

Members:

- ✓ = present

- ✓ Bob Robbins (Chair) – Hudson
- ✓ Kathryn Nelson (Vice Chair) -- Nashua
- ✓ Karen Archambault (Secretary) -- Nashua
- Glenn McKibben (Treasurer) – Litchfield
- ✓ Cynthia Ruonala (Public Relations) – Nashua
- George May - Merrimack
- ✓ Jim Barnes – Hudson
- Ray Peeples – Litchfield
- Stan Kazlouskas – Hudson

Also in attendance:

None

The meeting was called to order at 7pm in the Hunt Room in the Nashua Public Library. George and Ray had contacted Kath to say they would not be able to attend. Bob and Cynthia indicated they would have to leave early.

Old Business

Bob brought a letter he had received on September 4th about the alteration of terrain permit at Nashua Landing (the redevelopment on the Hampshire Chemical site in south Nashua). Members were concerned that the LAC's comments had not been heard. Upon reading the letter, the LAC found that the developer had received the comment about using permeable pavement, since the developer responded with reasons against using it on the site.

Members agreed that having the developer read and respond to LAC comments is a step in the right direction. Kath will e-mail a followup to Amy Clark at DES explaining that LMRLAC requested permeable pavement in a demo area and not over the whole project, but that we understand the project is moving along.

Bob also brought a Dredge and Fill application dated August 23 for a deck, walkway, and seasonal dock in Litchfield. He stated that he called DES to discuss the 30-day limit on the comment period. Bob was told that it would be 70 days before the application would be processed and thus LMRLAC still has time to submit its comments in this instance.

The project site is 294 Charles Bancroft Highway in Litchfield, DES file number 2007-01735. The application is for the same deck and dock that was submitted in the spring as a PBN (Permit by Notification) application. Upon review, DES required a complete application due to National Heritage Inventory (NHI) 'hits' near the project area. The NHI hits were for brook floater, with the closest known population 10 miles upstream, and for bald eagle winter roost.

Motion passed to submit a letter to DES on the project. Discussion followed on the contents of the letter. Kath recommended the letter include a recommendation that the new guidelines developed for the Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act that will be in effect April 2008 be followed to the best extent possible.

LMRLAC – September 27, 2007

Further discussion about the project and the contents of the letter followed, including George's comment from June requesting removal of the dock if it's to be no longer used. Karen will send Kath a copy of the comments that went out in June and Kath will write the letter to DES.

Cynthia asked about the dock's use. Jim replied that it appears to be just for the resident's use only and not for public access.

Jim responded to an action item from the previous meeting. He had checked in the Hudson Town Code and learned there is nothing specific in the code regarding Low Impact Development (LID), except in the context of stormwater phase 2 requirements.

Membership

Cynthia mentioned that her LMRLAC membership is up for renewal. Kath gave her a hard copy of the application for Cynthia to fill out. Karen said she would print out the forms from the NRPC Web site and submit her renewal as well.

Kath mentioned she has been in contact with Beth Chestnutt of Merrimack. Beth is in the education field and was once on the Nashua Conservation Commission. Beth had hoped to attend the September meeting but was unable to do so. She plans to attend the October meeting.

CSPA Update

Kath brought up the subject of the Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act updates and its status. She indicated that bills updating the CSPA were passed by the State Legislature, and the updates will go into effect in April 2008. DES is now working on changing its rules in accordance with the new CSPA. Kath is on the committee, which has had one meeting so far, and is expected to complete its work by the end of October.

Kath is looking for some feedback on the rules changes, and handed out copies of a snapshot of CSPA changes. The first item she brought up was the 50' waterfront buffer and the new approach of maintaining 50 points of basal area in each 50x50 foot grid within that buffer. In addition, it restricts removal of ground cover within the 50' waterfront buffer. A subcommittee has formed to work out specifics for the point system. Jim and Karen indicated that the specifics of the formula are important to understand to figure out if, for example, an owner could remove a mature pine and replace it with a sufficient number of shrubs to still meet the 50-point requirement. Jim pointed out that maintaining the mixture of species in the buffer (tall trees, lower shrubs) is what needs to happen.

Kath also brought up the issue of permitting footprint of existing structures when redevelopment takes place under CSPA. Kath mentioned that among the considerations were whether to use building foundation as a definition of footprint, or whether roof overhang would count as footprint. She stated that she feels the definition of footprint should go by outside walls of the previous structure. Jim mentioned wording that's used in zoning regulations e.g. about general setbacks – that a structure cannot be made more nonconforming than what is already in existence.

Jim and Kath agreed that the CSPA updates should be easy to understand, easy to enforce, and should make sense. Owners subject to CSPA should be able to understand the goal behind the rules.

Jim asked about outreach: how will DES get the word out about CSPA updates? Kath indicated she understands that information will go out via the Regional Planning Commissions. One group to whom it's important to get the word out is to foresters and tree cutters to make them aware of the changes in the rules, especially regarding the point system within the 50-foot waterfront buffer.

RMAC

Kath brought up that she has been appointed to the state level Rivers Management Advisory Committee (RMAC), representing the LACs in the state. The meetings are quarterly and she is working on establishing contact with the LACs across the state and learning the process. She described one of the roles of the RMAC, which is to provide comment on the disposal of surplus property if the property is on a Designated River, and expressed concerns over the timetable of that and how to gather comment on disposition of property by locals with specific interest or knowledge in the property.

Kath will also work to spread the word about LID on RMAC. Members agreed that Kath's appointment provides an opportunity for the LAC to start paying more attention to what RMAC is doing.

Kath also summarized the discovery and status of 'rock snot' in the Connecticut River. She described its texture as 'like felt' and indicated it runs bank to bank already in places. She stated that Norway has apparently had to deal with this invasive plant for 140 years. She said to spread the word on the existence of this plant and increase awareness to help prevent its spread. Boaters who go in areas where 'rock snot' is already present must check their boats to prevent spreading the plant to other areas.

Corridor Management Plan Update

Members discussed the questions that Minda had submitted earlier in the week about the corridor management plan update.

Regarding known violations of CSPA in the area: members were uncertain of specific violations in the area.

Regarding photographs for the plan: Kath will contact Glenn to get a bald eagle picture, potentially for the cover. Jim suggested a development along the river behind T Bones in Hudson as a site with potential violations for a photograph. Kath and Karen suggested the CSO outfall in Nashua near the Nashua Country Club as a photo opportunity. Historic photo possibilities included the historic stone arch at the mouth of Salmon Brook, and the trestle visible from Merrill Park in Hudson.

Regarding document references in the plan: members mentioned the LID document references that were brought up in the previous meeting, and Kath brought up a document on developing along the shorefront that was produced by Cooperative Extension. Kath will send information on the Cooperative Extension document to Minda.

Regarding the development review checklist: members discussed putting together a new member packet that would include that checklist so new members would know what to look for in a plan. Members discussed having NRPC keep the new member packet, either in a hard copy to make copies when new members join, or available electronically.

Meeting Schedule

Members briefly discussed a combined November/December meeting. The date for the November/December meeting will be discussed at the October meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45pm. Next meeting will be held on Thursday, October 25 at 7pm at the Nashua Public Library.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Archambault
secretary