

The following outline is intended to provide a basis for discussion as to what the Committee would like to see as the study process for the Squibnocket project.

The outline is only meant to be illustrative of what a study process might look like. It is quite detailed in order to provide a range of examples.

EXAMPLE OF SQUIBNOCKET COMMITTEE'S WORK PROGRAM OUTLINE

(Report of Findings may follow similar outline)

Establish Study Goals.

- Identify most favorable solutions in terms of:
 - Service provided: Access. Beach improvements (such as in pending agreement). Other.
 - Environmental impacts
 - Financial feasibility.
 - Ability to obtain required approvals, etc.
 - Durability
 - Acceptability. SFHA, neighbors, Town officials , other Chilmark residents
- Provide selectmen and Chilmark residents with sufficient information to select an approach and move ahead with it

Define Problem. Mother Nature (erosion, storm surges, rising sea level) is destroying SFHA access, beach and parking.

- Extent of damage.
 - Physical impacts. Existing and projected
 - Service impacts. Existing and projected
 - Monetary impacts. Existing and projected
- Needs
 - Maintain SFHA access
 - Maintain/improve beach opportunities

Define Project Components.

- Access for SHFA : Location, Type of roadway (viaduct, berm, etc.). Number of lanes, etc.
- Public Beach Access and Use: Extent of beach. Location of access. Parking lot location and configuration. (number of parking spaces, room for turn-around, parking attendant's booth and port-a-potty, etc.) Etc.
- Access to Squibnocket Pond: Location. Small boat storage, etc.
- Revetment. Removal, partial relocation, etc.

Develop Data Base.

- Existing physical conditions. Topography, wetlands, vegetation, etc.
- Likely future changes. Erosion, sea level, etc.(Use existing studies where possible).
- Property lines, ownerships and values
- Applicable environmental legislative restraints. Chilmark, MVC, State., Federal
- Comparable projects at other locations

Identify Alternative Solutions. May be comprehensive or only single components. Alternatives may be short-term or longer. (There are no really long-term solutions.)

- Do nothing
- Remove revetment only
- New SFHA roadway access
 - Type: Structure, berm, berm with culverts, etc.
 - Variations: Location, length, 1 or 2 lanes, etc.
- Beach enhancement
 - Extent of beach
 - Parking: Location, size, etc.
- Pond access.

Establish Review Criteria. Factors to be considered and means of measurement.

- Environmental Impacts
 - Wetlands: Size of area effected, type of wetland, etc.
 - Barrier beach: Size of area effected, etc.
 - Other land areas: Cut & Fill, etc.
 - Squibnocket Pond
 - Impacts of erosion, storm surges, and sea level rise on alternatives; Periodic rebuilding requirements, etc.
 - Impacts of new roadway and revetment modifications/removal on water flow, erosion, etc.
- Visual impacts
 - Neighbors: number, distance away, impact in summer and other times, etc.
 - Other: Vineyard character, etc.
- Approval and agreement requirements
 - Type; Local (Town, MVC), State, Federal, private
 - Likelihood of obtaining: policies, precedents
- Property requirements
 - Public
 - Private: Acquisition or lease, willing seller?, etc.
- Requirements for special agreements?
 - Initial
 - Ongoing
- Financial considerations
 - Initial costs (leases, construction, etc.)
 - Ongoing costs (leases, other agreements, maintenance, etc.)
 - Availability of State funding (Recent announcement.)
- Other
 - Implementation time
 - Record of similar improvements at other locations
 - Potential access interruptions: Frequency, duration
 - Etc.

Evaluate Alternatives. Description of analyses of each alternative or alternative component in each applicable review criteria.

- Summarize impacts. Some finding will be quantified while others may only be descriptive. The findings of these analyses might be presented in a comparative summary tabulation. Each box will have numbers, when available and/or a brief statement.

Evaluation Criterion		Alternatives								
Category	Issue	Roadway				Parking			Other	
		A	B	C-1	C-2	A	B-1	B-2	I	II
Environment	Wetlands									
	Barrier B.									
	Squib. Pd									
	Etc.									
Visual	Neighbors									
	Others									
Approvals	Type									
	Likelihood									
Etc.										

- First Cut
 - Eliminate those with the obviously most negative impacts: Approval very unlikely, etc.
 - Package remaining components into potential programs (There may be a variety of combinations of the pieces that can work. The committee may well identify and/or recommend several different potential combinations that can work.)

Recommendations.

- Highlight major advantages and disadvantages of alternatives
- Highlight differences among alternatives: i.e. visual vs. financial impacts, etc.
- Present single recommendation or alternative recommendations, noting differences, advantages and disadvantages of each as defined above.

- **Note: The relative importance each person places on the different evaluation criteria affects her or his judgment as to the preferred alternative. Therefore, it may be that a unanimous recommendation cannot be reached, and the committee may wish to recommend two or three possible combinations of solutions for selectmen/Town to make the ultimate decision.**

○ DG, April 19, 2014, Rev. June 14. 2019