

# Warner River Local Advisory Committee

5 East Main St., PO Box 265, Warner, NH 03278

[warnerriverlac@gmail.com](mailto:warnerriverlac@gmail.com)

## **DRAFT Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, April 24, 2019

Pillsbury Free Library (Lower Level)

18 E Main St, Warner, NH 03278

**Appointed WRLAC Representatives present** (Term Ends), those present in **bold**:

**Bruce Edwards**, Bradford (10-8-2021)

Scott MacLean, Bradford (10-8-2021)

**Carol Meise, Bradford** (10-8-2021)

**Ken Milender**, Warner (11-26-2021)

**Laura Russell**, Warner (11-26-2021)

**Susan Roman**, Webster (10-12-2021)

Christopher Spannweitz, Warner (11-26-2021)

Doug Giles, Hopkinton (11-26-2021)

**Linden Rayton**, Hopkinton (11-26-2021)

J. Michael Norris, Hopkinton (11-26-2021)

**David White**, Hopkinton (11-26-2021)

### **Guests**

Ray Martin – Warner Village Water District

Peter Savlen – Warner Village Water District

Mike Tardiff – Central NH Regional Planning Commission

Jen Drociak – NH DES, Rivers and Lakes Management Program

Bob Wright, Sutton (WRLAC membership pending)

### **Call to Order**

Chair Milender called the meeting called to order at 7:05 p.m.

With only seven representatives present, there was no quorum for voting.

### **Continuing Business**

#### **1. Meeting minutes**

Approval of March meeting minutes was tabled due to a lack of a quorum.

#### **2. Ray Martin, Warner Village Water District**

Ray presented information about the Warner Village Water District's proposed wastewater infiltration system (see attached map; also see [minutes](#) from WVWD's March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting).

- Facts to note: Warner's storm drains are separate from the wastewater flows; the treated effluent discharge is approximately 90,000 gallons daily; no change in temperature is expected.
- Warner's Wastewater Treatment Facility was opened in 1974 and has been operating in compliance with its discharge permits since that time. A reduction in effluent limitations was imposed in the current NPDES permit during renewal in 2014. This

renewal included a reduction in the allowable concentration of copper dissolved in the treated effluent being discharged to the Warner River. The District has been unable to reduce the levels of copper in the effluent and is currently out-of-compliance with the terms of the NPDES permit's effluent limitations.

- The District has engaged the services of Horizons Engineering, Inc. to evaluate alternatives and to determine the most effective and efficient means by which the copper in the effluent can be reduced or eliminated, thereby bringing the discharge into compliance with the new permit conditions. Horizons has determined that the best course of action would be to discharge the treated effluent into a series of shallow rapid infiltration basins where the treated effluent would infiltrate to the groundwater. The effluent would be “treated” to remove or reduce the copper during passage through the sand and gravel deposits below the basins before its ultimate discharge to the Warner River. This design would halt the direct discharge of the treated effluent to the River.
- Each basin would be approximately 60 feet x 60 feet x 2 or 3 feet deep. The proposed infiltration basins would be sited on land just to the south of the intersection of Route 103 and Old Main Road in Warner, a couple of hundred feet from the Warner River (and west of Route 103). Discharge would be into the sand and gravel deposits below the basins. The new discharge would be regulated through a ground-water discharge permit issued by DES. The ground-water discharge permit would require a network of monitoring wells, situated hydraulically downgradient of the infiltration basins, to be periodically sampled and the ground water analyzed to ensure that the concentrations of copper do not exceed the ambient ground-water quality standards. The ground-water discharge would create a ground-water management zone (largely below property that is occupied by Interstate Route I-89). The ground-water management zone would be a mapped area of the ground surface that would encompass the area where the ground water below could potentially contain concentrations of contaminants above the ambient ground-water quality standards.
- WWWD expects that the work could be completed and the new system in use by fall 2019. Ken reminded all that DES has an elaborate permitting system for this type of discharge, and a fall completion date is likely optimistic.

### **3. Warner River Corridor Management Plan discussion – Mike Tardiff (CNHRPC) and Jen Drociak (DES Rivers Management and Protection Program)**

Mike shared a draft (attached and described below) of the scope of work for the Committee to review. In addition, he provided for the Committee the text of RSA:483:10 (attached), which describes the role of the *rivers coordinator* (Tracie Sales at DES) and the statutory mandate for the topics that a river corridor management plan must include.

The proposed plan suggests the following actions and the estimated number of hours to complete each task, as proposed by CNHRPC.

*1. Compile existing data/mapping/resources for WR Corridor area using the existing WR Nomination data and any subsequent available data for use in the corridor management plan.*

*The proposed study area extends ¼ mile from the high-water mark on either side of the river and includes any adjacent 100-year floodplain areas (20 hours).*

*2. Undertake public outreach/survey/Conservation Commission/BOS outreach (80 hours)*

- Assist in the development/distribution/analysis of stakeholder survey.*
- Facilitate corridor-wide meeting and attend local meetings (up to 8) to seek public input.*

*3. Develop Draft and Final Warner River Corridor Management Plan (50 hours)*

*Plan outline*

- 1. Summary of Regulatory Framework*
- 2. Summary of resources (based on existing Warner River Nomination data as well as other readily available data)*
- 3. Review of public input process/results*
- 4. Goals and objectives (these will likely become action items)*
- 5. Proposed implementation measures*

Mike noted that much of the data required in a corridor management plan already exists in our Warner River Nomination package; it's a matter of compiling it, which CNHRPC will do.

Preparation of the management plan will also require several public meetings and extensive outreach to the river towns during preparation of the management plan, as well as later for each town's approval.

Jen reported that DES is currently revising and updating their "A Guide to River Corridor Management Plans" (dating from 1997). She expects that the updated guide will be ready very soon, and that WRLAC will be the first LAC to use the new guidance document and its format.

Mike stated that the funds available from DES, \$7500, expire on June 30, 2019, would cover some of the cost of putting the plan together, although he estimated that an additional 60-75 hours would be even better. The plan should be online, a "living document" [Secretary's words] that can be visible and easily updatable. Jen mentioned that there are templates available for creating corridor plans, although each LAC's plan is a little different. Mike proposed that he and Joanne Cassulo (project planner at CNHRPC) be part of the process. He said the product is important, but the process (being transparent about the process, soliciting public input, etc.) is just as important; community engagement and support are crucial. He has approval to begin this work with the WRLAC. Ken noted that without a quorum, we will have to wait to vote if a vote is still needed. Mike said in the meantime that he would get all the paperwork in place for a Warner River corridor plan. Chair's note: DES and CNHRPC have agreed that all required approvals have been given.

Ken asked for clarification about whether the \$7500 will cover the cost of creating the Corridor Plan. Mike replied that actually, about \$5,000 more would allow the plan to have more breadth, and hopefully that would be available at a later date. Ken suggested that after the

\$7500 has been spent, we should call the document a “draft” until we obtain the funding and CNHRPC finishes the full plan.

Carol asked for confirmation that it would be Mike who would put the plan together. He replied that Joanne would do most of the writing, but that he and WRLAC would want to participate in the organization and editing.

Linden asked whether the Corridor Plan could realistically be completed by June 30, and Mike said considering that the WRLAC is really just getting started on the plan, he would ask Tracie for an extension. Mike noted that gathering the data for the plan happens first, and the goals and objectives can be developed more fully after June 30.

A question was raised about the status of funding (\$7500) available to the WRLAC from NHDES to offset costs of writing a Warner River Corridor Study Plan. The Secretary notes the following research from the meeting minutes of December 19, 2018: At the December 19, 2018 WRLAC meeting, former Acting Chair Chris Connors indicated that Tracie Sales had offered the funds to cover the cost of writing the Corridor Plan. Tracie had also explained how the WRLAC could formally request the funds (see page 2 of meeting minutes from that date, attached). The WRLAC then voted unanimously for former Chair Connors to write a letter to Tracie requesting the funds for the WR Corridor Study Plan. Two questions are unclear. 1) Did former Chair Connors send a letter to Tracie Sales? 2) Because the WRLAC had not completed its by-laws, could this be considered an official request? [Sec. note: For the record, there was a quorum present for voting, although the number for the quorum was not yet official because the by-laws had not been formalized. On the other hand, perhaps that’s just a “chicken or egg”].

Mike noted that Joanne could come to our next meeting to help us develop the process that best fits our group.

Jen reiterated a comment from Tracie: *start small*. In the coming years, the WRLAC may identify in-the-ground projects, and at that time, the WRLAC can apply for EPA Section [319 funding](#) to cover those projects.

Mike said he and Tracie would come to the next WRLAC meeting.

#### **4. Permit Reviews**

No discussion (none in the past few weeks)

#### **Old Business**

##### **1. Volunteer River Assessment Program (VRAP)**

[Warner River VRAP](#) (Volunteer Rivers Assessment Program): [4 May 2019 workshop announcement](#), call for volunteers, &tc.

Ken mentioned that the training program is on May 4 in Concord. The program continues to look for volunteers. The Warner River VRAP group was first organized in 2017, and has monitored the river quality since that time. The water testing happens once a month during June-October in 16 locations. Each month's monitoring round takes about 8 hours to complete. The monitoring stations are located along the main stem of the river, as well as up several of the chief tributaries. The data are submitted to DES for their use in reporting to EPA about the region's water quality (that sounds like a good topic for a guest speaker!).

Jen mentioned that DES could offer additional testing kits at a reduced rate of about \$1,000. DES maintains and restocks the monitoring kits annually.

Ken reported that DES has our kit ready for 2019's use, and that he would be picking it up on May 4<sup>th</sup>.

David suggested that we see if there are local high school and college students who might be interested in participating.

Jen noted that the program is unique in the US and produces excellent results which are used even at the federal level.

Ken noted that it might be a good idea to have Ted Walsh ([ted.walsh@des.nh.gov](mailto:ted.walsh@des.nh.gov)) from NH DES, who does the trainings, come to an LAC meeting. [Sec note: Historical monitoring data for the Warner River VRAP program lives [here](#).] David also noted that [Leon Malan](#) environmental sciences instructor at Colby Sawyer College might be a good supplier of VRAP volunteers.

Several WRLAC members noted that a full 8-hour day for monitoring was a hardship. David noted that buying a second water testing kit for VRAP could be a long-term goal. A second monitoring kit would reduce the time each monthly VRAP group would need to accomplish the monitoring. Ken added that having a second monitoring kit would also allow us to double our 16 monitoring stations, but the Secretary notes this was probably meant as a joke.

## **2. Wetland Rules revision**

Tabled to next meeting.

Reference: <https://www.des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wetlands/process-improvement.htm>

## **Other Business**

### **Treasurer's Report (David White)**

The WRLAC has a zero balance. David spoke with the Hopkinton town administrator who said that Hopkinton would be able to provide in-kind support, especially if other towns would do this also. An example of in-kind support would be photocopying of documents. David asked other Committee members to ask their town administrators about their willingness to do the

same. And he also asked the Committee to think about other things we should consider asking our towns to support.

Ken noted that it would be important for the Committee to establish with town administrators what the process for asking for funding or in-kind services would be, so that when it is time to apply for funds or in-kind support, we'd know what we need to do.

Bruce noted that FEMA has many different kinds of small grants that could provide funds for some items or tasks, provided our requests have something to do with FEMA's core mission, which is to provide funding for hazard prevention or hazard mitigation projects, such as flood mapping, emergency communication systems for town emergency management directors, and flood planning.

Ken noted that another possible expense in the future could be setting up and maintaining a WRLAC website.

Bob reminded the Committee that it's important for us to keep our focus on the mission of the WRLAC so as not to unnecessarily broaden our work. Committee members acknowledged that Bob's point was a valid and a useful reminder for WRLAC to avoid "mission creep".

### **New Business**

In a few of the remaining minutes, some members of the Committee had the opportunity to introduce themselves. To be continued at a later date.

Committee Assignments: None yet.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted  
Laura Russell  
WRLAC Secretary

### **Long-Term Monitoring**

[Instream Flow Study](#)  
[FEMA Risk MAP Contoocook Basin](#)  
Route 127 (Davisville) Bridge  
Hopkinton complaint

[Concord-Lake Sunapee Rail Trail](#)  
Permit application reviews  
[Permit review guidelines \(UMRLAC\)](#)  
Sutton WRLAC Representatives

### **Relevant Documents**

All Corridor Management Plans written for Designated Rivers are located here:  
<https://www.des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/rivers/designriv.htm>

Other Source docs here:

- [A Guide to River Corridor Management Plans, NHRMPP, October, 1997](#)

- [Warner River Nomination](#) and [Appendices](#)
- [Warner River Designated Corridor Map](#)
- [The Contoocook North River Corridor Management Plan](#) – recommended by CNHRPC to use as guiding template.