



This is clearly an example of a project which became a runaway train in the race to chase funds (which we didn't get). The end result in little to no way resembles the original plan, needs or wants of the town. The original plan was to replace the sea wall with another concrete wall which would be higher to address sea level rise. What we have ended up with in the chase for funding is a walkway which sits on top of the existing wall that is heightened and shored up with heavy metal sheathing. Bottom line, we compromised original intent and needs in order to chase funding for an expensive walkway which effect is to provide unnecessary access to the Steamship Authority (we have an existing sidewalk), prevents access to an existing beach. The walkway also adds infrastructure to a coastline which not only will need to be maintained but is against the prevailing theory of NO HARD STRUCTURES ON A COASTAL BANK . (Please note the walkways the State provided to State Beach all along Beach Road). Additionally, the walkway and method for shoring up the wall takes away what remaining beach exists. Even if plans to renourish the beach at some future time come to fruition, there is no possibility for access but for one entrance. At some point, one needs to stop, step back and reevaluate. Is incorporating a walkway in the plan in order to gain additional funding worth sacrificing a new concrete sea wall which could last another 80 years and worth sacrificing an historic beach which has existed for hundreds of years, is part of and germane to the North Bluff neighborhood and provides an important and rare, valuable in-town recreational resource for the thousands that arrive from the Steamship ferries, Island Queen and Hyannis boats.

1. What was the final or most recent conclusion of FEMA as it relates to the integrity of the wall: i.e., did they determine it was "failed", did they claim it could be repaired and, if so, how? (adding concrete or other appropriate material).
2. Who were the main participants for the actual the planning and design of the North Bluff Project, including all changes made to the original plan during the past three years? What type of public outreach was done and what efforts were made for neighborhood (stakeholder) involvement.
3. Identify all outside funding sources for the project. May they be separated or one forfeited in order to eliminate the walkway and limit to replacement of the existing concrete wall with a higher concrete wall?
4. In order to incorporate a "transportation" feature into this project, why wasn't widening the original sidewalk contemplated which was part of the SeaView Waterfront Master Plan. It would have been less expensive (more affordable) and less disruptive to the Coastal Bank.
5. Why did FEMA determine the wall "not failed" and/or determine it did not need replacement.
6. When FEMA funding was questionable and efforts made to modify the design of the project to make it possible with existing funding, were the drawbacks to the changes in design (which incorporated walkway, metal sheathing....) weighed against the

benefits lost as a result of the changes (loss of existing beach, disruption to the coastal bank and loss of meaningful access to the shoreline).

7. Is the walkway inconsistent with local ConCom policy which generally does not allow permanent structures on a coastal bank? Was an exception made for this project?

- What was the original purpose of the North Bluff project at its inception? When was the walkway incorporated?