Little Beach Committee Meeting January 13, 2021 7 pm

Meeting Recording:

https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/fI-5gfhX ZVGdVN2bzDieNQn2B7 2TyoBUsSMBhkJIfo Z-guQIMzAt-07HH0TLS6.OQrnJLJtpWyRu 6E

Attendees: Janice McClanaghan, Anita Langer, Marlene Bellini, Anthony Salvadore, Bill DelGizzo (few minutes late)

Agenda

Call to Order

Janice called the meeting to order at 7 PM

Approval of minutes: November 11, 2020

Anita Langer made a motion to approve the minutes and Marlene seconded. All in favor

Update on:

1. Survey results

Janice reviewed the results of the survey that was sent out in early December. There were 770 emails sent out (of that number 472 were opened and 284 responded for a 60% return rate. Of those responding, 210 (74%) were in favor of the Fire District supporting the study and 137(48%) were willing to provide financial support should the district not support the study. (the entire report is attached to these minutes)

Carolyn DiLeo commented that the 60% return rate demonstrates the interest of the community in investing in this study and that the council should take note of its importance to the community.

2. update on grant investigations regarding studies including EMA/FEMA

The grant we are applying for is a 75/25 Federal grant from EMA/FEMA for \$69,800 of which the district would be responsible for \$17,450. Mary Flynn worked on the grant application and because of the need to have a letter from the district stating their support for the project, it was determined that it was necessary to ask those who agreed to financially support the Study to again support this grant application. An e-mail blast was sent to 146 residents. The response was that 79 agreed to pledge \$27,125.

Bill DelGizzo commented that the decision to send this e-mail had not been publicly discussed and should not have been necessary. He agreed that we are getting better at following OMA but work still needs to be done. If the Council had regular meetings, they

would have been aware of grant applications under consideration and could have committed the \$\$ should the need arise.

Janice said she was unaware of the actual grant application and its deadline until January 8 with a deadline of January 14 and she and Mary Flynn saw no other way to meet the deadline. One of the other minor items left to be done is a letter from Mike DeLuca. Since the community agreed to pledge \$\$, Len Mercier was able to send a letter of support from the Land Trust to meet the grant deadline.

Janice reiterated that these pledges are a commitment only. No one will be asked at this time to make a donation.

The grant is a 16 month grant which would probably begin on 1/1/2021 which gives the Council sufficient time to include in the 2021 budget.

Bill had no other grant updates but stated that the commitment from the community is very positive and very important. Mike Deluca had recommended that we send the survey as any Grant proposal looks for community and district support. Seeing the level of financial support from the community is history making.

- 3. update on surf rake proposal/alternatives
- 4. update on ramp
- 5. update on seaweed disposal

Janice reported that the district has sent out 18 Request for Services to landscapers and contractors. Due date for response is January 22, 2021. The request outlines the needs and requirements of the district for anyone interested to do the work. The time period of the contract would be Memorial Day to Labor Day.

Janice also had further conversations with Harry and after much discussion reminded Harry it is only 62 days of work. He has given a revised quote of \$12,000, down fro \$24,00 for his original quote.

Anthony Salvadore thought this might solve the problem and Janice agreed it is a big part of the solution. Still needed though is the purchase of 2 mats which would be used to access to the beach. Tom Lonegran described these as mats that would lay over the rocks in order to access the beach and could then be removed, thus eliminating the need for an assent from CRMC. We will also need to find a vehicle and someone to remove the seaweed and Janice asked for assistance finding someone to do. Janice will ask Phil and Anthony Salvadore agreed to contact Walter Manning and he will ask him to attend the next meeting. The schedule for removal can be coordinated with the days Harry rakes the beach.

Anita suggested we might also send out a Request for Services to handle this part of the job. Janice suggested we wait till we hear from Manning and other contractors by 1/22. Harry

does not require a firm commitment at this point but Anthony asked that we will have a signed contract.

Public Comment

Anita Langer thanked all that had worked on the e-mail survey: Janice, Mary, Bill and Carolyn as well as the community for their responses and financial commitment

Faith LaSallle/Paul Luba

Faith asked whether the district is planning to flush the seaweed and is that the intent of the study.

Janice responded No and referred her the website. Carolyn explained that we are talking about two (2) separate and distinct issues. One is the study and the other is the removal of seaweed over the course of the summer. It is possible both will happened concurrently. She also referred her to website for the URI presentation and offered to send her the recording.

Tom Luba asked if Dr. King has completed the study for any other community and its costs

Bill reviewed briefly the Phases of the Study:

Phase 1 will determine the current conditions along the coastline and how and what man made impediments are there now.

Phase 2 & 3 – URI will complete simulations and resulting conditions based on alterations made. All of this is might be to create a soft shoreline which is more resistant to storms and provide ways to protect the area from future storms. Other communities hire Dr. King regularly review changes that have occurred. Other URI researchers study these issues extensively and were involved in the development of this study.

Tom asked: Has this worked anywhere else.? Good question. Bill will ask Dr. King. Bill reminded the public that we might decide it is not advisable to proceed beyond the study. Even if we do not proceed, we will have a baseline of what exists now. After Hurricane Sandy, Charlestown had extensive damage. FEMA restored only a part of the damage because Charlestown could not prove what was there before. If they had, FEMA would have reimbursed 100% of the damage.

Marlene also spoke to a professor at URI prior to the formation of the committee. She had no real suggestion for addressing the problem except to suggest that we eliminate Colonel John Gardner Rd. She felt the area was the victim of time and climatic changes.

Chris Mannix asked if Dr. King is the sole source and do we have authorization from RIEMA or FEMA.

Bill explained that Dr. King referred us to RIEMA and we are working with them. Melinda Hopkins is the State Mitigation Officer at RIEMA and is working closely with us to secure the grant. RIEMA is very concerned about the area and looks for solutions to make areas such as this more resistant to storm damage. Bill explained that this portion of the grant is part of a larger FEMA grant. Dr. King has a world reknowned reputation and is the only source for this type of study.

Marlene asked about the cost. Janice reminded her that the URI portion is only for Phase 1, 2 and 3 and that phase 4 is not part of the study. That phase is the permitting process and is analogous to building a house: Phase 1, 2 3 is the engineering and architectural plans and Phase 4 is the hiring of the contractor to build the house.

Chris Mannix again asked about the waiver. Janice reiterated that is premature to think we need a waiver now, In addition, there is no one else to do this study and if there is a need then Melinda from RIEMA will indicate that to us. Her requirements from Dr. King were quite detailed.

Janice thanked Lenny Mercier for stepping in to assist with Zoom.

The next meeting will be Feb 10 at 7 pm

Anita made a motion to adjourn and Marlene seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 8:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn DiLeo

Attachment: Survey results