

**Upper Valley Subcommittee
Special Meeting Minutes**

Monday, June 24, 2024 – 6:00 PM Meeting

Hybrid Meeting - Latham Library, Downstairs, 16 Library Rd, Thetford, VT

Attendance

NH Members:	Attendance	VT Members:	Attendance
Alice Creagh, Hanover	X	Ted Unkles, Bradford	P
Vacancy, Hanover		Vacancy, Bradford	
Eric Agterberg, Lebanon	X	Ben Dana, Fairlee	X
Ruth Bleyler, Lebanon	X	Arlene Guest, Fairlee	V
Bill Malcolm, Lyme	P	David Barrell, Hartford	X
Vacancy, Lyme		Lynn Bohi, Hartford	P
Ted Cooley, Orford	V	Bill Bridge, Thetford	P
Carl Schmidt, Orford	X	Linda Matteson, Thetford	P
Vacancy, Piermont		Lynnwood Andrews, Norwich	P
Vacancy, Piermont		Vacancy, Norwich	

Note: P = present in person; V = present over remote virtual platform; X = not present

Partners Present: Majestic Terhune (Staff, CRJC); Audra Klumb (A&D Klumb Environmental)

Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Malcolm started the meeting at 6:01 p.m. Members and partners present introduced themselves.

2. Wetland PBN; Floating Dock Installation; Hanover, NH

Klumb provided an overview of the project. Bridge asked whether the trail is currently in place, and Klumb stated that the footpath is currently in place but will be improved. Bohi, Cooley, Matteson, and Malcolm reviewed images of the footpath and noted that it is very steep. Klumb said that stairs would be added.

Bohi and Malcolm expressed concern over how changing water levels would impact the dock. Malcolm added that should a waiver enable the dam to discharge more water than usual, water could damage or sweep away the dock. Andrews noted that the diagram made it difficult to see how far up the posts the water might rise. Bridge and Matteson said that so far, this year, water level has not majorly differed.

Unkles and Klumb discussed the design, and Klumb highlighted that the proposal is similar to a current dock a few miles north in Lyme. Bridge said that he has not had issues with his similar dock.

Andrews, Malcolm, and Unkles discussed the potential impacts of new hydropower ownership on the dock, concluding that less strain overall would be placed on the rope.

Cooley stated that his relatives in Orford who had a similar floating dock design work well and last for about ten years.

Malcolm and Matteson re-addressed the trail, with Matteson expressing concern over its steepness and future erosion. Malcolm explained that the LRS should also receive the Shoreland PBN. Klumb said that

no cutting would happen during trail building and that the Upper Valley Trails Alliance would be building the steps using wooden planks.

Guest motioned for no intervention. Andrews seconded. All voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

3. Water Quality Certification; Storrs Pond for Snowmaking; Hanover, NH

Bohi, Bridge, and Malcolm agreed that the modification was well done and thoroughly researched. Unkles noted that the modifier seemed to forget to change 5 million gallons to 8 million gallons on page 21.

Andrews highlighted that the State seemed to acknowledge that no one necessarily knew what the impact of the process would be on wildlife but there are no monitoring mechanisms discussed. Unkles suggested that public complaints or reports would alert the State. Guest pointed out that amphibians in particular need water depth in the winter to thrive. Andrews emphasized that the winters will continue to get warmer and the demand for water for snowmaking will continue to increase.

Guest and Malcolm discussed the modification versus original application. Malcolm wondered why the group had not received the initial application.

Matteson asked about the location relative to the Connecticut River. Bohi, Bridge, and Malcolm described where it is and how it overflows into the Connecticut River.

Unkles reiterated that the State should be made aware of the error on page 21.

Bohi moved to accept the modification as reviewed and having minimal impact. Matteson seconded. All voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

4. Shoreland Standard Permit; Dwelling and Driveway Construction; Hanover, NH

The group reviewed the maps for the permit application and expressed concern over the septic tanks. Bohi, Malcolm, Matteson, and Unkles noted the unknown location of a potential leach field, which could have negative impacts on the river depending on their location.

Bohi highlighted that there needs to be a buffer along the shore and no further vegetation can be removed. Andrews added that a buffer would help the homeowner with potential erosion.

The subcommittee agreed that maintaining current growth and supporting a riparian buffer would be very important for the protection of the shoreline.

Bridge and Unkles discovered that the aerial view (on Google Maps) shows a large dock. The group reviewed the tax map to determine ownership and moreover agreed that the dock suggested that the owners may be more interested in shoreline access.

Unkles moved to submit a comment requesting information about the dock, potential development along the shoreline, and leach field location, in addition to a strong suggestion for the maintenance of a riparian buffer along the shoreline. Bohi seconded. All voted in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

5. Other business

Bohi asked about the next meeting date. Terhune agreed to set it for July 15. Malcolm reminded members that they will be discussing changes to the commenting process.

6. Adjourn

Unkles moved to adjourn. Matteson seconded. All voted in favor. The meeting concluded at 7:20 p.m.

The next meeting is July 15, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Majestic Terhune.

DRAFT