

Pemigewasset River Local Advisory Committee  
July 31, 2012 at Boyd Hall  
Plymouth, New Hampshire

**Minutes**

**Members Present:**

Max Stamp (Bristol); Dan Paradis (Bristol); Carl Lehner (Holderness); Fred Gunter (Thornton); John Kelly (Plymouth)

**Also Present:**

Dave Jeffers (LRPC)

**Call to Order:**

Chairman Max Stamp called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Dan Paradis pointed out that the minutes of June 26, 2012 indicated that the minutes of April 24, 2012 were approved where in fact the minutes of May 29, 2012 were approved. John Kelly made a motion seconded by Fred Gunter to approve the minutes of June 26, 2012 as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

**604(b) Grant Opportunity:**

Dave Jeffers explained that DES had funds available for planning projects in 2013-2014 and had sought out letters of intent. LRPC looked at several possible projects and received input from PRLAC members. There was a good deal of interest in creating a demonstration project which would have provided guidance to homeowners regarding runoff reduction measures. However, when it became evident that this would not meet the DES requirements, LRPC submitted a proposal to develop plans to address impairments in the Winnepesaukee watershed.

In the process of helping develop the LRPC proposal, Dave spoke with Eric Williams of DES and learned that they are developing a program to assist with evaluations of runoff from homesites which may involve the regional planning commissions. DES is also looking at water protection ordinances, but with an emphasis on groundwater protection. A question from John Kelly about what such ordinances involve led to some discussion of the types of activities which are usually regulated or banned by groundwater protection ordinances.

**PRLAC Management Plan:**

Max explained that having gathered a good deal of material, we are now in the "cutting back" phase in the development of the Management Plan. He asked that we spend tonight's meeting reviewing Section VI in the rough draft, which deals with present and anticipated problems. He suggested that we use a 10-year time frame and that we make a real effort to anticipate problems which are likely to arise in that time frame. The first few paragraphs of this section (on P. 20 of the draft) set the stage by making the case that stormwater runoff contributes to about 80% of the surface water quality impairments in the state, so what happens on the land needs to be addressed in order to preserve water resources. The members generally agreed with these findings and what they imply.

Next, the draft plan presents a summary of the four statewide water quality initiatives which have taken place in the last few years. These include: 1) Shoreland Protection Study Commission 2006-7; 2) Storm Water Commission Report 2010; 3) NH Water Sustainability Commission 2011 and 4) Upper Merrimack and Pemigewasset River Study (UMPS) 2009-2012. (The final reports of the last two groups have not yet been published, but their work is summarized.) The group was generally supportive of including these summaries, but offered few specific suggestions. Discussion of the Storm Water Commission report evoked some discussion regarding runoff protection ordinances. Dave explained that state laws on alteration of terrain require a minimum disturbance of 100,000 sq. ft. before they apply. John Kelly suggested that developers seem to be proposing numerous smaller projects which are unregulated at the state level but which in the aggregate have the same effect as a larger project. Since the state is unlikely to get involved in smaller projects, this is something that needs to be addressed at the local level through zoning or site plan regulations. Dave said he likes the inclusion of the four summaries, but suggested that some results of the PRLAC opinion survey be integrated in order to show the relevance of the statewide studies to local conditions.

The next section to be reviewed was the list of present and anticipated water resource problems. The draft plan identifies nine specific problems and gives a brief explanation of most of these. The first of these is population growth, and the group agreed that this is the root cause of many anticipated problems. Dan Paradis suggested that some mention be made that most of the projected growth cited will occur in the southern part of the state. The group also agreed that the second anticipated problem cited, climate change, deserved mention but that a change of soil temperature from 2 degrees C. to 3.75 degrees C. should not be characterized as a “doubling” of the temperature. After reviewing the nine listed anticipated problems, Max said he would suggest adding several more. These include drinking water contamination, trash and litter problems, lack of a watershed approach to river protection, and lack of PRLAC funding. Max then asked for further suggestions for inclusion. Dan Paradis suggested that the anticipated problems contained in the existing plan be reviewed for possible inclusion.

The discussion turned next to draft recommendations beginning on P. 24 of the draft plan. The first of these, which involves creating model ordinances for towns and working to get them implemented, evoked a good deal of discussion. The proposal was criticized by those serving on planning boards as being unrealistic and too broad in scope. One suggestion to narrow the scope was to work with only one or two towns. Another approach suggested would be to focus on a single problem with all of the towns. One suggestion was to propose ordinances or site plan regulations limiting runoff to pre-development conditions on projects of any size. No conclusions were reached and the consideration of recommendations will have to be continued at a later meeting.

**Adjournment:**

Fred Gunter made a motion seconded by Carl Lehner to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel A. Paradis  
Secretary