

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

**COMMISSION MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES**

Friday, September 16, 2016

9:00AM – 11:45AM

NHDES Portsmouth Regional Office – Room A

Pease International Tradeport, 222 International Drive, Suite 175, Portsmouth, NH

Attendance:

Present	Name	Representation
	Arcieri, William	Town of Newmarket
Yes	Bachand, Jason	Town of Hampton
	Bird, Steve	City of Dover
	Borden, Rep. David	Town of New Castle
	Bowman, Peter	NH DRED -Division of Forests and Lands - Alternate
	Kasnet, Peter ⁱ	Homebuilders Association of New Hampshire
	Caron, David	NH Municipal Association
	Carroll, Patrick	Town of Rollinsford
	Couture, Steve	NH Department of Environmental Services - Alternate
	Cushing, Rep. Renny ⁱⁱ	Representative – District 21
	Durfee, Liz	Strafford Regional Planning Commission - Alternate
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
	Kipp, Jonathan	NH Public Risk Management Exchange (Primex)
	Kroner, Shep	Town of North Hampton
	Kupper, Theodore	NH Department of Admin Services - Bureau of Pub Works Design
	Melanson, Paul	Town of Hampton Falls
Yes	Miller, Steven	City of Portsmouth
	Denis Hebert	Town of Newington
	Nyhan, Kevin	NH DOT Bureau of Environment
	O'Sullivan, Michael	Town of Madbury
	Pennock, Jonathan	UNH Marine Program & NH Sea Grant Program

Present	Name	Representation
Yes	Pimental, Kyle	Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Yes	Rice, Rep. Frederick	Representative – District 21
Yes	Rice, John	Seacoast Board of Realtors
Yes	Riley, Cory	NH Fish & Game, Great Bay NERR
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
	Stiles, Sen. Nancy	Senator, District 24
Yes	Wake, Cameron Dr. ^v	University of NH
	Watters, Sen. David	Senator, District 4
Yes	Winslow, Phil	Town of Rye
Yes	Wolek, Gail	NH DRED – Division of Parks and Recreation

Other: Kirsten Howard, NHDES; Nathalie Morison, NHDES

1. Call to Order & Welcome & Membership Update [5 min] – Cliff Sinnott, CRHC Chair

Cliff Sinnott called the meeting to order at 9:15 when a quorum had been achieved.

Cliff gave membership updates:

- Erik Chapman will be NH Sea Grant member
- Jonathan Kipp, retired from PRIMEX, Cliff reached out to see if he will stay on or appoint someone else [later confirmed he will stay on representing PRIMEX through the end of the Commission]
- Denis Hebert will represent Newington

2. Approval of Minutes from June 17, 2016 Meeting [5 min] MOTION TO APPROVE (Attachment)

- Motion to approve made by John Rice; Motion seconded by Jason Bachand
- SO VOTED Fred Rice and Ann Scholz abstained

3. Changes Proposed to Draft Report by Report Writing Workgroup [60 min]– Nathalie Morison

- a.* Overview and Summary of Changes – [see Attached “Summary of Revisions”]
- Cliff summarized the process to collect and respond to the comments
 - Nathalie Morison gave a summary of report changes
 - Went through the document “Summary of CRHC Report Revisions” in detail

Social vulnerability additions

- Dick Huber asked why the State of New Hampshire doesn’t recognize Native American tribes if true?
- Cory Riley responded; There are no federally-recognized tribes in New Hampshire.
- Edna Feighner elaborated; We do have a commission and list; if there is a federal undertaking, we do suggest to federal agencies that they consider that heritage.

- Dick followed up; Is that covered under social vulnerability?
- Edna responded; It is a vulnerable population, in a way, because we don't recognize native populations here.
- Sherry Godlewski mentioned that in 2009 and 2010, we did engage New Hampshire tribes for an initiative. They didn't continue to participate.
- Edna mentioned that we have no federally-recognized reservations.
- Dick asked; Is there any legislation in New Hampshire that could be introduced?
- Representative Fred Rice responded; This is outside the scope of this study. This report can't address one family here or there.
- Cliff: The social vulnerability concerns that were added to this draft at least partially get at this issue.
- Dick agreed.

Figure 7/C-RiSe data

- Cam Wake mentioned that Figure 7, looks as though table has not been updated.
- Cliff clarified that that no changes were made in the draft report document itself; the highlights indicate where revisions will be made. Will we be adding maps?
- Nathalie explained that the maps are an illustrative example (Seabrook), we could provide two new maps for Great Bay communities.
- General agreement that two new figures should be added.
- Cliff asked are there any other thoughts on the changes?
- Cam mentioned he appreciates the effort to integrate social vulnerability index. On the text that you've added under Recommendation 1E, let's work on text a little more. Important relationship between vulnerability, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity. "How sensitive are our assets?" We should frame it better. Page 10.
- Cam committed to draft the edits by next Wednesday.
- Rep. Rice commented on Recommendation 1D, we mention storm surge. He is pleased with changes. That makes it more acceptable to the people who are reading this.

Phil Huber asked On Recommendation 2F, who will be doing this?

- Jennifer Gilbert responded that she will.
- Phil mentioned that he hopes it will be guidance, not mandatory.
- Jennifer responded that it will be strictly voluntary: a model ordinance.
- Phil asked, will it include examples of zoning ordinances?
- Jennifer responded that it will be a menu of options that a community can pick and choose from. One example: Raymond has a lot of flooding in developed downtown area. Adopted compensatory storage. They also adopted freeboard because saw flooding going above 1% annual chance base flood elevation. We'll develop model language to take and plug in. Expect to have this completed by the end of 2016.
- Cliff mentioned that Recommendation BL2C talks about additional standards. Asked, this is a mechanism to help bring that about, right?
- Jennifer responded that she will compile existing guidance into one menu, and make it specific to NH. Will reach out to RPCs and town planners for feedback.
- Kyle Pimental mentioned guidance on benefits for communities. Is there anything that exists to help communities decide whether CRS a good fit for them?
- Jennifer responded; OEP can provide guidance on that. In Portsmouth, for example, more than half of policies are outside the floodplain. Not a huge benefit for them to do it at this

point. Has to go above and beyond minimum. There is a “quick check” checklist on the CRS website. Any community can call me and go through it.

Cliff gave everyone 3-5 minutes to read 4.2.2 Private Property Section

- Ann Scholz mentioned; I don't necessarily have a problem with this section as written. However, I don't know where speculations came from. When we've looked at other example reports, do they have speculation?
- Cliff responded that it came out of discussion of several steering committee members in attempting to address public comments made regarding property impacts. Half a dozen articles and references were researched but did not support definitive conclusions.
- Ann suggested to add language that commits to updating this section as more research emerges.
- Cory commented that a more consistent way to handle it would be to talk about the vulnerability of private property. Include number of private residences. Acknowledge there is a link between coastal property and tax revenue. Then mention that we don't know more than that.
- Dick agreed. Say there's concern. There's speculation. There's uncertainty.
- Cam commented that the coastal real estate market is dynamic. We aren't pulling examples from thin air. There have been examples in Long Island/Plum Island where insurance companies have pulled out. There are examples where property values have increased.
- It's dynamic and we don't know what's going to happen. Here are some things that could happen.
- Cory mentioned a concern that this section takes us in a direction we haven't gone in other sections.
- Kyle added that in the C-RiSe project, we were able to get parcel data tied to assessing data. 6.3 with storm surge, if any parcels touched we got a value. We couldn't separate building and land value—they are together. If there is a parcel that's 45 acres worth \$3 million, touched very minimally by flooding it includes the whole \$ value. Need caveat or just number of parcels.
- Rep. Rice said he kind of agrees with Cory. It's written in a different tone. Parts of it are good. Parts are questionable. Coastal real estate markets are complex and dynamic. People want to know what is this going to do to the value of my property and my ability to get insurance? There is a tendency to maintain high values; risk of owning vulnerable properties have not been fully born by property owners. Thinks it's pretty well written.
- Rice continued: Biggest concern is with last two bullet items. Likes the last one: sound planning. That's thrust of much of the report and is based on common sense. Don't like last sentence of preceding paragraph. As a result efforts to reduce...that implies a direct relationship between CHG reduction and reduce SLR that I don't think we can't make in this report.
- Cam responded that he agrees with Fred on this. Reducing emissions will not necessarily reduce the impacts...we could say “may” reduce...
- Rep. Rice asked everyone to take note that he and Cam agreed on something.
- Cliff suggested that what we know and the things are speculating about could be grouped; the speculative questions could be put together: here are the things we are uncertain about.
- Cory responded that part of it could be increasing values of homes that are self-insured/outside of the floodplain, etc. There are properties that will gain values.
- John Rice mentioned that he did submit some highly speculative remarks. He's a salesperson, not a scientist. He drives up and down the coast. We have a small number of miles of oceanfront. It's so prestigious to own a parcel of that. When owners meet FEMA regs, redo

basements; you can see old properties being destroyed on Ocean Boulevard and arts and crafts mansions taking over. They think they've done what they need to do. They're willing to take a loss and insure themselves. Values have hit a ceiling which may be partly related to risk. It's hard to sell an oceanfront property for more than \$1.5 million/\$1.6 million. Days of 2.2 and 3.1 million seem to be over. I'm doing a market analysis on a property in North Hampton, looking for \$ million sales. Could not find any comps for something away from the ocean. All of the \$ million sales had occurred on Ocean Boulevard.

- Cliff offered to make some clarifications in this section.
- Cam mentioned that the place where the properties are worth the most are at the most risk. While there is a lot of uncertainty, it places an imbalance on society and on the tax base.
- Phil Winslow mentioned it's a time issue; vulnerability changes over time
- Kyle asked, should we change that sentence or remove it? Will to may?
- Rep. Rice suggested to remove it.
- General agreement.
- Cliff Sinnott will help re-draft. Cam Wake, Cory Riley, and Kyle Pimental will review.

Jennifer Gilbert described changes to 4.3.2.

- Phil Winslow commented that you mention that in the future, property owners may take on more of the burden.
- Jennifer said The Reform Act is really targeting the structures that were built before the regulations came on. It's case by case.

Check Figure 14 for update.

- Don Hawkins asked about pre-existing homes before 1986 (Seabrook)
- Jennifer said they expect a 18%-25% increase every year. These homes have been receiving a discount up until 2012. Tried her best to write it in a paragraph without getting into the weeds.
- Commission was generally ok with section as it is rewritten.

Section 7

- Cliff recalled that Rep. Rice has suggested a summary of top order recommendations and asked if we have addressed this.
- Rep. Rice said there is a lot of responsibility on municipalities. Is there any way to combine or prioritize it? Maybe include timeframes?
- Nathalie said the most immediate next step is to ask municipalities to prioritize (#2)
- Cliff suggested making #2 a preface. "We recognize there are a lot of things"
- Jason commented that we always have a lot to do.
- Steve Miller suggested that maybe it's covered in the introduction.
- Cliff said it's important to re-emphasize. Set up how to approach next steps. Don't do it all at once.
- Rep. Rice said in the introductory narrative, mention they should do according to relative priorities for communities.
- Don said that practically, this is a list for towns and departments to use as guidance, We used this list in master plan chapter for coastal hazards. The town can get more specific. Didn't bother him at all.
- Rep. Rice suggested soften the word "immediate" or delete it
- Gail Wolek said she is in favor of keeping list, but emphasizing priorities.
- Cliff reminded there is a specific recommendation for the construction standards (based on FFRMS).

- Edna asked that for #5, change historic “places” to “resources”
- Phil said they just replaced two culverts on Red Mill Lane in Rye that were being replaced in kind, doubled size of those. Town would not have done that if it were not for that document.
- Kyle said some of this information will go into a municipal master plan. Maybe call out master plans under Setting Sail section.

b. Discussion & Action on Proposed Changes **MOTION(s) TO APPROVE**

- Cliff asked for a motion to adopt proposed changes as amended to incorporate suggestions and decisions made today.
- Rep. Rice made the motion: “ I propose that we accept propose changes as they will be modified slightly by the Steering Committee.”
- John Rice seconded the motion.
- No Discussion, Motion approved unanimously.
- Cliff reminded that everyone has until September 21 to get final comments in. Suggested that Steering Committee be empowered to handle those comments. General agreement.

4. Final Responses to Comments Received [30 min] – Nathalie Morison [Attachment]

a. Comments received after June 17 (previous meeting)

- Peter Kinner asked why aren’t we including it as an appendix?
- Nathalie responded that it will be on website. It is referenced in the report. Once we have the link we can include the link. The report printed would be very long if we include the comment responses.
- Gail said that we should follow similar format to other state agency reports.

Tom Wismuller comment

- Rep. Rice mentioned that if we don’t use the predictions we should be consistent. We should remove others that are similarly imprecise. We should add small paragraph that explains why we don’t use probabilities. Should be clear on probabilities, predictability and precision.
- Steve Miller asked was this not already addressed in the STAP? It’s undermining the whole report.
- Fred disagreed.
- Cory said she thinks the report edits are good as is.
- Rep Rice said that he doesn’t know that probability statement is needed in here. Maybe just explain why.
- Sherry suggested to move on. Nathalie has done a good job. Don’t need to debate it anymore.
- Agreement to move on and not change the current wording.
- Phil asked what’s the sense with the House and Senate? What are they hearing about this document? Are you getting support from them?
- Rep Rice said he hasn’t heard specifics. Not heard objections. Everybody realizes that you have to do some planning. Think that because report is not some “clarion call” but more like a call to common sense preparation.
- Roger made a motion to accept in entirety and acknowledge Nathalie’s careful attention to detail.
- Gail seconded the motion
- Motion unanimously approved

5. Next Steps for the Final Report [10 min]

- a. Consideration for Approval at October 21 CRHC Meeting
- Steering Committee may need to meet a week earlier in September. Can we move October meeting to October 28? Or in afternoon on October 21? 12:30-2:30pm was decided.
- Printing 300 copies. Don't know who is paying for it yet. Senator Watters is investigating finding funds for the printing.
- There will be a front to back copy edit by the designer as well.
- b. Final prep, formatting and printing
- 6. Report Rollout [10 min]**
 - a. Press Conference – all Commission Members requested to Attend – Nov 30, 11 AM LOB Lobby
 - b. Press Releases, Local Distribution, Op-Eds, other media
- Some discussion on these topics occurred. No decisions.
- 7. CRHC Sunset Planning [10 min] - Website Site archive; Other Documentation; Final gathering/celebration**
- Nathalie and Kirsten Howard are building a website to archive the meeting details.
- Some sort of final event was discussed.
- 8. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard – Update [10 min] – Roger Stephenson**
- Military expert panel report on sea-level rise issued this week in Washington. Includes case studies from Union of Concerned Scientists, including Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. One recommendation is to collaborate with adjacent civilian communities; there is interest in both parties coming together to talk about next steps.
- 9. Member Updates & Communication [10 min]**
- None of note.
- 10. Other Business and Public Comment**
- Wes Tater made one comment: Thank you. It's reminiscent of when I was in grade school, watching legislative session. Deeply appreciate the work that you've all put in over the last few years. With Citizens Climate Lobby. Empowering people to get engaged in topic of climate change. Fee on carbon. Hosted first showings of film called Facing the Surge—25 minute documentary shot in Norfolk, VA. Doesn't leave with the tragedy of that. Leaves you with the power an opportunity of people to take action. Hope citizens will pay attention to your work and take some action.
- 11. Adjourn [~11:45]**
- Adjourned at 12:01pm.

ⁱ Replaced Kendall Buck in December 2015

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