The other topic is the Surf Drive Study. There are various strategies with a bias toward natural resources and managed retreats. They recommended one approach of retreat from the barrier beach itself. Building a high wall is not an alternative. Creating a public park with streams where the bathhouse is was not recommended specifically. Do we agree with the recommendations – have a better one? Was the park idea fully explored? How do we address the Surf Drive Study?

Mr. Mathews: In a general sense I agree with most of the recommendations. Some need to be studied further. All the recommendations have to be looked at more closely.

Mr. McCaffrey: We have been given a set of recommendations. One is not trying to protect a barrier beach as a natural resource. I'm not recommending a seawall along Surf Drive.

Mr. Mathews: We have to give them choices.

Mr. McCaffrey: Yes, but not narrow options.

Mr. Mathews: We can narrow down the choices a bit. We looked at everything wholesale and didn't dismiss any one thing.

Mr. McCaffrey: There are some we should dismiss. A causeway or a seawall are not likely choices.

Ms. Freitag arrived at 4:16 p.m.

Mr. McCaffrey mentioned to Ms. Freitag that the Committee is discussing what we would say about the Surf Drive Study. The consultants made specific choices. Some alternatives are not likely to be pursued. The park idea should be fully explored.

Ms. Freitag: I just have a draft report.

Mr. McCaffrey: That doesn't matter.

Ms. Freitag: We should highlight some of the recommendations and not others.

Mr. McCaffrey: We should highlight options that are worth further study.

Ms. Freitag: Like the natural resources option.

Mr. McCaffrey: There are recommendations that warrant further exploration. We can summarize them some way.

Mr. Ashton: There are preferred pathways on page 45 and page 94.

Ms. Freitag: Also on page 99.

Mr. McCaffrey: The approach to analyzing the shoreline is good but it doesn't adequately assess the evolution.

Ms. Freitag: Figure 36 on page 89 seems to be the main one.

Mr. Ashton: I picked figure 38 that dealt with the road elevation.

Mr. McCaffrey: Without getting into detail a summary of the study can say what should be further explored. We should not mention others that we wouldn't explore.

Mr. Ashton: We could mention specific recommendations as a combination of themes.

Ms. Freitag: By not talking about natural resources and retreat?

Mr. McCaffrey: They want us to make suggestions.

Ms. Freitag: In figure 36 they are talking about a barrier beach – following natural resources and managed retreat. They are not for a barrier beach but are for protection of the road. The beach and road are so intertwined.

Mr. McCaffrey: We can't have both and we want to agree. I went through this and some of the pathways could be feasible and can be explored. Some are not feasible and that should be told to the Select Board. There are 4 options: build a causeway and the barrier beach may survive; protect the barrier beach with a high wall; let the barrier beach evolve naturally; raise the road to protect the neighborhood; retreat from neighborhood and allow the natural resource to do its thing. It could be a problem to protect the neighborhood by high berms or other problems if we abandon the neighborhood. Their methodology is great and we want to use it in other things.

Ms. Freitag: I would recommend numbers 3 and 4. They are about protection and not retreat.

Mr. McCaffrey: I wasn't looking at the Study.

Ms. Freitag: There are 4 possibilities: protection, connection, managed retreat and natural resources.

Mr. McCaffrey: The emphasis is on managed retreat and natural resources.

Ms. Freitag: We can protect in the beginning.

Mr. McCaffrey: An important aspect is that it evolves. What's good for today may not be good for 50 years out. We can address that when we mention replicating the Study. It's important to eliminate the causeway and sea walls on Surf Drive in the long term. It can be pursued for near time.

Ms. Freitag: All this would need to be funded by Town Meeting.

Mr. Ashton: Why are we talking about a causeway, they're not.

Ms. Freitag: It's one recommendation the Select Board will see in the Study.

Mr. McCaffrey: The main negative about the causeway is the cost. The road can be maintained by raising the road.

Mr. Mathews: I see a causeway like in Chapaquoit but this is more like a bridge.

Mr. McCaffrey: The cost is huge. We want to de-emphasize structures on Surf Drive.

Ms. Freitag: I agree.

Mr. McCaffrey: I would further recommend that the retreat and protection of neighborhoods need to be explored. This type of planning is needed for the neighborhoods.

Ms. Freitag: Is it feasible to protect neighborhoods?

Mr. McCaffrey: No, but I think it needs to be explored. We need more understanding about if you retreated from there. Would a natural beach form? We don't know.

Ms. Freitag: The natural resources part recommends a neighborhood to be still protected in 2050. The managed retreat neighborhood is a pond in 2070.

Mr. McCaffrey: Look at the tables in the Study. 800 homes will be permanently inundated in 2070 – 300 of them in New Silver Beach and Surf Drive neighborhoods. We can draft something and send it around to the Committee.

Ms. Freitag: The report is going to be about 30 pages. We have two pages tops for Surf Drive.

Mr. McCaffrey: It could be an introduction to the appendix where we say we replicate the Study – managed retreat and natural resources.

Ms. Freitag: The natural resource solution has something like berms.

Mr. McCaffrey: Do we have anything else on the Surf Drive Study?

Ms. Freitag: Choose 2070 natural resources and managed retreat. Do an adaptive plan with the goal of these two recommendations.

Mr. McCaffrey: Have one paragraph of their adapted management recommendation.

### **Discuss assistance for Woods Hole Group in preparing final report.**

Mr. Mathews: I have a note from our last meeting about asking Woods Hole Group (WHG) to do neighborhood assessments.

Mr. McCaffrey: Not for each neighborhood. They should hit the high points of the number of homes to be inundated by 2070. Nearly one half will be in two neighborhoods – New Silver Beach and across from the bathhouse. Does that make sense?

Mr. Mathews: It does.

Mr. Dreyer: Is WHG going to do figures on Surf Drive as well?

Mr. McCaffrey: Not likely. They are only adding what we just discussed. If we go to the last version of the outline we can identify where we should expect WHG to do something.

Ms. Freitag: I don't think I have a clean copy of the outline.

Mr. McCaffrey: Use the early December report. It did include an outline within it. Start with the Table of Contents and then in the introduction process what we've done. We may edit it again. Under issues and analysis – work done by WHG. Let them write about natural resources. I will revise the draft. Societal conflict is a little dryer than what is at risk in Falmouth. It's one of the things you wrote about. A lot of recommendations will be found in the section called recommendations. We will talk about broader trends.

Ms. Freitag: Not recommendations?

Mr. McCaffrey: There were some recommendations. The Select Board should know about existing programs. There is also what I wrote on FEMA'S flood plan and showed the flaws in it. Coastal erosion – that's where I see WHG helping. They can use what we've done. We work on education, etc. That makes sense.

Ms. Freitag: Back to the Table of Contents.

Mr. McCaffrey: Resources at risk.

Ms. Freitag: Before we do that do we want a section for the synopsis of studies completed and then go into recommendations. This is what we've done. After section 4 of the Table of Contents is Studies. Section 5 would be recommendations and proposals. We can talk about the results of studies. Broader recommendations in Section 5 and future projects in Section 6. We have never had a section for a summary of what we've done. WHG summarize the work we've done? No.

Mr. McCaffrey: They must say something about studies. Maybe talk about the scope of the Surf Drive Study.

Ms. Freitag: We have a cap of \$9,000.

Mr. McCaffrey: This will take no time – just one paragraph on the Surf Drive Study. We say, of all the approaches, this is what we do.

Ms. Lincoln: I'd like to look at it first.

Ms. Freitag: This might be in a grant application. We don't need WHG to re-create the wheel. We have three months to do this.

Mr. McCaffrey: They are not going to write a summary of the Vulnerability Assessment?

Ms. Lincoln: Melissa wants to write a summary of the Vulnerability Assessment. Let WHG summarize their analyses. Elise LeDuc (WHG) wants to propose a schedule to work with us on their part. I will send a portion of it to her on Friday and the Committee can look at on the next Tuesday meeting and then send them ideas.

Mr. McCaffrey: I want the report to flow.

Ms. Freitag: Do you see page 8 – Issues and Analyses – that's the big hole. They can add something there if they want. Part B is still a work in progress if they want to comment on that.

Mr. McCaffrey: They can look at all of it and make suggestions.

Ms. Freitag: Not in the text.

Mr. McCaffrey: They will re-write everything. The series of recommendations related to the outline belong in the recommendations section not this one.

Ms. Freitag: On page 10 there are not recommendations. There is a list of roads that are most at risk. They are not recommending anything.

Ms. Lincoln: Paul wrote about strategic planning.

Mr. Dreyer: Quite awhile ago.

Mr. McCaffrey read from Ms. Freitag's writing. There are some recommendations and they should be in the recommendations section.

Ms. Freitag: There is no need to have WHG rewrite all the sections.

Ms. Lincoln: I need to re-read what we already have and give Elise an idea of what you want from them.

Ms. Freitag: We want a synopsis of neighborhoods. By the end of April we'll have something for the WHG.

Mr. McCaffrey: We should have something for WHG by the 13<sup>th</sup> of April.

Ms. Freitag: No, the 27<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Lincoln: I'll talk to Elise tomorrow and let you know.

Mr. McCaffrey: We present the report to the Select Board at the end of June.

Mr. Mathews: For the Committee report.

Mr. McCaffrey: It's the same thing. The final report will be on June 21<sup>st</sup>.

Ms. Freitag: What about June 28<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. McCaffrey: It wasn't an option.

## **VOTE MINUTES**

3/09/2021

Mr. Dreyer: Move to adopt the minute as corrected.

Mr. Mathews: Second.

Mr. McCaffrey: Freitag, aye; Dreyer, aye; McCaffrey, aye; Mathews, aye. Ashton abstained. Unanimous, so moved.

Mr. Mathews: Move to adjourn.

Mr. Dreyer: Second.

Mr. McCaffrey: Freitag, aye; Dreyer, aye; McCaffrey, aye; Mathews, aye. Ashton abstained.  
Unanimous, so moved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Cronin, Recording Secretary