

Paul Foley

From: richardseelig@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 1:28 PM
To: Paul Foley
Subject: Re: North Bluff Sea Wall Project DRI #659

Mr. Foley,

If you didn't receive my letter on Friday, I am re-sending it.

Richard Seelig

From: "Richard Seelig" <richardseelig@comcast.net>
To: foley@mvcommission.org
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 11:35:25 AM
Subject: North Bluff Sea Wall Project DRI #659

Mr. Foley,

As I understand it, the original intent of the project at North Bluff was to rebuild the concrete wall and preserve or increase access to a beach that is fairly popular. Apparently, there was insufficient money to do that project. In order to attract more money, a walkway, which was not part of the intent of the original project, was added. But there still wasn't enough money to rebuild the concrete wall, so a corrugated steel wall was substituted so that the walkway would attach to a solid foundation. And then a revetment of large boulders was planned to protect the steel wall, resulting in the loss of a usable beach.

Does this make any sense??? The original project was aesthetically appropriate and would have protected the bank and preserved a popular beach; the current plan substitutes an eyesore, a walkway that isn't needed, and sacrifices the beach.

I have heard that the Conservation Commission is claiming that the beach won't be lost because they are getting a permit that would allow dredge material to be added to the beach below the mean high water line. The Commission should know that we, the beach goers, have been hearing about this planned permit for at least four years, with no sign of said permit or the significant amount of money that would be required to fulfill the planned work that the permit involves.

My recommendation is that this project needs to stand on its own and not count on a illusionary permit, and that Oak Bluffs should do it right or wait till we have sufficient money.

Richard Seelig
Oak Bluffs Citizens' Beach Committee