

**MEETING MINUTES  
NEW HAMPSHIRE WATER SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION  
August 21, 2012**

**New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services  
Concord, NH**

**Commissioners in attendance:**

Virginia Battles-Raffa  
Kris Blomback  
John Boisvert  
John Gilbert, Chair  
Michael Licata  
Marcy Lyman, Vice Chair  
Amy Manzelli  
Glenn Normandeau  
Cliff Sinnott  
Chuck Souther  
Alison Watts

**Commissioners not in attendance:**

Dave Allen  
Thomas Burack  
Denise Hart

**Public in attendance:**

Fred Arnould  
Paul Basiliere  
Ann Marie Banfield  
Arthur Bingham  
Michael Brown  
Rene Gingras  
Bill Hounsell  
Dennis Lemare  
Robert Kingsbury  
Don Kleeberg  
Sarah Pillsbury  
Jennifer Rowden  
Aram Sisoian  
Lucy Sisoian  
Paul Susca

*Chairman John Gilbert announced that the Commission meeting would be delayed slightly for the Commission members to hold a non-meeting consultation with legal counsel. All non-Commission members were asked to leave the room; once the consultation with legal counsel was finished, the public meeting would begin immediately.*

*The meeting was called to order at 2:50 p.m.*

**I. July 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

A motion to accept the July 17th meeting minutes was made by Marcy and seconded by Glenn. The motion to accept the minutes passed unanimously with Amy, Alison and Virginia abstaining.

**II. Public Engagement Subcommittee Update**

**A. July 9th Session Report**

Marcy explained that the draft July 9th public session report developed by Public Engagement Subcommittee had been distributed to the Commission members for their review. Pending any changes from this meeting, the subcommittee would like the Commission to accept the report so it can be sent to participants and posted on the Commission's website. Two additional changes the subcommittee would like to make are to include a table of contents and a list of the session participants with their affiliation. The Commission members offered the following comments:

- The subcommittee should check with New Hampshire *Listens* to see if there are any issues with including participants' names given that they facilitated the session registration.
- The report should be published on the website as a stand alone document, but also included as an appendix to the final deliverable.

A motion to accept the July 9th session report pending the inclusion of a table of contents and the discusses appendices was made by Amy and seconded by Cliff. The motion passed unanimously.

**B. Review of Public Comments**

All public comments received to date (Listening Session Reports, the public comment questionnaire, the e-mailed and mailed comments, and comments from meetings) have been sent to the Commission. The subcommittee would like feedback about how the comments are framed or emphasized in the final deliverable. The Commission members offered the following comments:

- Within the report, do not respond to individual comments, but similar themes should have a response.
- At minimum, all the comments should be included as an appendix and posted online.
- Towards the beginning of the report (perhaps in the Chairman's Overview), the huge amount of comments received on a variety of topics should be mentioned.
- Summarize the comments in the report, with all the comments in an appendix.
- The report should specify in that members have reviewed all the comments and have considered them when formulating the goals and recommendations.

Comments will be brought back to the Public Engagement Subcommittee and they can work with the deliverable content group to incorporate the public comments.

### **III. Final Deliverable**

#### **A. Content Outline**

John G. provided an overview of the draft final deliverable content that was distributed; this will be used to frame the paper report and the online content for the Commission. He explained the structure that those working on the content would like feedback on; the specific language included is just for clarification and is not necessarily the language that would be used in the final report. The goals section is the most complete because the most work has been done on it to date; however, goal six related to funding is a new addition. At the last content group meeting, the need to emphasize the funding beyond just infrastructure was realized and should include items like funding for monitoring.

The final deliverable will mainly be electronic (possibly with a website) to allow for easy linkage to other documents and sources. The short document discussed previously is likely not realistic, however, the printed copies of the report can reference the long appendices as being available online to cut down on length.

The Commission members provided the following feedback regarding the draft outline:

- Goal one and five may need to be clarified as they sound similar.
- In the goals, terms like watershed and stormwater should be used in the goal statements; do not may weaken what is being stated. Defining the terms in the sidebar was decided as the best solution. In general, the language needs to be simple or the terms need to be defined.
- All public comment will be included in the report as an appendix.
- For the "what can you do" section, the groupings should perhaps be more general (individuals, municipalities, businesses/organizations, government officials). Specific items to include are to know what watershed you live in and the importance of a water budget.
- Reorganize the "why is water important" section into the following subheadings:
  - A. Bundle the idea water is important for the environment, society and the economy.
  - B. General trends and issues now and possibly in the future.
  - C. The Commission's vision statement.
- Within the "findings" section, the importance of pilots and experimentation should be included, along with the information gaps that exist. The idea for flexibility and adaptation strategies should also be included.
- The findings and recommendation sections need to be consistent with each other once they have been more refined.

- There needs to be emphasis that the report, findings, recommendations, etc. are the Commissions. Inclusion of a letter from the Governor may not help move the report's content into future governors' agendas.
- For the funding goal, the funding need should be the central argument and that the situation is getting worse and not better. In the long run it is cheaper to address the problems now versus later, however, everything does not need to be done right away. The emphasis should perhaps be that that the scope of the problem is known, however, all the potential solutions may not be.

The Commission discussed if the goals, recommendations or actions should be prioritized with no definitive conclusion. There was agreement that goals had largely been agreed upon, as had many of the recommendations (pending some wordsmith). To move towards a final deliverable, John G. would like anyone with thoughts on the content to come the August 29th content team meeting. He will send out a revised report outline based on today's meeting discussion. For the next regular Commission meeting, the goal will be to send out a fairly complete report by September 11th with the request any comments be sent to John and Marcy. This will be the basis for the discussion at the September 18th meeting. This should allow those who will not be able to attend the September 18th meeting the chance to provide input. The tentative vote on the final report was scheduled for September 25th.

## B. Rollout Update

Marcy explained that the deliverable rollout has three main items to work with:

- 1) The physical report and its rollout.
- 2) How the Commission's recommendations will be moved forward.
- 3) Establishing a New Hampshire Water Prize. This was seen as a light, positive activity.

The next deliverable rollout meeting will be on September 6th at the same time as the content meeting.

## IV. Upcoming Meetings

The following dates and times were proposed for upcoming Commission meetings and the general timeline for work: **August 29th** from 2:00 to 5:00 at DES. (Content Team)

- **September 6th** from 2:00 to 5:00 at DES. (Content & Rollout Teams)
- **September 11th** - *Draft report sent to Commission for review and comments. Draft to be discussed at 9/18 meeting. If members are unable to attend, send comments to John and Marcy in advance of the meeting.*
- **September 18th** from 1:00 to 5:00 at F&G. (Regular meeting) *Draft report discussion.*
- **September 25th** from 2:00 to 5:00 at DES. (Regular meeting) *Approval of final report (tentative).*

## V. Public Comments

The public in attendance of the meeting provided the following comments to the Commission:

- Submitted written comment: 1) Recommendations need to be a reasonable reflection of the critical infrastructure upgrades that need to be addressed in the one to three year timeframe to avoid an interruption of services to water system needs and wastewater requirements. 2) The budget items necessary to address the one to three year priorities should become clear when the above is considered.
- Bill Housell, CDM Smith: Urged the Commission to reread the minutes from when Ira Leighton, EPA, spoke to them. Ira discussed the partnership between municipalities and the state's role in the funding issues. Primacy is also an upcoming issue. He urged the Commission to think from a municipal point of view versus the state's point of view.
- Dennis Lemare, US Senate Candidate (New Hampshire - District 2): Stated this is about property rights. If elected, he would never support funding that would go towards any of the efforts

discussed by this Commission. This is more about control by the United Nations as an entity. Sustainability is about private property rights being given over to the community. It is not about the sustainability of the water; it is about the United Nations taking your property rights. He also asked who in attendance and on the Commission were federal employees.

John G. explained that the Commission was not being directed by the United Nations. It was established by Governor Lynch by executive order and that all the Commission members were volunteers appointed by the Governor.

- Anne Marie Banfield, New Hampshire resident: She stated that she, and likely others, would like to have the following questions addressed: 1) Where is the evidence that there is a shortage of water? 2) How was the Commission formed? 3) How were all of the issues being discussed by this Commission dealt with before the Commission was formed? 4) What is the budget for the Commission? 5) What is the purpose of this Commission?

John G. explained that there are studies that point to a lack of water related both population changes and weather changes. He suggested that she look on the Commission's website to read about the Commission, including the Executive Order. The Commission was established by the Governor in an effort to bring together the findings of multiple legislative commissions from recent years to establish one strategy to protect water in the state.

- Bill Housell: He additionally urged the Commission to reread the information Dana Bisbee presented to them at the January meeting regarding the implications on NAFTA [North American Free Trade Agreement] and its implications on property rights related to taking water.

Marcy stated that based on the findings of this Commission and others, the issues surrounding water will require the investment of time of residents to inform themselves and others about water now and into the future.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Glenn and seconded by Amy. The motion passed unanimously.

***Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.***

***The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for September 18, 2012 from 1:00 to 5:00 at the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department.***