

Seacoast Stormwater Coalition Meeting Minutes

McConnell Center at 61 Locust Street, Dover, NH in room 323

Dover, New Hampshire

Wednesday, January 31, 2018, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m Dover Community Services

Attending:

Gretchen Young, Dover (Chair)

Jamie Houle, UNH SW Center

Ridgely Mauck, NHDES (presenter)

Barbara McMillan, NHDES

Sally Soule, NHDES

Tim Puls, UNH SW Center

Glen Tuttle, UNH

George Guilmeth, Rollinsford

Tavis Austin, Stratham

Steve Brewer, Raymond

Paul Cazeault, Rollinsford

James McCarty, Portsmouth

Mike Bobinsky, Somersworth

Diane Hardy, Newmarket

Owen Friend-Gray, Rochester

Nancy O'Connor, SRPC

Jim Hafey, Hampton

RH Snow, SWA

Paul Vlasich, Exeter

Dave White, Dover

Bill Archieri, VHB

Rachael Mack, SRPC

Heidi Marshall, CLD/Fuss & On'Neill

1. Introductions:

2. **Approve November 29, 2017 Meeting Minutes.** Jamie McCarty motions to approve the November 29, 2017 minutes. Owen Friend-Gray seconds. Motion passes.

3. **NH Alteration of Terrain Permit (AOT) Overview** – Ridgely Mauck, NHDES provided an overview of the latest AOT permit requirements and how many of the components compare with the Construction and Post Construction MS4 permit requirements.

- Jurisdiction of AOT- 100,000 SqFt of disturbance, 50,000 in protected shoreline. MS4 (EPA) covers 43,560 SqFt (one acre).
- AOT assumes the road is the disturbance area that triggers a need for a permit. It does not look at the disturbance associated under lot development but it does under MS4. So some subdivisions may come under the MS4 but not AOT.
 - Q - What about stockpiles of soils, striping, and processing?
 - A - Only if it is under the trigger and we see it.
- Any disturbance over 100,000 sq. ft., in a 10 year winder needs an AOT permit. The applicant can be required to retrofit if they are not upfront about their plans.
- Three major review components are hydraulic analysis, sediment and erosion control plans, and stormwater control and treatment.
- Erosion and sediment control plans are similar to the MS4: How they are sequencing – see the check list that AOT uses (on blog). AOT is looking for perimeter controls, inlet/outlet protection, runoff directed to temp BMPs, slope protectors, and inspection requirements. For stormwater

treatment practices, AOT is starting to require certain BMPs for certain contaminants. We don't allow dry-ponds for treatment. We no longer allow micro-pools.

- We don't have a distinction on re-development right now so everyone has to meet all the rules of new development.
- Rule revisions from August 15, 2017 include storm surges, blasting considerations, and lining of detention ponds. Approximately 50% of the water quality volume has to be permanent storage. Added certification by engineer of work completed.
- Chloride impairments- there are 48+/- watersheds defined as Chloride impaired, they need to develop chloride management plans, guidance includes: Green Snowpro, weather monitoring, equipment calibration, and salt usage evaluation and monitoring. They can adapt a NHDES salt reduction plan template.
- N/P Impaired waterbodies:
 - Will need to demonstrate that they will not cause a net increase.
 - Use infiltration/ filtration- swales and wet ponds are not enough treatment control.
 - Elevated groundwater- use gravel wetland.
 - Q – Which year impaired waters list is used?
 - A – Good question. We will have to double check.
- Onestop on NHDES website will have a layer around impairments - currently it is a one mile set back but will be changed to quarter mile. Class A will be whole watershed.
- The 2014 Coastal Risk and Hazards Commission Science Technology Advisory Panel (STAP) report
 - Assumes 15% increase in precipitation depth.
 - Addresses sea level rise and storm surge.
 - Updated every 5 years (this is not by rule).
- Differences between what AOT requires and MS4.
 - The rule change is requiring bigger BMPs.
 - Sediments control and reporting are similar.
 - Temporary erosion control measures have some differences with litter, etc.
- NHDES found that oversight at construction sites is important; contractors have a strong response to construction oversight. They have been using interns to get data.
 - Comment – most communities have records of transfer of ownership that can be accessed on-line.
- NHDES will start outreach, some people do not know about the manual, inspections, etc.

4. **Update on Rockingham Planning Commission NOI grant project –**

Gretchen Young asked if there was anyone interested in acting as project lead for the NOI effort. Hearing none, Gretchen agreed to act as lead unless someone contacted her later offering to take on that role.

Gretchen read a brief update from Julie LaBranche, RPC.

- *Staff have TA contracts in place and have scheduled meetings with towns/grantors for February.*

- Comments – No communities have scheduled a meeting yet. The communities discussed that the coordinated effort the SSC funded would be best implemented through the SSC meetings. It was agreed that RPC will be put on the agenda for the next meeting rather than meeting with town and city’s individually.
 - Young agreed to reach out to Julie and let her know that the communities would like to meet as a whole, and hopefully during the February SCC meeting.
- Q – (Mike Bobinsky) Will every community have a signed document at the end of this.
 - A – Except for the community specific differences. For those, it is intended that RPC will indicate next steps and what resources are available to help.
- *It appears the SSC will contract with RPC and SRPC for the mapping RFP. Results of this project will inform preparation of the NOI guidance and mapping specifications.*
 - Comments – The two projects should be done separately. The mapping project should not influence the NOI project.
- *RPC will report on the tools and templates we’re developing for the MS4 program at the next SSC meeting (in March?).*
 - Comments – Hopefully the RPC will attend the February meeting to begin the process with the group.

5. **Mapping RFP Update** – Gretchen Young, City of Dover

- We received ten strong proposals outlining unique and varied approaches to our project. The subcommittee reviewed all of the proposals, and is recommending selecting the Rockingham Planning Commission and Strafford Regional Planning Commission team, to work with the SCC to complete this project. The RPC team’s proposal meets our goal of developing a common denominator that covers the vast majority of the AUIDs and meets the requirements of the permit, have a relationship with many of the municipalities, and have the ability to carry out the tasks at an affordable budget.
- Owen-Friend-Gray motions to approve RPC and SRPC contract award. Mike Bobinsky seconds. Motion passes.
- Jamie McCarty will be the project lead.

6. **Other Business?**

- Mike Bobinsky suggested communities might want to start thinking about setting aside in their budgeting process a re-contribution to the coordination efforts.
- Gretchen presented that the Southeast Watershed Alliance (SWA) provided a check to the RPC for the NOI project. They also withdrew an additional 15% for overhead costs. She requested feedback from the coalition.
 - Comment – Overhead costs were not discussed at the beginning of this process. SWA requested to be the fiscal agent. There were possible other options including offers from Rochester that would not have overhead costs that were not explored due to the request by the SWA to be the fiscal agent.
 - Comment – This should have been brought up at the beginning of the process, and certainly before the fee was simply withdrawn.

- A – (Bill Archieri) There was some understanding among the SWA board that there would be a fee.
- Q - What does the funding pay for? There is no staff.
- A – (Bill Archieri) This was intended to allow the SWA to hire a staff to help Dick Snow.
- Comment – There was no agreement of administrative fees in the contract with SWA that the communities signed.
- Comment – 15% of the funds that have been collected, totals approximately \$4,500, which is essentially the cost of doing a project.
- Comment – There are pros and cons to changing mid-stream
- The SCC requests that the SWA to review the need for an administrative fee and present to the group. The SCC also would like to know of any future administrative or other fees that may be applied if we decide to do another round of projects.
- Bill Archieri will review with the SWA Board tonight. The SWA will discuss at the next meeting.
- Jamie McCarthy suggested we start thinking about next year projects.
- Bill Arcieri suggested we look at updating the stormwater model regulations. Discussion will continue next meeting.

7. General Announcements:

- Jamie Houle attended the NEWEA conference and met with the head of the Municipal Stormwater Alliance which is going country-wide. Jamie will invite him to present at the SSC.
- Barbara McMillan announced that the final Aquatic Resource Mitigation (ARM Fund) workshop will be held at the Rochester Community Center on 2/6 from 4 to 6:00 p.m. Details will be sent out.
- Jamie Houle announced that a Governor consent letter was sent to EPA on January 24th. The new EPA Regional Administrator, NH Governor, and the Municipal Coalition will be meeting with EPA. There should be representation from the SSC.

8. Next Meeting Date and Agenda:

- Next Meeting will be February 28, 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. back at Dover Community Services. Agenda items include:
 - Work Session with RPC on NOI work.
 - Introduction from RPC on mapping effort.
 - Revisit the NOI matrix to identify next coordinating tasks.