

- 1) Meeting Convened at 9:02 AM in the Nowak Room of the Exeter town offices on December 5, 2013. Members present were Rod Bourdon, Frank Patterson, Peter Richardson, Lionel Ingram (Chair), Dr. Mimi Larsen Becker, Virginia Raub, Richard Huber and BOS Rep Don Clement.
- 2) Minutes from September and October 2013 meetings were corrected. Mr. Richardson moved to pass the minutes and Ms Raub seconded. Minutes were passed.
- 3) December 12, CAPE (Climate Adaptation Plan Exeter) will hold a briefing on their progress. Afterward there will be a catered lunch.
- 4) Mr. Vlasich the Exeter town engineer gave more information about the Hurricane Sandy Grant to partially fund dam removal. If grant is received the town would have a two year timeline for the removal. Before action is taken on the dam the water treatment plan construction must be completed and the earliest it could be done is May-June 2015. Applications for the grant are due at the end of January.
- 5) Discussion of Outcome of the Selectman's Meeting from December 2.
 - a) Mr. Clement reported the resident's opinion and concerns about the dam. Some comments related to how the removal could reduce flooding and improve water quality. The Board of Selectman voted to move ahead with the Sandy Grant while some BOS raised more questions about the dam. Questions would be brought back to the board on January 7. The BOS will decide to support an option on January 7. Historical and cultural symbols of the dam were also brought up. The December 2 meeting had cleared up some questions related to the dam.
 - b) Frank Ferraro said the BOS should discuss the dam at the first meeting in January or earlier. He noted that there was a strong showing from the public and many were in favor of dam removal and also other options. Some questions raised were answered in the report.
- 6) Dr. Becker said the report on the dam study is difficult to find on the town website. People need to be able to access the information. Mr. Richardson commented the report will be on the front page of the website as early as December 6.
- 7) Mr. Ingram outlined how the dam decision making process should move forward. The River Study Committee will help the town with the grant making process. The committee will work on getting the information program together to best inform the public. He stressed the committee is not responsible for making a decision on the outcome of the dam.
- 8) Dr. Becker spoke about the meeting on December 6 to discuss the strategy for the grants. Information for the public on the dam is needed. The working group will have a clearer picture for the tasks after the meeting.
- 9) Mr. Vlasich said some questions from selectman about the dam can be answered in the report. He spoke on some questions and comments made at the December 2 meeting. More information is required to make the best decision on the Mill's intake system. The numbers still need to be fine tuned to replace the system. Fire suppression and wetlands concerns are included in the report and DES consulted. Some fears were raised about more land opening for development if the dam is removed but the flood plains maps will show

that development will not be possible in those areas. Water supply was a concern and Mr. Vlasich plans on working with the public works department. Money is also available for the other options as well as dam removal. Reducing the dam height is still up for discussion and the option was not eliminated by the BOS.

- 10) Mr. Ingram said Exeter is a SB 2 town meaning the town needs to be best informed before going to vote.
- 11) Sally Soule from the Department of Environmental Services Watershed Assistance Section, spoke about her role in the working group to put together examples from other dam removal situations from other towns. The timing of the presentation of info is critical before town makes a decision. The working group wishes to work with the River Study Committee and creating a workshop on presenting the information.
- 12) There was discussion on how to best disseminate information about the dam. Public access TV, the media, the town website and public presentations were some ideas. There should be a visual for what would happen if the dam were removed for up and downriver. The Rivers Committee will represent the data in a neutral way.
 - a) A workshop to go outside and visualize the changes as a tour.
 - b) Putting visuals of each option and information on public TV, public meetings with VHB and the committee to propose changes to the public, and other media outputs are some ways to communicate possible dam changes.
 - c) A working group from the Rivers Committee will put together the presentation, DES will add scenarios and VHB can add visuals.
 - d) Peter Walker Lead Consultant with VHB has examples from other dam removal projects to see what the removal could look like.
 - e) A two page flyer with visuals could be best for the public to see changes to the dam.
 - f) Information for property owners should be presented such as active restoration of native plant species and how to control invasive plants. Restoration is accounted for in the budget.
 - g) Mr. Ferraro noted if presentation is before January 7th it should be a neutral presentation after January 7th with an option. The warrant article will say to vote on an action and not choose an option. The public will not be voting on which option they want. He suggested all of the information and presentations made public through the website, and library.
 - h) Deliberative is session February 1 and Mr. Richardson spoke on the readiness of the committee to present information to the public. Two meetings for presentations, a meeting before February 1st meeting and 1st before March meeting.
- 13) Memorializing and mitigating changes to the dam were also discussed. Creating a visual of historical changes over time could be placed at the dam.
- 14) The next meeting River Study Committee meeting will take place January 9 in the Nowak room of the town offices.
- 15) Meeting was adjourned at 10:14 AM.

Respectfully Submitted
Sarah McGraw

