CONSERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING

131 Pleasant Street
Nantucket, Massachusetts 02554
www.nantucket-ma.gov
Thursday, February 22, 2024 – 5:00 p.m.

This meeting was held via remote participation using ZOOM and YouTube.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h5asyS7BqAQ

Commissioners: Ian Golding (Chair), Seth Engelbourg (Vice Chair), Mark Beale, Tim Braine, Mike Misurelli, Joe Plandowski, and Linda Williams

Called to order at 5:00 p.m. by Chair Golding

Staff in attendance: Will Dell'Erba, Conservation Agent; Jeff Carlson, Natural Resources Director
Attending Members: Golding, Engelbourg, Beale, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, and Williams
Absent Members: Beale, Braine
Members Left Early:

*Indicates items not previously opened/discussed

I. PUBLIC MEETING

A. Public Comment - Chair Golding called for Public Comment on items not on the agenda. There was no comments from members of the public.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Notice of Intent

1. Siasconset Beach Preservation Fund/Town of Nantucket – 41-119 Baxter Road (various) SE48-3736

Sitting:	Golding, Engelbourg, Beale, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski
Recused:	Williams
Representative:	Steven Cohen, Cohen & Cohen Law PC; Dwight Dunk, Epsilon Associates; Gordon Thompson, Meredith Moldenhauer, Vince Murphy and Jennifer Kelly Lachmayr, PE, ARCADIS
Documentation:	Site and topographical plans, photos, requisite departmental reports and correspondence.
Discussion:	**Dunk** - The project is designed to meet key performance standards set by the bylaw and the Wetland Protection Act, which aim to protect pre-1978 homes with no feasible alternatives. - The design minimizes adverse effects on adjacent and nearby beaches by utilizing best available measures to reduce wave action and vegetating the face of Coastal Bank B. - Phase one of the project involves installing a sand-covered geotube array extending from Lot 117 to Lot 119 down to 77. This was detailed in the January 25, 2024, hearing where significant modeling supported the design. - The geotube design includes features such as being high enough to prevent overtopping, shallow-angled returns to reduce wave reflection and refraction, and a sand template for onsite sand stockpile to nourish the littoral drift system and stabilize the coastal bank. - Phase two includes the installation of coir terraces from Lot 71 to the property line between 59 and 61, and a sacrificial dune from the northern end of 59 down to 41, which is a nature-based protection measure. - The project includes adaptive sand management strategies to ensure the geotubes are covered after erosion events within seven business days. - The overall design minimizes wave reflection and refraction, which can cause scouring, by incorporating sloped surfaces and strategically angled returns.

	- Additional measures discussed include potentially raising the height of the sand template to store more sand above the geotube system, thereby minimizing its footprint on the beach. - A brief synopsis of sediment transport mechanisms was provided to underline the importance of compensatory sand in shoreline protection projects. - For the notice of intent related to this specific project, data from 1994 to 2022 was analyzed to understand the erosion patterns along the coastal bank. - To conduct a thorough analysis, transects were established every 10 feet along the project's length, resulting in over 200 transects being analyzed. - At each transect, the team assessed the retreat rate and height of the coastal bank, with the transects themselves designed to capture a 10-foot wide section of the coastal bank, encompassing 5 feet on either side of each transect point. **Gordon Thompson** - Historical data confirms that the Sconset shoreline has experienced a pattern of erosion and retreat for over 170 years, with this natural process affecting both the north and south areas surrounding the geotextile tube system. - It was emphasized that the erosion observed along the entire Sconset shoreline cannot solely be attributed to the geotextile tube system, due to the long-documented history of shoreline retreat in the area. - The variability of the shoreline's behavior was noted, with areas of advancement as well as retreat. Specifically, to the south of the geotextile tube system, the shoreline is currently showing slight advancement, while to the north, the shoreline is receding, albeit at a rate less than that observed in front of the geotextile tube system. - Concerns were also addressed regarding the potential impact of the geotextile tube project on adjacent properties, such as Green Hill, indicating a need for ongoing monitoring and adaptive management to mitigate any negative effects. - Provided a summary of the historical shoreline change data. - **1846 to 1887**: During this period, the shoreline was advancing. This observation was based on data provided by the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management (CZM), USGS, and a study by Taylor et al., published in 2013. - **1887 to 1955**: The shoreline continued to advance, particularly up to the area where the current bluff stabilization project is located. North of this area, the shoreline began to show signs of retreat. - **1955 to 1978**: This period marked a shift, with significant shoreline retreat observed south of the pilot project area. North of the project, near the Green Hill property, the shoreline showed slight advancement with a minimal retreat rate of about one foot per year within the Green Hill property limits. - **1978 to 1994:** During this period, there was significant shoreline retreat to the south of the pilot project, with the retreat signal decreasing as you moved north. Around the Greenhill property, the shoreline was relatively stable. - **1995 to June 2005:** This timeframe saw a dramatic change with a marked peak of shoreline advance to the south, reaching up to 22 feet per year. There was also a strong retreat observed from the 5,000 to 10,000-foot mark south of the bluff. To the north of this, the shoreline transitioned from retreating to becoming stable and even advancing. - **June 2005 to September 2013:** This period was characterized by an inversion in shoreline dynamics. Previously observed areas of strong shoreline advance shifted to retreat, and areas that had strong retreat signals became areas of advance. This data was provided by Coastal Planning and Engineering in 2006, funded by the Sconset Beach Preservation Fund (SBPF). - **September 2013 to December 2022:** In this period following the installation of the geotube system, the previously noted trends of shoreline dynamics continued, but with an increasing tendency for shoreline retreat as one moves northward along the coast.

	- Data Collection: The Woods Hole Group was contracted by the Sconset Beach Preservation Fund (SBPF) to collect data on a quarterly basis during this period. This data provides a detailed snapshot of the ongoing shoreline changes. - Overall Shoreline Behavior: The entire stretch of shoreline from the sewer beds to north of Sesachacha Pond displayed periods of both shoreline advance and retreat. Notably, as one approaches the Green Hill property and further north, the signals of extreme shoreline changes start to abate. - Geographical Influence: Some of the variability in shoreline dynamics can be attributed to the geographical features east and southeast of the area, particularly around Sesachacha Pond, where the shoreline dynamics tend to become more uniform. - It was noted that the area immediately north of the geotextile tubes is experiencing less erosion compared to the area within the geotextile tube system itself. - Expressed skepticism about attributing the observed erosion between September 2013 and December 2022 solely to the geotextile project. Given the length of the pilot project and its location along a three-and-a-half to four-mile section of beach, it was deemed unrealistic to link all observed erosion during this period directly to the geotextile system. - It was noted that while the shoreline to the north of the geotextile tubes has experienced some retreat, the shoreline to the south is advancing. This highlights the varying responses of different sections of the shoreline to environmental forces and protective measures. - The primary objective of the geotextile tube system is to mitigate the impact of high and periodic shoreline recession events. The system aims to prevent one-way transport and subsequent loss of the bluff material, which is crucial for maintaining shoreline stability. - The intent behind the geotextile tubes is to interrupt the movement of "sand waves" through the system, thereby reducing the incidence of significant shoreline retreat and bluff loss. Following such interventions, a recovery of the shoreline is generally expected. - The primary goal mentioned for the geotextile tubes is to reduce the variability in shoreline recession at the top of the bluff. By doing this, even in years with significant shoreline recession, the geotextile tubes can help mitigate these effects while continuing to contribute sand to the littoral system. - The system is designed to stabilize the position of the bluff, which is a key aim of the project. This stabilization helps maintain the current location of the bluff over time, despite varying environmental conditions. - The pilot project includes specific areas identified as reaches 1, 3, 4, and 5. The extension of protection measures further south, particularly around Baxter Road, is considered due to its vulnerability and the potential for increased variability in that section of the shoreline.
Commissioner Questions/Comments: (00:44:38)	**Williams** - Raised the question about how the previously required amount of sand for the geotextile tube project compares to the current proposal for sand nourishment. **Dunk** - For the pilot project under Order of Conditions, there was a stipulation to place 22 cubic yards of sand per linear foot per year along the project. This requirement totaled approximately 20,838 cubic yards of sand per year. The purpose of this sand was to maintain the on-site stockpile, known as the template, to ensure there was enough sand available to cover the geotubes after erosion events. - The sand added to the template was not solely for direct contribution to the littoral drift system but to ensure that the project would continue to contribute sand in a similar manner to an unconstructed bluff, effectively mimicking natural sediment flow and bluff contribution.

	- The current proposal modifies how sand is managed:
	  o Initially establish the template with 22 cubic yards per linear foot.
	  o Instead of automatically replenishing this amount annually, ongoing operations and maintenance (O&M) activities will involve monitoring and documenting the actual amount of sand lost from the template.
	  o Sand replenishment will then be adjusted based on actual erosion, with the template being refilled to maintain the 22 cubic yards per linear foot baseline as needed. For example, if an average of 7 cubic yards per linear foot is lost in a year, the replenishment will match this amount. In years with heavier losses due to major storms, more sand will be added accordingly.
	- This revised strategy introduces a more adaptive management approach, which allows for sand volume adjustments based on actual conditions and erosion rates rather than adhering to a fixed annual replenishment schedule.
	Golding
	- Questioned where was "ground zero" and how the shoreline change analysis was conducted.
	Thompson
	- In the context of the discussions and the data presented, "ground zero" refers to an arbitrary but specifically chosen point, which is the location of the Town sewer beds.
	- The survey process involves measuring across the beach to establish a contour line, regardless of the tide level at the time of the survey. This contour typically represents the mean low water line, which is then used as a reference point for determining shoreline position.
	- The Woods Hole Group conducts four surveys annually to monitor the shoreline. To maintain consistency in data presentation, especially for the 2013 to 2022 period, surveys from September and October are primarily used. This choice is made because these months typically provide a more stable profile of the beach, avoiding the natural variations seen between winter and summer profiles, where beaches can appear different in width due to seasonal shifts.
	- The data from these surveys are reported in a format that allows the examination of both seasonal variability and year-to-year changes in the shoreline. The reports often include what are described as "dot plots," which visually track the position of the mean low water line over time based on the surveys conducted throughout the year.

Discussion Continued (00:50:25)	**Dunk**
	- The construction process for the geotextile tube project is thoroughly outlined in section 4.7.1 of the project documentation. This section provides a step-by-step sequence that the Sconset Beach Preservation Fund (SBPF) will follow during the implementation phase.
	- The SBPF will lead the project, including hiring contractors. They will work closely with both the Town and the Sconset community to ensure that the construction process is smooth and minimally disruptive.
	- Strategies to minimize construction impacts include:
	  o Careful scheduling to avoid peak tourist seasons, thereby reducing traffic and community disruption.
	  o Establishing performance standards for contractors to minimize damage to the beach and bluff during construction.
	- After installing the geotextile tubes and placing the initial sand (to establish the template), additional sand will be placed to smooth out and fill any gullies or erosion spots on the bluff above the tubes. This area will then be vegetated to help stabilize the bluff and integrate it more naturally into the surrounding environment.

Jennifer Kelly Lachmayr

- Serves as the principal in charge of contracts with the Town of Nantucket. ARCADIS has been advising and working with the town since 2020, beginning with assignments like the coastal resilience plan.
- Through their work, particularly on the coastal resilience plan and the long-term utility and access continuity plan along Baxter Road, ARCADIS has gained significant insights into the town's goals, desires, and specific issues related to coastal management.
- ARCADIS has been closely involved in understanding and addressing the maintenance issues of the pilot program for shoreline protection. This involvement included multiple discussions with both the commission and the town, pinpointing various operational challenges.
- In the current Notice of Intent (NOI), specifically section six and attachment H, there is a detailed operation and maintenance plan that has been significantly influenced by the town's Natural Resources Department. This plan aims to tackle previously identified challenges effectively.
- The operational plan includes comprehensive details on maintenance, monitoring, and reporting. It clarifies roles and responsibilities to address past ambiguities and expands on the economic responsibilities associated with the project.
- The plan reflects a collaborative effort to ensure that all stakeholder concerns are considered and addressed, enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of the coastal protection measures.

Provided an overview of the routine and post-storm activities detailed in the operation and maintenance plan for the geotextile tube project, which included:

- Regular checks and documentation are required to assess the condition and effectiveness of the coastal protection measures.
- This involves annually adding sand to the designated areas to ensure the geotubes remain adequately covered and functional.
- Actions to cover any geotubes that become exposed due to erosion or other factors.
- Keeping access points to the beach clear and functional for public use and emergency services.
- Checking the condition of the sand cover after storm events to determine the extent of erosion or displacement.
- The authorized contractor will conduct necessary work to re-cover any geotubes exposed after storms.
- Ensuring the infrastructure used for delivering sand to the site is in good working order.
- Addressing any damage to the geotubes to maintain their effectiveness in shoreline protection.
- Implementing repairs as needed to maintain the integrity of the toe protection system, which is critical for safeguarding the shoreline.

Dunk

Provided a comprehensive summary of the collaborative efforts and the changes in the operational and monitoring procedures, as follows:

- The Operation and Maintenance (O&M) manual was a joint effort between ARCADIS, the Town's Natural Resources Department, and other stakeholders, not merely a document prepared by one party and reviewed by others. This collaboration aimed to produce a robust document addressing the town's concerns, with significant involvement from key figures like Mr. Murphy.
- The initial pilot project was heavily monitored to gather sufficient data to make informed decisions for potential future extensions. After a three-year wait period, the proposed changes in the O&M procedures include:

- These will be conducted for one year post-construction to closely monitor the initial impacts.
- Conducted in spring and fall, similar to the Woods Hole group's surveys, to continue monitoring changes with less frequency but maintaining rigor.
- These will be conducted semiannually to assess the physical and biological conditions of the beach and nearshore areas.
- Initially frequent due to concerns about impacts on cobble habitats, these will now be conducted once every three years due to the findings of minimal changes, reflecting the natural variability of the habitat.
- Critical for immediate assessment and action following significant weather events.
- These surveys are crucial for determining the volume of sand that needs to be replenished annually to maintain the system's effectiveness, particularly after the winter storm season.
- The updated O&M plan is designed to meet and exceed industry standards and best practices, as evidenced by adherence to guidelines such as the CZM and DEP Beach Nourishment Guide and Best Management Practices.
- For the initial post-construction phase, quarterly monitoring is recommended, aligning with CZM guidelines for beach nourishment projects. This intense initial monitoring phase helps to capture the immediate effects and stabilization following construction.
- After the first year, the monitoring frequency is proposed to be semiannual and continued for three to five years, which is a more rigorous approach compared to typical recommendations of annual monitoring after the first year.

Ongoing Reporting and Documentation:

- The Operation and Maintenance (O&M) manual specifies detailed reporting requirements to the Natural Resources Department, including:
- **Storm Reports:** These must be submitted within seven days following a storm, including photo documentation, estimates of sand displacement from the template, exposure of geotubes, and any necessary repairs.
- **Quarterly Work Reports**: Due within 30 days of each quarter's end, documenting all maintenance activities, sand placements, and other relevant work.
- **Shoreline Surveys:** Also to be provided within 30 days of survey completion, detailing changes and conditions along the shoreline.
- Standardization of Practices:
- Geotextile tubes covered with sand for shoreline stabilization (including coastal banks and dunes) is established as a standard practice, not only in Nantucket but globally. This method is recognized within the industry for its effectiveness in various geographic settings.
- The application of geotextile tubes is a globally recognized method for coastal management, demonstrating the project's alignment with well-established and effective coastal protection strategies. These practices are not novel or untested but are part of an industry-standard approach to managing shoreline erosion and stabilizing coastal environments.

Meredith Moldenhauer, SBPF Board Member

Provided a comprehensive summary of the key points discussed about the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) manual for the geotextile tube project, as follows:

- The manual was developed collaboratively with significant input from the Town of Nantucket, ARCADIS, and the Sconset Beach Preservation Fund (SBPF). This partnership was formed to incorporate many of the lessons learned from the past eight to ten years of the project's implementation.

Focus on Roles and Responsibilities:

- A major focus of the revised O&M manual is on defining clear roles and responsibilities to foster a culture of accountability among all parties involved.

	The manual includes a detailed chart listing the primary persons responsible for each critical aspect of the project, ensuring clarity and facilitating effective management. - The manual is designed to fill any gaps in responsibilities and provides comprehensive details on how to contact responsible individuals. This structure is intended to give the Conservation Commission and the town greater confidence in the project management and oversight, addressing past concerns. - All costs related to the installation, operations, maintenance, and monitoring of the geotextile tubes are the responsibility of the SBPF. The manual outlines SBPF's commitment to funding these efforts, including potential fundraising and grant applications. Since the initial pilot project permit in 2013, SBPF has transparently managed and borne the costs associated with these activities. - The extended project is described as financially essential, providing the necessary economies of scale required for sustainable management. **Vince Murphy, Natural Resources Department** - The O&M manual is specifically designed as a response to historical challenges encountered in previous phases of the project. Its development is a proactive measure to overcome these issues by establishing a clear and new framework for future operations. - A central feature of the manual is its detailed delineation of roles and responsibilities. It assigns both a primary and a secondary person for each role to ensure redundancy and reliability in project management. This dual-assignment approach is crucial for maintaining continuity and accountability in the project's execution. - From the town's perspective, the sustainability programs manager is designated as the primary contact, with the town manager, Libby Gibson, serving as the fallback person. Similarly, the Sconset Beach Preservation Fund (SBPF) has appointed nominees for each role within their organization, ensuring that both the town and SBPF have structured oversight and clear points of contact. - The manual facilitates open lines of communication between all parties involved. - By outlining who is responsible for what actions, when these actions should take place, and how issues should be resolved, the manual provides a more streamlined and efficient approach to the operation and maintenance of the geotextile tube project. - The project aims to enhance public access and enjoyment of the beach area, which is crucial as it is a public beach with facilities at the top of the bluff. - The Sconset Beach Preservation Fund (SBPF) has considered several amenities to improve public utility and environmental responsibility, including: - Installation of waste stations for pet waste to maintain cleanliness and hygiene. - Providing bike parking facilities to encourage environmentally friendly transportation options. - A notable proposal involves constructing public beach access stairs, which would likely require an easement through SBPF property. This access would lead directly onto the top of the existing template and then onto the beach via ramps at either end of the template. - From the town's perspective, there is an intention to undertake water quality monitoring to evaluate the suitability of the area as a potential swimming location. Although not planned as a lifeguarded beach, understanding the water quality is essential for public health and safety. - Consistent with other beaches on the island, signs indicating water quality and other relevant public health information would be easy additions to inform visitors about the conditions of the beach. - SBPF has been acknowledged for their generous viewpoint towards increasing public use of the area, demonstrating a collaborative effort to enhance the community benefits of the project.

	Chip Nylon - Demonstrated compliance with the performance standards set by the Conservation Commission under both the local bylaw and the Wetlands Protection Act. - For the Conservation Commission to issue an order of conditions, they must find that the project meets specific criteria. These findings are crucial for the approval and continuation of the project. - Referenced findings from a previous order (SE48 2824) that allowed them to proceed with the pilot project. They believe that the outcomes of the pilot project have validated these initial findings by demonstrating compliance with the performance standards. - It was noted that the issuance of a removal order for the pilot project was not due to any adverse impacts on the beaches or wave action. Instead, it was because the required sand was not placed according to the conditions set by the order. - Expressed confidence that the experience and results from the pilot project have adequately prepared them to meet the performance standards for the proposed extension of the project. They believe that the lessons learned and the data gathered provide a solid foundation for future compliance and successful project implementation.
Commissioner Questions/Comments: (01:15:40)	**Beale** - Noted loss of beachfront directly in front of the geotextile tubes on the ocean side, with waves reaching the tubes at normal high tide. - Expressed concern about the impact on public access, particularly the ability to walk back and forth along the beach. - Uncertain if this beach erosion is a seasonal effect or a permanent change due to the installation of geotextile tubes. - Need to determine whether the geotextile tubes are disrupting natural sediment transport, potentially leading to erosion. **Thompson** - Recognizes that the shoreline experiences natural seasonal fluctuations. - Explained that large storm events and astronomical tides (e.g., full moon tides in September or October) can cause higher than normal tides, affecting shoreline positions. - The management strategy involves providing sand from in front of and on top of the geotextile tubes to compensate for natural sediment movement. - Bulldozers will be used to redistribute sand from a reservoir area in front of the geotubes, ensuring that there is movement of sand along the shoreline. - The purpose of moving sand is to maintain a buffer of sediment that can naturally be carried along the shoreline, mitigating potential impacts from the geotextile tubes. - Remains focused on long-term shoreline positions rather than short-term or recent changes to understand overall trends and eliminate day-to-day variability. - Emphasizes that their analysis removes transient variations to get a clearer picture of enduring changes and impacts. **Engelbourg** - Stated that the shoreline along the stretch is highly variable. - Mentioned that the overall trend across the entire area is one of erosion. - Discussed the divided expert opinions on whether geotextile tubes directly cause increased erosion. - Noted that the impact of geotextile tubes on erosion remains unclear, with conflicting expert opinions. - Outlined that geotextile tubes are installed primarily to protect the bank. - Explained that geotextile tubes do not halt shoreline erosion but are intended to protect the coastal bank.

	- Indicated that the presence of geotextile tubes on the beach reduces the width of the beach profile due to their physical footprint. - Concluded that geotextile tubes could potentially accelerate the timeline for shoreline erosion to reach these structures, compared to a scenario where they are absent. - Suggested that in the absence of geotubes, natural erosion processes might eventually erode the bluff, contributing material to the beach through natural processes. - Raised the need to consider both the immediate protective benefits of geotextile tubes and their potential long-term impacts on natural sediment dynamics and beach profile. - Expressed concerns about potential downdrift impacts on adjacent beach areas, specifically regarding the blockage of longshore sediment transport. - Explored how the installation of geotextile tubes impacts the physical space they occupy on the beach and how they may accelerate erosion processes reaching their location on the shoreline.
Discussion Continued (01:21:30)	**Dunk** - Stated the primary role of the Conservation Commission is to ensure projects comply with the Wetlands Protection Act and local bylaws. - Highlighted that the project addresses each performance standard from the seaward edge moving landward, considering beach, bank, dune, and land coastal storm flowage. - Described in the Notice of Intent how each standard was met or noted as not applicable. - Confirmed that Coastal Engineering Structures (CES) are typically restricted from altering beach form but can protect pre-1978 homes under specific conditions. - Discussed the use of compatible sand for the beach and bank, ensuring it matches local sediment in grain size. - Provided a sourcing document in the Notice of Intent for reviewing the sand's suitability. - Mentioned precautions to ensure sand is free from anthropogenic contamination, especially if sourced from local excavations. - Addressed regulations regarding land under the ocean and other areas not directly impacted by the project. - Outlined provisions under specific statutes that allow for CES on beaches to protect buildings erected before 1978, given no feasible alternative exists. - Detailed the project's design to minimize effects on adjacent beaches by managing wave action effectively. - Explained the strategic placement of sand above the geotextile tubes to ensure sufficient volume for beach nourishment and coastal protection without unnecessarily extending onto the beach. - Discussed efforts to balance the need for sufficient sand to protect the geotextile tubes and maintain a robust littoral drift system with the need to minimize the footprint on the beach. - Clarified that sand needed to reach the specified volume would be placed on top of the geotextile structure rather than pushed to the front, to ensure it is available for redistribution post-erosion events. - Reviewed building department data confirming that all homes along the project stretch are pre-1978 constructions. - Noted that these homes generally have not undergone substantial improvements, except for the property at 41. - Proposed a sacrificial dune from 59 down to 41, which is classified not as a Coastal Engineering Structure (CES) but as a nature-based solution to provide erosion control.

	- Mentioned that the coastal protection regulations were promulgated in 1978, designed to address issues specifically related to coastal areas. - Highlighted specific clauses in state regulations and local bylaws that permit CES for protecting pre-1978 buildings, structures, and infrastructure under certain conditions.
Commissioner Questions/Comments: (01:43:15)	**Engelbourg** - Emphasized that actions by past conservation commissions do not legally bind future commissions, highlighting the principle of non-precedential decision-making in wetlands permitting. - Argued that each project, despite similarities to previous ones, requires its own robust review without assumptions based on past approvals. - Challenged blanket statements regarding compliance with Coastal Bank performance standards, particularly those allowing for Coastal Engineering Structures (CES) for pre-1978 structures. - Suggested that each lot should be individually reviewed, especially those with complex histories or vacant lots, to ensure accurate compliance assessment. - Noted the need for detailed discussion on lots with unclear building and permitting history to reconcile possible discrepancies in improvement assessments. - Critiqued the assertion that Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regulations allow for the protection of "gap lots" (lots between protected properties), stating that there is limited supporting case law or permitting history. - Advocated for a thorough review covering all relevant aspects of the project, stressing the importance of not overlooking details that could impact the evaluation. - Underlined the duty of conservation commissions to ensure that all resource areas are considered and that performance standards are met without compromising one resource area to protect another. - Emphasized the need for proof that the project protects all relevant resource areas, not just the Coastal Bank. - Concluded with a call for a detailed and comprehensive review process that goes beyond basic compliance, ensuring that all factors and impacts are thoroughly evaluated.
Public Comments:	**Dennis Murphy** - Appreciated the detailed historical perspective provided on shoreline changes dating back to before the Civil War. - Noted the substantial attention given to the Green Hill property, emphasizing that the Green Hills, as residents of Nantucket, are also committed to preserving the beach for public use, not just their own property interests. - Mentioned that the Green Hills have hired Dr. Dave Kriebel, an expert who has produced a significant report. - Highlighted that Dr. Kriebel's report focuses on the broader public beach rather than solely on the Green Hill property, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the area's environmental needs. **Dr. Kriebel** - Confirmed representation of the Green Hill family in matters related to the coastal engineering project. - Discussed concerns about the loss of public beach due to the existing geotextile tubes and anticipated further loss with the proposed expansion of the project. - Highlighted the irony of the town being a party to actions that have arguably led to the reduction of public beach access, considering its public status. - Submitted two reports to the town addressing the impact of the geotextile tubes: ▪ The first report discusses the encroachment of existing geotextile tubes on the public beach, resubmitted in light of its relevance to a new Notice of Intent (NOI).

	▪ The second report examines the encroachment issues related to the proposed expansion and also assesses construction activities, specifically questioning whether there is adequate space between the bluff and mean high water to undertake the project. - Provided a summary which captured the key points related to the impact of seawalls and similar structures on beach erosion and emphasizes the need to consider these dynamics in coastal management practices. - Highlighted the critical issues related to the placement and impact of geotextile tubes on natural beach processes, particularly focusing on erosion and beach berm reduction. - Explained critical observations and technical assessments made in the second report regarding the geotextile tube expansion project, emphasizing the potential for significant and rapid loss of public beach access due to the proposed construction methods and dimensions. - Noted discrepancies in the project's design drawings, where the excavation trench depicted in gray shaded areas touches or crosses the mean high water line in several places. - Highlighted that the drawings do not account for the sand stockpile relative to the mean high water line. - Advised that the applicant should update the project narrative to specifically address the loss of dry beach, which has not been adequately covered in the Notice of Intent (NOI). - Recommended that engineering drawings be corrected to reflect the stated goal of maintaining 22 cubic yards per linear foot of sand cover. - Suggested that scale drawings should be provided for each transect to account for variations observed from one transect to another. - Pointed out that the topographic survey data is outdated (last survey from December 2022), emphasizing the need for a current survey to reflect the latest conditions. - Recommended that the NOI should include a detailed discussion on expected future erosion, including how these erosion rates could impact the project over time. - Stressed that the NOI currently lacks a comprehensive analysis of how erosion rates might affect the project, particularly in relation to the mean high-water line. - Concerns Over Construction Impact Near Water Line: - Expressed concerns about the potential impacts of construction activities near the mean high-water line, suggesting that scale drawings should clearly delineate where sand is stockpiled, where excavation occurs, and where heavy equipment operates. **Nylon** - Emphasized that approval of the earlier pilot project by the commission does not automatically imply approval for the current project. - Stressed that the current project is entirely different from the pilot project and should be evaluated on its own merits. - Noted the benefit of having data and findings from the past 10 years to inform the current project's evaluation. - Clarified that the current Notice of Intent (NOI) is separate and distinct from the earlier project identified as 2824. - Stated the necessity for the commission to make independent findings regarding whether the current project meets the required performance standards. - Expressed a desire to prevent any misconceptions among commission members that there is an entitlement to project approval based on past project approvals. -
Commissioner Questions/Comments: (02:11:51)	**Golding** - Intends to discuss the project with Jeff Carlson, who will follow up directly after the discussion.

	- Will circulate a paper with fellow commissioners to facilitate understanding and streamline the review process. - Aims to ensure clarity and direction in the project's progression among the commissioners. - Discussion will continue to the March 7, 2024, meeting.

III. PUBLIC MEETING

1. Discussion of Request for Independent Legal Counsel for SE48-3736

Sitting:	Golding, Engelbourg, Beale, Braine, Plandowski, Williams
Discussion: (02:12:19)	**Dell'Erba** - Multiple requests for proposals have been sent out. - Currently waiting to receive an official proposal from one positive respondent. - Hopes to receive the awaited proposal within the week.

2. Discussion of Independent Reviewer for SE48-3736

Sitting:	Golding, Engelbourg, Beale, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Williams
Discussion: (02:12:54)	**Dell'Erba** - A proposed contract has been circulated among relevant parties. - Currently waiting to hear back from additional potential respondents.

3. Discussion of Removal Order for SE48-2824

Sitting:	Golding, Engelbourg, Beale, Braine, Misurelli, Plandowski, Williams
Discussion: (02:19:37)	Commission discussion ensued, during which they agreed to extend the date of the move order.
Motion:	**Motion to extend the date of the move until May 9, 2024. (Made By: Engelbourg) (Seconded By: Williams) (02:20:40)**
Vote:	Carried: //7:0 – Beale, Braine, Engelbourg, Misurelli, Plandowski, Williams, Golding (aye)

Discussion:	**Murphy** Summarized the presentation given to the Select Board regarding the alternative access project, in collaboration with ARCADIS: - The project is currently at the 90% design phase, involving a series of trackways from San Road through private properties to facilitate access to sewer and water services. - Presented updates to the select board about reaching the 60% design phase, noting significant property owner feedback. - At the 90% phase, feedback was solicited again, resulting in minor, detail-oriented suggestions that are easier to address. - Feedback has been incorporated into the design, bringing it closer to completion. - Plans are in progress to finalize the design to 100% and seek property owner approvals for moving forward. - Intends to bring the completed project proposal to the Conservation Commission in the spring for necessary approvals and easements. - Discussed the possibility of having a pre-application discussion with the commission in March to identify any potential issues. - Engaged multiple town departments, including the fire department for safety analysis, planning department, and DPW, to ensure comprehensive input and approval. - Next Steps:

	- Planning to schedule a pre-application meeting with the commission through coordination with Jeff or Will, as appropriate, to discuss detailed plans and receive feedback.

4. Adjournment

Motion:	**Motion to adjourn. (Made By: Plandowski) (Seconded By: Misurelli) (02:26:35)**
Vote:	Carried: //7:0 – Beale, Braine, Engelbourg, Misurelli, Plandowski, Williams, Golding (aye)

Submitted by:
Elaina Cano