

## EXETER RIVER STUDY COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 18, 2010

### 1. Convene Meeting:

Chairman Lionel Ingram, Paul Vlasich-Town Engineer, Resident Rod Bourdon, Ginny Raub, Matt Quandt, Roger Wakeman-PEA Rep., Frank Patterson and Mimi Becker were all in attendance. Guest speakers: Deb Loiselle and Sally Soule from NH DES; John Merkle-Heritage Commission. Lionel convened the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

### 2. Approve minutes of 1/21/10:

There was a motion to accept the minutes of January 21, 2010 as presented by Mimi Becker and seconded by Ginny Raub. Vote was unanimous.

### 3. Report of the Sub Committee on the Feasibility Study-Mimi Becker:

Mimi Becker passed out three documents: 1) Q & A on the Exeter Great Dam Impacts Evaluation Study; 2) Minutes on the first meeting of the Exeter River Great Dam Removal or Repair Study Advisory Group (DRAG); 3) A copy of the Power Point presentation given by Mimi Becker. Lionel Ingram explained the purpose of the Q & A is to make sure we get the proper information out to the public. Adding once the committee comments and agrees to the list he will ask the Town Manager to get them on the Town's website and into the newspaper<sup>i</sup>.

Lionel began by stating the Q & A was something that came out of the deliberative session. Lionel sensed the need to get the information out to the public in order to vote properly on the warrant article. Mimi stated the DRAG committee members realized the public really needed to understand what the money from the warrant article would be used for and what the implications would be if the warrant article was approved<sup>ii</sup>. Mimi explained the draft Q & A was reviewed by the DRAG committee and weighed in with corrections.

Lionel Ingram read through the Q & A one by one and asked for comments from the committee. Ginny Raub asked if the additional \$24,500, that was the previous budget funds, does that deplete the funds. Lionel responded, no there will be more if needed. Lionel suggest an asterisk be put on that Q & A explaining if we needed to go into that money, how it would be done. Mimi clarified that Lionel wanted additional information on what basis the \$24,500 can be accessed. Yes, Lionel replied.

Lionel stated the Q & A's will clarify the intent of the committee. Lionel asked Mimi to add "cost" to the various impacts and benefits of dam removal, in the 5<sup>th</sup> Q & A; also, an additional sentence referring to the importance of the historical aspects of the dam. Lionel stated once the changes were made the Q & A will be forwarded to Russ Dean for distribution as well as the DRAG working group.

Mimi and Deb Loiselle presented the PowerPoint presentation on the first DRAG committee meeting. John Merkle addressed the committee explaining the Heritage Commission doesn't think it is appropriate to have an active role seated on any one committee. John stated the Heritage Commissions role is purely an advisory and neutral. Deb concurred with John on their role.

Deb stated she feels it is a role of a town official to fill out the Request for Project Review (RPR) since the Town is the owner of the dam but DES could provide assistance as well as members of the Heritage Commission. Lionel asked if that process has begun. Deb replied no. Deb recommended that Lionel put someone in charge of that with the assistance of John and herself to fill it out. Lionel suggested that Deb bring this up further on so the committee doesn't lose sight of the RPR.

Lionel stated we are going with a consultant and that consultant will move the project along with one task being the scope of work and how to put the Request for Proposal (RFP) together. Lionel suggested the working group

“Exeter River Great Dam Study Technical Resource Advisory Group” be called “Exeter River Great Dam Resource Advisory Sources”. These sources would be available as needed. The fundamental tasks would be passed to the consultant. Lionel suggested the structure will be is to have the Exeter River Study Committee (ERSC) report to Russ Dean, Town Manager and have the DRAG committee deal directly with the consultant firsthand the ERSC secondary. Lionel added one of the tasks for the DRAG committee will be to work on the RFP, scope of work and a consultant by the March ERSC meeting.

Mimi stated the need to get information from some of the sources out there to find out what issues have been studied. Before the RFP the committee should have an initial public session to get the concerns and the knowledge that the residents have as part of the input that needs to be covered in the RFP. Mimi stated her experience is if the public is included in the very beginning and those issues are taken seriously as part of the investigation and plan of study it’s very possible to address them in a timely way so that we can get the answers to the questions that people have. But if the committee waits to the end of the process it will cause controversy. Mimi thought a Saturday morning in the spring would be a good time to have a public workshop. Lionel concurred.

Don Clement, public member and Chair of the Exeter River Local Advisory Committee, (ERLAC) asked if ERLAC could have a larger role other than an advisory level. Lionel asked the committee if they wanted ERLAC to be a member of the DRAG committee. They all agreed it was a good idea. Lionel asked Don to recommend someone from ERLAC that is not current on the ERSC committee. Don agreed and stated he would get back to Lionel.

Deb Loiselle recommended to the committee putting a small group together to work on the RPR. Deb suggested herself, Paul Vlasich, a John Merkle or another member from the Heritage Commission, to begin inputting the data into the RPR form. Deb stated once the form is filled out it would be presented to the ERSC prior to submitting it. Lionel agreed with Deb and appointed Deb, Paul Vlasich and using John Merkle as the lifeline as the group to work on the RPR. Once the RPR is filled out it will go back to the ERSC for review. Deb explained the RPR form goes directly to the Historical Resources, which is a state agency; they evaluate all the information on the form so they can make a determination on whether the resource is historic or not. And based on the proposed project is there going to be an adverse effect looking at both architectural, above ground resources, and archeologically, below ground resources. Deb stated it would be very clear in the form that the Town does not know which route to go either removal or modification and ask them to comment on either of those alternatives. Deb stated the RPR form will help the Town guide the consultant on what needs to be researched and what needs to be surveyed. Deb stated it is a 30-day turn around process.

#### **4. Up-date on the Hazards Policy – Matt Quandt**

Matt Quandt informed the committee the policy will be discussed at the Board of Selectmen meeting on Feb 22, 2010. Matt encouraged any board members to come and speak in case anything is forgotten.

#### **5. Up-date of the Discussion at the Deliberative Session Regarding the Warrant – Lionel Ingram:**

Lionel stated again the Q & A was something that came out of the deliberative session.

#### **6. Other Business:**

None

7. **Public Comment:**

None

8. **Adjourn the Meeting:**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m. The next meeting was set for Mar. 18, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. in the Nowak Room of the Town Office.

Respectfully Submitted,

Grace Rogers  
Public Works Office Manager

---

<sup>i</sup> There was an article on the Q & A's in the Exeter Newsletter dated March 5, 2010 top half of page two.

<sup>ii</sup> The warrant article passed with the Town vote March 9, 2010.