

LOWER MERRIMACK RIVER LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

May 24, 2007

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:

- ✓ Minda Henderson, NRPC

Vice Chair Kathryn Nelson called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm in the east wing downstairs in the Nashua Public Library.

Corridor Management Plan Update

Minda handed out hard copies of her draft of Chapter 5 and suggested members divide up areas of interest to review the recommended actions so as to have all topic areas covered. After a discussion, members decided to review and comment on the entire chapter. If it becomes necessary to assign focus areas later members may decide to do so.

Minda pointed out that Chapter 5, Recommended Actions, uses the same ten topic areas covered in Chapter 2 (Goals and Objectives) and lists specific action items for each topic area listed in Chapter 2. Some of the action items Minda listed were from the old corridor management plan, others are new. Items underlined and capitalized in the draft are those for which the committee needs to develop one or more action items, or revisit the associated Goal and Objective to determine whether it still belongs in the document.

After some discussion on filling in specific actions for the highlighted areas, Minda offered to generate specific actions for the next draft for members to review. George indicated that the plan should include a large education component. Other specific actions suggested by Minda for Public Access and Awareness could be such things as river trips, flyers, day trips. Bob suggested we put something in the corridor management plan to recommend to the towns that they reference LID in town ordinances.

Minda will e-mail out her draft of Chapter 5 for members to submit comments and changes. Minda would like the comments back within about a week, and the updates will be provided at the next meeting.

Members discussed the review process with Minda. Chapter drafts should be e-mailed to members before the meeting. Dates of two weeks prior and one week prior to the meeting were both discussed; Minda stated she would send out the next chapter (Chapter 3, probably) draft on June 14, two weeks prior to the next meeting. Minda will send a copy to Cynthia via USPS since Cynthia does not have e-mail access. Cynthia will follow up with Minda if she hasn't received the draft in the mail prior to the meeting.

LMRLAC – May 24, 2007

Members should submit comments to Minda within a week of receiving the draft, and should use Reply All so all members can see all comments. If members do not agree with comments submitted by another member, they should in turn use Reply All to indicate disagreement and request further discussion on the topic at the next meeting.

Minda stated that the objectives are not currently in a suggested priority order. This led to a discussion of whether the objectives or actions should be prioritized. Members decided that groupings of 'short term' and 'long term' actions might be appropriate in a separate section. The intent is to use the list as a master list of actions from which the LAC will pick a few items each year on which to focus.

Bob asked whether any recommended action items were captured from survey responses. Minda replied that she had done that for the goals, but not for the action items.

Minda also asked whether the LAC would like a responsibilities matrix showing the responsible entity for each action item. The matrix could show both stakeholders and lead organizations. It would help to clarify what LMRLAC could do themselves, and what actions would require coordination with or cooperation with others.

It was pointed out that timing or choices of actions to pursue may be driven by grant availability.

Minda will provide the next chapter for review, probably Chapter 3, by June 14. Included with this will be the reminder of the timeline for responses (initial comments requested back within a week so Minda can incorporate into a second draft which will be reviewed at the June meeting).

Kath will send an e-mail out looking for comments on Chapter 5 by next Thursday.

Old Business

Bob gave a summary of his appearance at the Hudson Conservation Commission meeting. Bob described to the commission what LMRLAC is and what it does. He mentioned that point source pollution is well covered in the corridor but that nonpoint source pollution is not. He also discussed LID and gave the commission two sources of information. He indicated that the LAC must comment on development within the quarter-mile river corridor. The commission asked if Bob could help with a LID workshop.

Bob also discussed his assignment to set up a meeting with DES Commissioner Burack. Bob indicated that he was able to get a brief meeting scheduled for July 2. At the meeting, he plans to cover feedback to the LACs from DES on comments submitted by the LAC on plans, and if rivers could get assistance from the state in water quality monitoring similar to how lakes receive assistance. Bob had also talked to Steve Couture about getting feedback from DES, and Steve had replied that administrative guidelines would have to change for this to take place. Kath will help prepare the presentation for Bob to give. Bob's meeting with Commissioner Burack is scheduled for July 2 at 11am.

George indicated that he sent out a newsletter with some additional information than what was in the draft sent to members.

Most members confirmed that they received a copy of "Meanderings" (the DES Rivers Management and Protection program newsletter) in the mail. Kath suggested the LAC keep a running tally of items to put in "Meanderings" to make it easier to put together future articles. Kath indicated having articles in "Meanderings" is a good way to have the LAC's activities known by DES.

Kath indicated she attended the Senate committee hearing on the proposed changes to the Shoreland Protection Act. She mentioned that it added protection for third order streams. She

LMRLAC – May 24, 2007

also mentioned that an amendment to the changes had been submitted discussing shrubbery and the ability to take out ledge. She said LACs were very well represented at the hearing and that roughly three quarters of the speakers at the hearing were in favor of the changes to the Shoreland Protection Act.

George asked if the sludge bill was included in the hearing. Kath replied that four bills (383, 665, and two others) were discussed, but that the sludge bill was separate.

Members passed a motion for Kath to send a follow up letter supporting the Shoreland Protection Act changes on LMRLAC letterhead to the committee chair, Martha Fuller Clark, the rest of the committee members, and state senators representing the four communities in the corridor. George will try to supply Kath with a list of e-mails for area senators and committee members.

Cynthia asked about how to restore damage done e.g. from the spring storm and cited an example of debris and silt/sand flowing into Salmon Brook. Bob replied that LID approaches, by keeping precipitation where it falls, would reduce such problems. Jim indicated it's easier to convince engineers to use such techniques when they are developing something new, rather than making changes to an existing parcel.

New Business

Nashua – Macy's redevelopment at the Pheasant Lane Mall

The Nashua Planning Board has approved this, according to the paper. DES has not yet approved the Site Specific. Bob had called Laura Weit at DES and asked about the Alteration of Terrain permit for the project.

The project is, essentially, to replace an existing parking lot. Kath mentioned that Nashua does have a recharge requirement for new development but that redevelopment projects have the guidance to 'do the best you can'.

Bob had talked to the engineer for the Macy's project about using LID but the engineer was not very receptive to the idea. Bob indicated the engineer did say the project is designed to the 100 year flood.

Jim pointed out a landscape plan is not part of the plan set.

Kath will write a letter to DES and cc the Nashua Planning Board to recommend the following:

- Enhance the landscaping
- Use LID for some portion of the project. One example given was to use a pervious surface for the walkway with an educational sign

Nashua – former Dow Chemical (a.k.a. Hampshire Chemical) site

Bob said he will call DES about this project to check on the status. The expectation is that there are no state permits in place yet but that an Alteration of Terrain will be needed for the project. The LAC understands that the Nashua ZBA has approved the wetlands special exception required by the project.

A brief discussion followed about nonpoint source pollution and how that gets followed on a local level.

Local Updates

Hudson – Riverplace – The developer has pulled out of the Riverplace project in Hudson and has joined the Nashua Landing project in Nashua on the former Hampshire Chemical site. Jim indicated the owner still intends to develop the site and is looking for another developer. Kath suggested that the LAC could recommend the requirement that the developer have a detailed

LMRLAC – May 24, 2007

plan for waterfront development. She cited the example from the Cocheco Waterfront Development Committee that she had e-mailed to members recently. Kath will follow up with Steve Couture on how the LAC can help promote a waterfront plan.

Jim indicated that the LAC should get these materials should get to the Hudson town planner (for example, the Cocheco waterfront plan). He indicated that he can do it initially and that eventually the LAC should follow up with correspondence on letterhead. Kath suggested potentially scouting for funding for a waterfront plan.

Nashua – no updates

Litchfield – no updates

Merrimack – no updates

Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the April 26, 2007 meeting were approved without changes.

Miscellaneous Business

Kath had copies of the Nonpoint Source Pollution Guides available for members if they did not already have a copy.

Kath indicated that she would miss the June meeting. There is a possibility that Bob may miss the June meeting if he is delayed in returning from a trip.

Meeting adjourned at 9pm. Next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 28 at 7pm at the Nashua Public Library.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Archambault
secretary