

DRAFT MINUTES

**NEW HAMPSHIRE COASTAL RISKS AND HAZARDS COMMISSION
(RSA 483-E)**

**FRIDAY, November 13, 2015
9:00 AM – 11:30 PM**

NHDES Portsmouth Regional Office
Pease International Tradeport
222 International Drive, Suite 175
Portsmouth, NH 03801 (603) 559-1500

DRAFT MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Present	Name	Representation
	Arcieri, William	Town of Newmarket
Yes	Bird, Steve	City of Dover
Yes	Borden, Rep. David	Town of New Castle
	Bowman, Peter	NH DRED -Division of Forests and Lands - Alternate
	Buck, Kendall ⁱ	Homebuilders Association of New Hampshire
Yes	Caron, David	NH Municipal Association
	Carroll, Patrick	Town of Rollinsford
Yes	Couture, Steve	NH Department of Environmental Services - Alternate
	Cushing, Rep. Renny ⁱⁱ	Representative – District 21
Yes	Feighner, Edna	NH Division of Historical Resources
	Fitzgerald, Brian	Town of Rye - Alternate
Yes	Gilbert, Jennifer	NH Office of Energy and Planning
Yes	Godlewski, Sherry ⁱⁱⁱ	NH Department of Environmental Services (Commission Clerk)
Yes	Hawkins, Donald ^{iv}	Town of Seabrook
	Houle, James	Town of Durham
Yes	Huber, Dick	Town of Exeter
Yes	Kinner, Peter	Town of Greenland
Yes	Kipp, Jonathan	NH Public Risk Management Exchange (Primex)
	Kroner, Shep	Town of North Hampton
Yes	Kupper, Theodore	NH Department of Admin Services - Bureau of Pub Works Design & Constr.
Yes	Melanson, Paul	Town of Hampton Falls
Yes	Miller, Steven	City of Portsmouth
	Morgan, Thomas	Town of Newington
	Nyhan, Kevin	NH DOT Bureau of Environment
	O'Sullivan, Michael	Town of Madbury
Yes	Pennock, Jonathan	UNH Marine Program & NH Sea Grant Program
Yes	Pimental, Kyle	Strafford Regional Planning Commission

Present	Name	Representation
Yes	Rice, Rep. Frederick	Representative – District 21
Yes	Rice, John	Seacoast Board of Realtors
Yes	Riley, Cory	NH Fish & Game, Great Bay NERR
Yes	Ryan, Mary Kate	NH Division of Historical Resources - Alternate
Yes	Scholz, Ann	NH DOT Bureau of Environment - Alternate
Yes	Sinnott, Cliff	Rockingham Planning Commission (Commission Chair)
Yes	Stanwood, Sabrina	NH DRED -Division of Forests and Lands
Yes	Stephenson, Roger	Town of Stratham
Yes	Stiles, Sen. Nancy	Senator, District 24
Yes	Wake, Cameron Dr. ^v	University of NH
Yes	Watters, Sen. David	Senator, District 4
	Winslow, Phil	Town of Rye
Yes	Wolek, Gail	NH DRED – Division of Parks and Recreation
	Wood, Rep. David	Town of Hampton

Other attendees:

Kirsten Howard, NHDES Coastal Program
Julie LaBranche, Rockingham Planning Commission

1. Call to Order - Welcome/Introductions

Cliff Sinnott called meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes from September 25, 2015 Meeting

MOTION TO APPROVE by Paul Melanson
Motion seconded by Steve Bird
Abstaining: Cameron Wake, Don Hawkins, Jonathan Kipp
Remainder approved the minutes.

3. Update on Draft Report – – Kirsten Howard [60 min]

[revised report and recommendations distributed separately]

Sinnott explained that the group’s objective for the meeting is to review the draft report and recommendations, but that it will not be the last chance to make changes. The Commission will vote later in the meeting to approve recommendations for municipal review process so they may be used by NHCAW in the municipal discussion groups.

a. Comments received and report revisions since last meeting

Kirsten explained the edits to the report and recommendations that had been completed since the last meeting, including the new recommendations format to include icons and the SAIL goals.

Senator Watters thanked the report writing group for its work. Clarified that the recommendations are going to appear at the appropriate moment in the full narrative report to give context. Mentioned that it’s a significant moment for the Commission: to send its set of ideas and strategies out to municipalities for feedback. Reminded the Commission that We there is a year to finish report.

Senator Stiles suggested adjusting the report title to state storm surge, sea-level rise, and then extreme precipitation. Representative Rice agreed.

Representative Borden suggested a diagram to help understand the order of the recommendations.

John Pennock asked about the Executive Summary. Said his only concern is that for the reader that isn't going to look at the whole thing, we're pushing down the recommendations. Once we get to page three, that's the meat of what people have been working on. I like SAIL, they could be the charge to the Commission.

Edna Feighner pointed to the definitions of our built landscape and our heritage—wondered if there is some way to incorporate our heritage/recreation, which may include our history into built landscape.

Mary Kate Ryan suggested that we be explicit about the fact that the definitions are fuzzy/overlap.

Senator Watters suggested that for "Implementation" we should call it: Identify implementation strategies

Cory Riley made a request to folks who aren't on the writing team to identify opportunities to reduce duplication.

Cam Wake commended the writing group and Commission for their work. Noted that science recommendations 1 and 2 are important in recognizing that the science will develop and change. That flexibility is critical.

Sinnott noted:

- 1A: missing word storm surge and upland flooding.
- B and E: are the same thing—could be combined
- D: drought is an outlier topic for us, if no findings made, probably should not make recs

Dick Huber asked What is the ideal intended future for the action—what is the future vision? Was that assigned to someone?

Riley noted Rec 1, the difference between B and E: E is baseline info that we don't have so it will be hard to apply new information. Skip second phrase in B. Acknowledge need baseline info. D: impact of changing water regimes—more water sometimes and less other times, hits on issue.

Sinnott noted E through J all specify or recommend specific research that needs to happen. Put together as a list that's broader—support further research to better understand...

Riley pointed out that we may not need 3.1 because B belongs in 3.2. C is 3.2. And D is important but belongs in science to educate people.

Ryan noted that 3.1 D might belong in 3.7 as part of helping municipalities incorporate into policies and plans.

Rice agreed that there is lots of potential to combine recommendations.

Representative Borden asked whether the audiences for each recommendation are defined because the responsible party isn't always clear.

Watters agreed that there are audiences, but said let's not do any of that right now—not our priority today.

Steve Bird: We don't want to lose recommendations to municipalities in 3.7.

Sherry Godlewski states that it's important to help municipalities understand they don't have to do all of this right away.

Watters noted I still have trouble navigating the document. Keep the rubric of goals. The response from discussion groups will help the Commission.

Peter Kinner notes that dates show up in three places, could consolidate.

Sinnott stated that dates were a column in the timeframe in the matrix.
Kinner asked: Will it be a matrix in an appendix?

Sinnott responded: I don't think we can do it all at once. That's a whole different task. Let's worry about some of those details later in our process.

Huber said we should think about the audience the recommendations are intended for. Include a list of acronyms at the end. Could add a word or phrase that captures the topic, it can be put up front in bold. Page 7 d and e should be combined. Reverse sentences.

Sinnott noted a few edits to be made:

- Page 5 2.1 D and E can be combined.
- Page 6, 2.2 D assess and determine the most---key thing. Something missing is shoreline treatment or hardening.
- 3.2 C page 6: reference STAP report recommendations, Commission's report, not STAP

Watters: STAP. If we go beyond that and say state should adopt whole report.

Rice: Page 6. 3.2 and 3.3 combined

Watters: 3.3 notes need for a new position which has budgetary implications so would keep separate.

Rice: Can they do it by themselves without a new position?

Stiles: responded that state agencies need a coordinator.

Kyle Pimental: 3.3 Could be action under 3.2.

Godlewski: A coordinator position is ideal. It won't prevent work we're already doing.

Kinner agreed it should be kept separate.

Borden agreed that a person needs to coordinate readiness.

Rice—need to coordinate how we're responding overall rather than incident related

Stiles agreed that a coordinator would be accessible to communities

Rice stated that he doesn't like unnecessary positions. But he thinks a coordinator is a good first step.

Sinnott asked: Does anyone disagree?

Godlewski noted that it would be parallel to statewide energy coordinator.

Ann Scholz asked: Did we mean statewide?

Godlewski: Statewide is needed, but maybe the recommendation shouldn't be statewide since the Commission is coastal.

Wake: There is enough work for a coastal person.

Steve Couture: Coastal Program has set up a part time position for this purpose. We are thinking about it.

However there is a need for statewide coordination when it comes to adaptation.

Watters: Let's remove "statewide"

Sinnott: Do we think we can get through this today? We need to if we want the discussion groups to be held in December.

Riley: suggested giving everyone five minutes to look through and ask whether there are things we're uncomfortable with. Or that are missing.

Godlewski: The question you should focus on is: When we put invite out to municipalities, do you feel comfortable asking municipal decision makers to discuss these draft recommendations?

Riley: 3.9 will generate interesting discussion. Focus on that. Might be uncomfortable for people to discuss. 3.8 seems like there is something missing—I was hoping to see something about looking for opportunities to shift sectors. Not sure what words are...could someone help?

Ryan: Vulnerability assessment?

Riley: I think that's in 2.3. For example, someone has to think about if Hampton Beach isn't there anymore or fisheries.

Rice: I think you mean contingency plans. Unlikely things. Army—had plans for unlikely things.

Julie LaBranche: New Orleans plan has references to adapting economic plans to respond to changing conditions. I will send text.

Roger Stephenson: caution on overreach. There are elements of private sector that are focused on the risk. Don't think weighing in and suggesting that there's vulnerability to businesses is appropriate.

Riley: I was focused on tax base.

Stephenson—that's ok.

Sinnott: In 2.3 we should include Hampton-Seabrook Harbor, Rye Harbor,

Rice: Or maybe beaches, parks, ports, and harbors.

Kipper: Suggest eliminating action. ID vulnerability.

Pimental: doubts on 3.9. Tax incentives are a red flag.

LaBranche: take word "tax" out of 3.9

Kipper: offer suggestion—broader to say use appropriate and available mechanisms, including but not limited to X, Y to fund climate adaptation. Also icons double up. On 3.5—encourage putting action with icon. 3.5a could be combined. Action items flow out underneath.

Watters: this is not our final report. We have to get something out to the discussion groups.

Sabrina Stanwood: Do we all feel comfortable to invite the public in? I'd like to do that.

Steve Miller: That's part of the discussion groups will do, that's what we're trying to do now.

Watters: Should we reference our response to the Executive Order?

Sinnott: 3.11 on design standards, freeboard and elevation and so forth. B following federal executive order.

Second thing c: minimum of one foot, is that enough?

Jennifer Gilbert: The difference is this gets into more than federal funding. The 2015 state building code requires one foot above state building code at minimum or based on best available science.

Ted Kupper: Tool to bring discussion. Referencing just executive order doesn't provide enough info. Technical editing thing: assessment rec 2.4 and 2.5 should be combined.

Asking about word require in 2.4B: is that appropriate? Like it.

Also, when we say assessment, what level of assessment is needed?

Steve Couture: Asset level—infrastructure assets.

Kupper: Then we should also recommend establishing funding source for agencies to perform assessments.

Scholz: FHWA—detailed assessments are very expensive, so we need to add a funding source.

Stiles: I agree we need to recommend that a funding source be identified.

Pimental: On 2.6; all coastal communities just got new floodplain maps. Distinguish that this will be future floodplain mapping, based on projected precipitation data and land use change.

Rice: Are there questions about 2.7 Inventory shorelines and survey?

Kupper: That might be a private issue. For state-owned assets, we know what's there. Need more collection about asset information.

Rice: So this asks us to establish a baseline.

Wake: 2.8 add mapping natural resources that also protect critical built landscape.

Sinnott: We're also Missing understanding impact on salt marsh. Move E up to 2.8.

Godlewski: on 3.14; move E up

Kipp: On Page 12: split require and encourage between state and municipal. Encourage municipalities and require state/state agencies.

Sinnott: Delete action 3.17 b
Godelwski: combine on page 12 d and e

Sinnott: Can someone explain the connection to instream flow?

Kipp: Agree that 3.17 seems like a stretch for this commission's charge. Need a direct correlation.

Wake asked about 3.17: page 13, was there rationale for not including potential of removing dams? Is it worth having something that identifies it as a potential action?

Rice: I'm not a dam expert, but there are moves to remove some dams to restore natural flow. There are arguments on the other end. Seems those things are working in opposite directions.

Feighner: Do need to include cultural resources.

Sinnott: Reframe with better explanation.

Steve Couture was assigned to do this.

Borden: How to package? The two documents together are really good. We need to figure out a way to package it in a way that won't be overwhelming. Also need to refer to hazard mitigation plans.

LaBranche: 3.5 on page 17, refer to it there?

Senator Stiles: consolidate budget years

Ryan: looking at last five recommendations. Should we make a list of all the things that need funding?

Report targeted at legislature could be different.

Kupper: support suggestion to streamline. Request funding and make a list.

b. Revisions to recommendations **MOTION TO APPROVE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW**

Watters made a motion to endorse draft NH CRHC goals, recommendations and actions with suggested edits for public review.

Sabrina Stanwood seconded.

All ayes; None abstaining. **MOTION CARRIES**

c. Report schedule

Sinnott explained that the Commission will get feedback from discussion groups. The draft will come back in February to adopt as a complete draft.

4. Legislation filed re CRHC Draft Recommendations – Senator Watters [10 min]

Senator Watters wanted to make the Commission members aware that legislation will come out of the recommendations. Doesn't have language yet from Legislative Services yet. One bill is about updating the STAP. DES will bring together agencies. Update every five years. The second bill requires state agencies to do an audit of existing statutes, rules, and other regulations as required in consideration of STAP report by 2018. Then action must be taken as a result of audit by 2019.

5. Municipal Discussion (Focus) Groups: process & plans to date -- Sherry Godlewski; Steve Miller [15 min]

Steve Miller explained the plan for the municipal discussion groups:

Sherry Godlewski and he are working on questions, format, met with experts. It's important we can use the recommendations. We're working on the invite, registration, materials. Dates are: December 8 and December 17. Holding day meetings for paid staff and night meetings for volunteer staff. We'll have 8 to 10 people at table, facilitation or note taker.

Kupper: will Commission be invited?

Steve: I see the value in inviting the Commission. Not sure what the answer is. Would make sense to have Commissioners there to listen.

LaBranche: Get more candid responses from municipal representatives if state agencies aren't there. I think include the municipal representatives in the discussions.

Hawkins: The point is to get a whole different voice and perspective—don't mind inviting everyone, we all participate in the background. I wouldn't hesitate to have the members from these groups there. Need greater level of visibility for this whole subject.

Godlewski: If you represent a community and no one from your community has signed up, we will call you.

6. Report on Rising Tides Conference – Roger Stephenson [10 min]

Roger Stephenson summarized the Rising Tides summit on coastal flooding. 35 mayors from coastal states participated. The event got significant news coverage. Senator Stiles and Senator Watters agree that the event was a success. Stephenson explained that one next step will be a billboard at Manchester airport, what do candidates plan to do about sea-level rise.

7. New Hampshire's Project of Special Merit Application for FY16 – Steve Couture [10 min]

MOTION TO ENDORSE

Steve Couture explained a NOAA Project of Special Merit Federal FY2016 funding opportunity.

It's a competitive proposal that would provide funding from October 2016 through April 2018. The NH Coastal Program has to apply with partners. Current thought is to submit a proposal that includes three tracks:

- Outreach/education
- Municipal assessments & implementation
- State assessments & implementation

Feighner: does NOAA give direction as far as making sure historical resources are included in program. Would historical resources be part of the discussion?

Sinnott: They are a significant part of our recommendations to be implemented.

Feighner: My biggest concern is that we go far without considering them. Make sure it's in the topic of discussion and not something that happens afterwards.\

Roger Stephenson made a **motion** to endorse this proposal and provide a letter of support from the Commission.

Cam Wake seconded.

All ayes; none opposed, none abstaining. **MOTION CARRIES**

8. Roundtable: Issue to Raise and/or Information to Share [10 min]

Sinnott proposed skipping the round table due to time.

9. Other Business [10 min]

- a. Legislative Forum on Coastal Risks and Hazards: CRHC Panel - Nov. 18
November 13 was the last date to RSVP for the RPC legislative forum.
- b. Schedule update
No meeting will be held in December.
Next meeting will be held the third Friday in January 2016.

10 Public comment

11. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 11:40am.

ⁱ Robert Cormier, previous NHHBA representative, retired in summer 2015; Kendall Buck is serving as NHHBA contact until a replacement is appointed by the Association

ⁱⁱ Replaced former representative Christopher Muns in January 2015

ⁱⁱⁱ Replaced former Asst. Commissioner Vicki Quiram as NHDES CRHC representative in April 2015

^{iv} Replaced Raymond Smith as Seabrook CRHC representative in June 2015

^v Replaced Dr. Paul Kirshen as the University of New Hampshire CRHC representative in October 2015