

1. **Convene Meeting** The meeting convened at 9:05 AM in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town Offices. Members Present: Richard Huber, Virginia Raub, Dr. Mimi Larsen Becker, Lionel Ingram (Chair), Peter Richardson, Kristen Murphy (Natural Resource Planner), Frank Patterson, Rod Bourdon, Richard Huber, Don Clement (BOS Rep), **In Attendance:** Deb Loiselle (DES) Sally Soule (DES), Paul Vlasich (DPW Rep), Eric Hutchins (NOAA)
2. **Minutes of the 23 January 2014, the 20 February 2014, and 20 March meetings : Mr. Clement moved to pass the minutes from January 23, 2014 with corrections, second by Mr. Patterson. VOTE: Unanimous.**
Mr. Clement moved to pass the minutes from February 20,2014 with corrections second by Mr. Patterson. VOTE: Unanimous

The March 20, 2014 minutes will be voted on at the next River Study Committee meeting.

3. **The meeting was opened up to the public by Mr. Ingram :** Jim Weber of 12 Shaw's Hill in Kensington NH, commented on a recent letter from the Kensington Board of Selectman dated April 7, 2014 stating if the dam is removed, a new well would need to be drilled at Mr. Weber's property. Mr. Vlasich responded that Exeter would have to delineate lines of affected areas as a result of the dam removal. Mr. Vlasich also said he would get the information on maps from the dam engineering consultant.

From the public, Mr. Ferraro stated the dam removal would not happen for two more years.

Mr. Hutchins from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration said the owner would have to find out the depth of their well in order to see the effects of the dam removal.

Mr. Ingram noted schedule speaker Paul Kirshen, director of the Climate Adaptation Plan Exeter was unable to attend the meeting.

4. **Discussion of the status of the Dam's removal and the river's restoration**
Mr. Vlasich said the consultant (VHB) mentioned the River Study Committee wanted a new schedule in an easy to read format for the grant application. It was suggested to put on the Town website.
Contract proposals:
Mr. Vlasich said the consultant needs to talk to geotechnical firms, for geotechnical work done, as well as structures between the dam and the Great Bridge.
The Mill:
The consultant in a telephone conversation with the mills learned the owners have an engineer to review the feasibility study..

ARM(Aquatic Resource Mitigation) Application: Ms. Loiselle brought up a new grant if the Sandy Grant is not rewarded.

Sandy Grant Application:

Mr. Vlasich read an article from the grant application about youth and veteran engagement. Volunteers could be used to clean the worksite and monitor effects of dam removal. Post project monitoring could be accomplished by graduate students for example the TIDES program at the University of New Hampshire. Mr. Vlasich said Pete Walker asked if the Sandy Grant decision will come out soon and the answer was no. Mr. Vlasich suggested looking at other grants between the design time and start of construction.

Mr. Clement spoke on the \$1.7 million bond application due Friday April 18, 2014. Grants would be applied to bond. The Town is getting ready to review the bond.

Dr. Becker suggested trying to meet the two year schedule with or without the Sandy Grant and address dam safety and water quality issues.

Mr. Hutchins said he made contacts asking about the Sandy Grant and a decision should be made by mid May to June.

Mr. Ferraro said he assumed the Town would apply for all grants.

Ms. Soule said the Water Shed Restoration grants pre-proposal will come out in May and due at the end of June. She encouraged the town to create a pre-proposal. She would be available to help prepare the application.

Deb Loiselle spoke about the Aquatic Resource Mitigation Funds; there is \$150,000 available for the area. The application is due April 28, 2014 and could not be used as a non federal funding match. The NFWF (National Fish and Wildlife Foundation) grant, a non federal match for any funds spent can be applied toward match if granted and Ms. Loiselle will verify.

Dr. Becker asked how collaborations between working groups and committee work into the grants.

Mr. Ingram clarified the ARM grant is due first and Mr. Vlasich said he could take care of preparing the grant.

Mr. Hutchins said mitigation money cannot be used for match funding as well as similar sources of funding. He said there is no functional gain for these types of funds. Clashing of programs; mitigation and proactive money cannot be fixed.

Dr. Becker asked how to keep the public involved and informed. Mr. Vlasich said VHB will communicate with the public but is also looking for the River Study Committee to help.

Mr. Hutchins suggested sending out an update once per month to update people on the project. Mr. Vlasich said they could put a link to the website.

Mr. Hutchins commented on the Section 106 Review Process saying the strategy and level of input depends on the project and also the outcome of the Sandy grant. He said that he is not sure if he can take a lead role in the "review process." He also said to coordinate with the Division of Historical Resources and interested parties then describe the resource impacts and mitigation. There will be a memorandum of agreement which is reviewed, then goes back to the Town for signature, and Division of Historical Resources signs.

Mr. Hutchins said legitimate mitigation components are important to the town and suggested permanent signage for more long term impacts.

John Merkle from the Heritage Committee agreed to collaborate with the Heritage Committee, the Historic District Committee and the Exeter Historical Society for participation in the 106 Review process

Dr. Becker said all mitigation actions need to work together and suggested including modeling from the CAPE (Climate Adaptation Plan Exeter) study.

There was discussion over the new Federal Emergency Management Agency(FEMA) maps and how to use them effectively. Mr. Clement said the new FEMA maps are on the Town website and should compare new and old maps. Mr. Patterson asked if FEMA should be notified. Dr. Becker said the new maps are already out of date. Mr. Hutchins said to coordinate with FEMA to give them a heads up on the dam project. The town will have to come up with a Letter of Map Revision including a scope of work, hydraulic remodeling; making a case for how much a 100 year flood will change. Mr. Vlasich asked if the latest flood maps have up to date elevations, and putting the flood plain on better topographic maps. In the existing report for dam removal it has an 11x17 plan view of Exeter and flood zones. The maps depict dam removal with a fifty year flood a certain shade. Mr. Vlasich asked if a 100 year flood could be superimposed on the map. Mr. Vlasich concluded the dam out plan shows that the flood zone grows.

Dr Becker said they revised their data and DES agreed what is a 50 year flood. The CAPE models have more extensive information on the watershed.

Mr. Ingram said the FEMA map will not look at CAPE data but what the River Study came up with in the feasibility study.

Mr. Vlasich said if they superimpose the dam out data more people would be included in the flood zones. Mr. Vlasich also asked if the data were compatible for the criteria for the Letter of Map Revision and if it were costly.

Mr. Ingram said if the dam comes out the FEMA maps will be different. In the scope of work they should consider the Letter of Map Revision.

Mr. Vlasich said it may be premature to include the letter and the costs are not included in the budget. Mr. Ferraro suggested superimposing FEMA maps onto the feasibility study map.

Mr. Hutchins suggested not doing the Letter of Map Revision until the project was completed; Letter of Map Revisions can be complicated.

Mimi said the CAPE study and the River Study feasibility study could possibly be two conflicting plans; they need to communicate with each other.

Ms. Loiselle said sections in the feasibility study discuss the issue and also FEMA will not accept data until the dam removal project is completed.

Ms. Loiselle summarized on a letter dated March 19 2014 from Steve Doyon (Department of Environmental Services). It stated that DES expects a response from the town of Exeter with a plan for moving forward by the end of May including a simplified chart for that plan.

Mr. Vlasich said the grant process implementation is relatively simple but with time schedule changes. He did not know he would not be able to use the remaining 2008 grant monies. He suggested leaving the Sandy Grant as a fluid issue.

Mr. Ingram asked to put the CAPE presenters on the agenda for next meeting.

The next River Study Meeting will at 9AM on May 15 in the Nowak Room of the Exeter Town offices.

Mr. Patterson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, second by Mr. Bourdon VOTE: Unanimous.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31 AM.

Respectfully Submitted ,

Sarah McGraw