

RIVERS MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
September 28, 2010
NH Dept. of Environmental Services
9:00 am – 1:00 pm

Members Present

Ken Kimball, Chair
Michele L. Tremblay, Vice Chair
Gary Kerr
Anne Krantz
Frederick McNeill
John Magee
Kathryn Nelson
Allan Palmer
Jim Ryan
Larry Spencer

Representing

Recreational Interests
Conservation Interests
Granite State Hydropower
Historical & Archaeological Interests
Municipal Government
NH Fish & Game Department
Local River Management Advisory Comm.
Business and Industry Association
NH Fish & Game
NH Association of Conservation Comm.

Term

Dec. 28, 2011 V
Dec. 28, 2011 V
Jan. 5, 2012 V
June 15, 2010 V
Nov. 16, 2011 V
Indefinite NV
Sept. 5, 2010 V
Sept. 28, 2010 V
Indefinite V
Oct. 12, 2010 V

Members Absent

Vacant
Bob Beaurivage
Jennifer Czysz
Gail McWilliam Jellie
Johanna Lyons
Kevin Nyhan
Richard Verville

Agricultural Community
Public Water Suppliers
NH Office of Energy and Planning
NH Department of Agriculture
Dept. Resources & Economic Development
NH Dept. of Transportation
NH Dept. of Safety

Mar. 22, 2009 V
Sept. 28, 2010 V
Indefinite NV
Indefinite NV
Indefinite NV
Indefinite NV
Indefinite NV

DES Staff Present

Laura Weit-Marcum
Jenn Rowden
Wayne Ives
Carolyn Guerdet
Shane Csiki

NHDES Acting Rivers Coordinator
NHDES Rivers and Lakes Programs
NHDES Instream Flow Specialist
NHDES Administrative Assistant
NHDES Geological Survey

Guests Present

Bill Maher, Souhegan River LAC
Spencer Brooks, Souhegan River LAC
Rep. Judith Spang
Don Clement, Exeter River LAC
Pete Richardson, Exeter River LAC
Rep. Mike Kappler
Rep. Frank Gould
Shawn Donovan, Mascoma River Nomination Committee
Rachel Ruppel, Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission
Dawn Genes, Lamprey River Watershed Association
Sharon Meeker, Lamprey River LAC
Isobel Parke, Lamprey River Nomination Committee

The Meeting Was Called to Order

Ken Kimball, Chair, called the meeting to order 9:00 a.m.

I. Introductions/Minutes/Committee Business

1) June 30, 2010 RMAC Meeting Minutes

- ***Michele L. Tremblay made a motion to accept the June 30, 2010 RMAC meeting minutes, second by Jim Ryan. Motion passed unanimously.***

2) Acceptance of Public Hearing Minutes for River Nominations

- ***Michele L. Tremblay made a motion to accept Public Hearing minutes of the July 14, 2010 nomination of the Lower Exeter River and Squamscott River into the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program, second by Jim Ryan. Motion passed unanimously.***
- ***Michele L. Tremblay made a motion to accept the Public Hearing minutes of the August 5, 2010 nomination of the Mascoma River into the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program, second by Kathryn Nelson. Motion passed unanimously.***
- ***Michele L. Tremblay made a motion to accept the Public Hearing minutes of the August 17, 2010 nomination of the Oyster River into the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program, second by Anne Krantz. Motion passed unanimously.***
- ***Frederick McNeill made a motion to accept the Public Hearing minutes of the August 31, 2010 nomination of the Lamprey River, North Branch River, North River, Little River, Pawtuckaway River and Piscassic River into the NH Rivers Management and Protection Program, second by Jim Ryan. Motion passed unanimously.***

3) RMAC Membership Update

- 1) The following members need to be reappointed:

Bob Beurivage, term expires September 28, 2010
Anne Krantz, term expired June 15, 2010
Kathryn Nelson, term expired September 5, 2010
Allan Palmer, term expires September 28, 2010
Larry Spencer, term expires October 12, 2010

Chairman Kimball noted that members may continue to serve until their replacement is confirmed or they are re-nominated, unless they elect to step down.

The Governor's Office has contacted Roger Noonan, potential Agriculture Community representative to determine his interest; however he has not responded. Michele suggested returning to the three nominating organizations and asking them to submit another name or a due date for Roger to respond.

II. Instream Flow Pilot Program Update – Wayne Ives, DES

Wayne Ives, Instream Flow Specialist provided an update. He is now working on the Lamprey Water Management Plan. The Souhegan has been put off until the finish of the Lamprey due to funding source and time. He met with the Local Water Management Planning Area Advisory Committee in July to describe the activities up to that point. The three main sub-plan components were reviewed. These are the 1) Conservation Plan for each of the affected water users 2) a Water Use Plan for each of the affected water users, and 3) a Dam Management Plan for each of the affected dams. This is designed to protect the levels of stream flow described in the first part of the process, which was the study that defined protected instream flows. The sub-plans are nearly complete for all of the water users and dam owners and have been distributed to those affected.

It was decided to have the affected water users adopt a conservation plan that meets the requirements of the Env-Wq 2102, the Drinking Water and Ground Water (DWGW) Program's rules. Responsibility was shifted from making a new instream flow conservation plan to developing a conservation plan under the existing rules for the affected water users then letting the DWGW Program implement and maintain compliance with that.

The water use plans have remained the same except there has been a shift for managing the summer peak uses by public water suppliers. They have some control over peak demand, which is a reasonable, useful approach for reducing and flattening the water use. This approach would investigate one or more levels of protection that reduce outside water uses. The first stage is an alert. The second stage are reductions, i.e. no car watering, on-off watering of lawns, etc. The third or fourth stage is a complete reduction of voluntary water use outside, however this depends on the town. Michele asked about distinguishing between vegetable gardens vs. flowers/lawns. Wayne said they allow the towns to make up their own process and usually there is a distinction. Kath asked about the lag time between being pro-active and being too late. In general, the alerts take place at the appropriate time. The instream flow process would start earlier and be based on river flows rather than tank capacity, etc.

Dam management plan – the important dams on the Lamprey River are on Pawtuckaway Lake and Mendum's Pond. The process is to release two day-long relief flows that would reset the affected instream flow clock whenever the flows get beyond the durations of allowable and catastrophic conditions for the critical and rare flows. There are still negotiations ongoing with the Dam Bureau regarding the process. The thought process behind the protected instream flow program is that there are the natural occurrences of high and low flows on a regular basis and if this time schedule isn't happening they will create/re-create an artificial flow and then let the river go on as it would before. Maintaining a semblance of the natural flows would then maintain the aquatic life support and the other uses that are on the river (water supply and recreation). These dams have fall draw-downs and in the spring the stop-logs are put in gradually to match the historical flows. The process is to get the dam management plans in place. There is tension between those living on the reservoirs vs. those wanting the water downstream. There are also effects causing losses to a release in a watershed, absorption in wetlands, etc.

It was asked if we were going to wait for all these studies to be done before implementation and the answer is yes. There are two things to wait for – first, an approved water management plan. There is still being work done with the towns that they're onboard with their individual components of the water management plan and the second is the dam bureau, as to what issues they have as far as physically doing the release activities, such as being able to get the manpower and actual mechanism to release the water. Also, there is the pre-existing 2000 water level decision that states how Pawtuckaway is going to be operated. Until this is reviewed and revised there is no mechanism to make the changes. We now have the numbers for volume/rate of dam releases for the protected flows that are wanted: however we need to work out the process to make it happen. It is a public process that requires time. Possibly having the Governor make a change was discussed.

The conservation plans are designed to make sure that water isn't being wasted. There is metering, to understand where the water is coming from and have accurate calculations of that. Also, for reducing water waste from losses. The water use plan is more tied to the summer-time water usage; flattening pumping rates by pumping at lower rates for longer periods of time so the impacts are less abrupt. The past thirty years of historical data have been assessed for both the fall and spring; the data is fairly consistent on the Pawtuckaway. Management is most concerned about late spring through late summer in regards to the dam releases. Some conservation plans were implemented this past summer. They are trying to incorporate some early effects so that they don't get too deep into the restrictions. They want to make sure that the sacrifice that is being asked is worthy.

The intention was to finish the studies this fall but it is taking longer for some of the towns to respond. So, we are now looking at early next year.

Is the 'alert' practical? Is change mandatory? The purpose is to protect the level of variability. The process is based on the idea that periodically there are peaks coming back that should happen on a regular basis and that should continue. Right now, there is an acute situation but not an unknown situation. Low flows occur on a regular basis. The river is OK now and this one situation that the river is in right now is not that bad. If it happened maybe three years in a row then you would have a serious problem.

Rearing and Growth - The Water Management Protection Area Advisory Committee meeting held on July 9th included a description to the committee of the calculations to develop the dam management numbers.

There are three levels of protected flow during the rearing and growth period. Each has two time durations – one is the persistent with the allowable duration and the other is the catastrophic duration. What is the two day release pulse volume that is needed once you've exceeded a duration? This is the basis to identify what the flow is. Common flow describes the ideal fish habitat situations. Ninety percent of the historical event's volumes for each bio-period is what is used as a guideline to a release event. There may be some losses to the released flow so an additional 20% is added to the 90% volume to give a buffer. We will be watching this extra 20% to see whether it is lost or reserved—is it enough?. [There was a handout page describing each impoundment's releases – Pawtuckaway, Mendum's, and one page combined.] For summer events there is a 90% volume, add the 20% and then convert into a two-day pulse that represents a rate of flow in csf. The intention is to take the existing fall flows from the releases, manage them actively, so that all of the events that may occur in the fall during salmon spawning, would meet the protected flows. Then, store something in the winter from what currently is released in the fall to use for a release event. By spring, the reservoirs would be refilled, so that we would start back at scratch. This can be applied better to dams with stop-logs (Pawtuckaway) than those with gates (Mendum's Pond) in the winter.

Chairman Kimball asked the questions: Next steps after the Lamprey and Souhegan? Where do we go? What did we learn from this that allows us to move ahead for the resources the state will have? Wayne said that the conservation plan development is now simplified. The Drinking Water and Groundwater (DWGW) rules have written out the process. We are now taking notes on the instream flow rules to match the DWGW rules. All water users in a protected watershed would then have the responsibility of getting a conservation plan under the existing DWGW program, which is a great simplification of that process. We have also defined how to manage dam management plans. Bullet three describes how the existing watershed was evaluated. All of the dams in the watershed may provide in the future some sort of release if needed by ranking impoundments by what they contribute by surface area. Some process is now developed that is leading to future simplifications in developing the water management plans. Some problems include water withdrawals from Durham, the political issues and technical issues. The mandate from RMAC was to get to the 2012 process in advance as to what we want to make changes in. Identify problem areas and some of the suggested processes that should be used instead. Wayne is documenting methods of developing the rationale and processes for the water management plans. Task Two was to find a way to evaluate all the water users that have some impact, either immediately or over a long period (within the 500 ft.). PUC was to review the dam management plans for hydropower usage and what effect. Now PUC does not do that kind of activity and so will not be involved.

Michele asked for a future agenda before the report to the General Court is due – she'd like to see some kind of base criteria for how existing rivers in the program will be phased in. She also asked for the criteria to be developed in such a way so that when a new designation comes in there will be a sense of low, medium, or high priority and it will be part of the consideration. This information should also be shared with the nominating bodies, so that they will have can better answer those questions when they're going around to their towns and cities. Fred asked general order magnitude – what has been the budget for the water management plans? Wayne – the consulting budget for the two plans is \$545,000. This shouldn't be the price tag for each plan. Complexities and length of river segment make a difference. They have tried to maintain this as a process to deal with the problems as we go and more has been spent but the contractors have continued on. Fred noted that the state's investment and DES's time should be acknowledged in these economic times as many states can't afford to do this and they fall to the wayside.

III. River Nomination Presentations

Michele made a suggestion to begin with a cursory introduction for each of the nominations, since the hearings were each two hours long. Chairman Kimball agreed and suggested a quick overview and then divide the discussion into two elements. One is the evidence of public support and then the second is the substance of the nomination, are the designations correct relative to statute, etc.

1) Lower Exeter/Squamscott Rivers

Chairman Kimball noted part of the river is already in the program. The portion enrolled is from its headwaters in Chester to its confluence with Great Brook in Exeter. The portion being nominated is from the junction of Great Brook in Exeter, past the Great Dam and the falls to the head of the tide in Exeter, and then the Squamscott River to the boundary of Great Bay as defined by the upstream side of the railroad bridge in Stratham and Newfields. The nomination covers three towns – Exeter, Stratham and Newfields. Letters of

support have been received from elected and appointed officials in all three towns. RMAC members attended a site visit hosted by the Exeter River Local Advisory Committee on July 14th. A public hearing was held later that day to solicit public feedback on the nomination. [Refer to the Public Hearing minutes of the Lower Exeter/Squamscott River for a review of comments received.] All comments received were in support of the nomination. The nomination has met the criteria set forth in statute and rule.

Michele noted that over the past year and a half more attention has been drawn to the condition of Great Bay. As the Rivers Management and Protection Act does not specifically address water quality, this nomination along with the Oyster River, and Lamprey, et al, represents a strategic approach to using every possible tool to address the water quality problems associated with Great Bay. All three of these nominations represent a ground swell of support to try and use every possible means to maintain and improve the water quality in that area. The Rockingham Planning Commission and the Exeter River Local Advisory Committee did an excellent job with the nomination. There was an impressive level of organization and support. In addition, there was no opposition at the public hearing.

Jim Ryan noted that attendees at all of the public hearings were encouraged to submit written comments if they did not feel comfortable speaking in a public forum. He asked what kind of written comments were received, either positive or negative so that they are not neglected. Laura noted the endorsements received before and after the hearing were distributed and that there was only one additional letter of support received from an individual after the hearing. No letters of opposition or concerns were received.

Chairman Kimball noted this is a real compliment to the nominating committee. Issues had an opportunity to surface, since extensive education and outreach were conducted with public meetings held in each town prior to the public hearing.

The segment designations were reviewed with the final segment marker identified as upstream of the railroad bridge in Stratham and Newfields.

- ***Michele L. Tremblay moved that it be recommended that the nomination of the Lower Exeter/Squamscott Rivers into the NH Rivers and Protection Program be forwarded to the commissioner, second by Larry Spencer. Motion passed unanimously.***

Chairman Kimball shared his appreciation to the nominating committee. The recommendation will now be forwarded to the commissioner.

2) Mascoma River

Chairman Kimball reviewed the Mascoma River nomination, which begins at the downstream confluence with the Canaan Street Lake outlet in Canaan Center to the upstream confluence of the Connecticut River in West Lebanon. The nomination flows through three communities – Canaan, Enfield and Lebanon. The nomination also includes a quarter mile around Mascoma Lake, which is standard practice compared to other nominations that have lakes along river corridors. Letters of support have been received from all three communities, with the exception of the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Canaan, who voted to remain neutral. There were two letters of support from individuals and no additional letters received after the hearing. [Refer to the Public Hearing minutes for the Mascoma River nomination for more information.] Segment designations were reviewed and there were no questions regarding the classifications.

Michele noted that no one spoke against the nomination at the hearing. There was one question over how the division of the community vs. rural was made and that was answered to their satisfaction.

- ***Anne Krantz made a motion that it be recommended that the nomination of the Mascoma River into the NH Rivers and Protection Program be forwarded to the commissioner, second by Larry Spencer. Motion passed unanimously.***

Chairman Kimball again thanked the committee for the excellent nomination and the extensive public outreach that was conducted to gain such wide support.

3) Oyster River

Chairman Kimball reviewed the Oyster River nomination, which involves the towns of Madbury, Lee, Durham, and Barrington. The nomination begins at the headwaters at Hall Road in Barrington to the Mill Pond Dam in Durham. The tidal portion of the river below the dam is not included. Letters of support were received from elected officials in all four towns. Considerable outreach was conducted to UNH, as the Oyster River is one of their primary drinking water supplies. One letter of opposition was received from an individual. There was unanimous support from those in attendance at the public hearing. [Refer to the Public Hearing minutes of the Oyster River nomination for more information.] The segment designations were then reviewed. There was some discussion as to dam removal, however, since the RMPP is not a dam removal program and the nomination does not include the Mill Pond Dam, that question will be resolved by future processes.

- ***Kathryn Nelson made a motion that it be recommended that the nomination of the Oyster River into the NH Rivers and Protection Program be forwarded to the commissioner, second by Larry Spencer. Motion passed unanimously.***

Chairman Kimball again thanked the committee for their efforts. Representative Kappler volunteered to sponsor this bill with Representative Spang volunteering to co-sponsor.

4) Lamprey, North Branch, North, Little, Pawtuckaway and Piscassic Rivers

Chairman Kimball reviewed that the Lamprey, North Branch, North, Little, Pawtuckaway, and Piscassic Rivers nomination involves 13 towns. Letters of support were received from elected officials in all 13 towns. There was one letter of opposition received from a resident in the Town of Nottingham. The NH Department of Transportation (DOT) submitted a letter of support with concern. DOT expressed concern regarding the natural river designation classifications, since this classification limits their ability to perform maintenance work on bridge crossings. All public testimony at the public hearing was in support of the nomination. [Refer to the Public Hearing minutes of the Lamprey, North Branch, North, Little, Pawtuckaway and Piscassic Rivers for more information.] The designations were not read but it was asked if there were any questions concerning the classifications. There were no questions.

- ***Jim Ryan moved that it be recommended that the nomination of the Lamprey, North Branch, North, Little, Pawtuckaway and Piscassic Rivers into the NH Rivers and Protection Program be forwarded to the commissioner, second by Michele L. Tremblay. Motion passed unanimously.***

Fred McNeil wanted to thank the committee members and was impressed with the professionalism and how thorough the tour was. Chairman Kimball echoed that for all the tours he participated in.

Michele noted this is an extraordinary year with four nominations. In a year when the staff was down by one full-time staff, she wanted to acknowledge and show gratitude to Laura and Jenn.

Representative Kappler wanted to thank all the committee members who came out to the tours and the public hearings for taking the extra time.

In the Public Hearing minutes for the Lamprey River et. al. Amanda Merrill needs to be changed to as a Senator as she is listed as a Representative.

IV. Legislation/Rulemaking/Other

Michele reported the legislative session has ended and there is not a final status on everything that was adopted. She thanked Allan Palmer and Kathryn Nelson for their work as well as Laura and Jenn. Next year Gary Kerr will be joining the subcommittee. They will schedule a meeting after all the LSRs are ready for review, probably at the end of December. The recommendations to the full committee will come after the full bill text is available sometime between January 1st and January 15th.

Representative Spang noted the deadline to submit legislation for the coming year is December 2nd. She would welcome the opportunity to work with any of the RMAC members. She can be contacted at judith@kestrelnet.net.

Michele thanked Representative Spang and Kappler on behalf of the RMAC for their help with changes to RSA 483. She recommended that Representatives Spang and Kappler reach out to the seacoast groups

and that Representative Gould reach out to the Mascoma group to make sure that there are sponsors and co-sponsors for all of these nominations. She also requested that each nomination seek co-sponsors from the Senate.

Chairman Kimball suggested addressing rulemaking relative to the instream flow policy and also the fiscal challenge for the future. There is excellent science but now the cost and transferability of that strategy needs to be looked at. Michele said we should be in good shape with NOAA, since three of these nominations are located in the seacoast. The Northeast Regional Oceans Council has a lot of clout and there has been a huge proposal submitted for a large amount of money. What they are looking to do is take that money and channel it into various agencies or consortiums or non-profit groups to get work like this done. One idea is to contact the Gulf of Maine Council and the Marine environment and see how more money for instream flow processes can be secured.

Representative Spang thinks this will be a large problem in the legislature. The Water Management Advisory Committee did not have the role that was envisioned with guiding the process and fine-tuning it. There is going to be a lot of kick-back from that. There are big problems in the process. It may need to go through a study where the whole process is evaluated.

Chairman Kimball agreed we need to get pro-active on this issue as there will be legislative rulemaking and recommendations proposed. Representative Spang agreed about bringing forth legislation. Chairman Kimball says the deadline has been extended twice now with the final recommendations to go forward in 2012. Discussions will continue.

2) Water Quality Standards Advisory Committee (WQSAC) –Allan Palmer and Phil Trowbridge. Phil gave an update on HB 1305, which was introduced during the last legislative session. The purpose of the bill is to change the definition of surface waters. This would make it clear that surface waters apply to all waters of the United States including wetlands. This was a surprise to many and caused consternation as to how these standards might be applied to wetlands, what it was going to do to forestry, agriculture and other types of things. The bill was sent to Study Committee. WQSAC operated as a study committee with many meetings and much discussion. There are about 30 word changes. The current proposal was to amend the definition of surface waters of the state in RSA 485-A:2 to say "and waters of the United States under the federal Clean Water Act". When trying to create a separate definition for wetlands in RSA 485-A that was different than RSA 482 for the dredge and fill permits a lot of confusion was created and could have potentially undermined DES's jurisdiction under RSA 482. This gets us in compliance with EPA so that we can retain primacy over our water quality standards.

Another change proposed is to add a definition of Water Quality Standards. This would move the definition that is already in rule and place it in statute, which states that water quality standards are a combination of designated uses, criteria to support the uses, and anti-degradation provisions.

It would also bring federal requirements into state statute to adopt rules to authorize the Department to implement anti-degradation provisions of the Clean Water Act.

The largest output from all of this was some session law text that was agreed on dealing with the designated uses and the classification system. Right now all the waters are considered the same and flexibility was needed with the designated uses. The Committee is asking the legislature to authorize the Department to undertake a two-year study to be completed by September 30, 2012 which is a full top to bottom review of the water quality standards and recommendations for revisions of the classification system. This was sent to the RR&D subcommittee and approved with some minor changes. It goes now to the full RR&D committee.

There will be a different effort for numeric nutrient water quality standards at another time. They are proposing changes to the rules that would add the numeric standards for estuaries this year and numeric standards for lakes the following year. Presumably rivers would be added the year after. Kathryn noted the interconnected factor to protect the designated use as the adjacent wetlands affect the surrounding waters. Michele noted that so many more rivers are being used for water supply that rivers should be moved up in the priority scheme. Phil noted an additional data set is needed for the nutrient criteria. What has come down from the science advisory board in Washington is that multiple end points need to be looked at and need to

have very clear causative relationships between the nutrients and the impacts. John Magee asked about lakes that are in rivers – such as the Namaske Lake in the Piscataquog River and the Mascoma Lake in the Mascoma River in terms of nutrient criteria to determine which are lake/riverine systems. Phil said if the waterbody is classified as a lake, the lake criteria would apply. For impoundments criteria is still being worked on. It was suggested that Ken Edwardson come and speak to this issue - lakes vs. rivers. There are challenges with the classification system. Anti-degradation starts to address this, but the question of classification and is it a lake or is it an impoundment, is it oligotrophic, is it mesotrophic needs to be discussed on an individual water body level. Kathryn noted that the process used needs to be science based looking at it from an interconnected hydrological standpoint.

IV. FY 11-12 604(b) Update

Twelve proposals were received for FY 11-12 604(b) funding; a total of \$82,400 is available. The top six proposals are being funded:

- 1) Southwest Region Planning Commission, Lake Warren Comprehensive Lake Inventory and Lake Management Plan
- 2) Central NH Planning Commission, Upper Merrimack River Regional Land Protection Study
- 3) Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission, Mascoma River Corridor Management Plan, Phase I
- 4) Lakes Region Planning Commission – Update of the Pemigewasset River Corridor Management Plan
- 5) Rockingham Planning Commission – Development of a Watershed Management Plan for the Exeter and Squamscott Rivers
- 6) Southern NH Planning Commission – Piscataquog Watershed Impervious Surface Mapping.

There were two proposals for the \$5,000 or under category, neither was selected for funding. Either the application did not fit into the scope of water quality planning under 604(b) or the proposal was not prepared well.

The applicants appreciated the simplified process, with a lower bar for smaller applications and a more streamlined application. The RPCs are still struggling for funding. Michele suggested considering funding two or three larger projects, but emphasized that this should be vetted through an online survey to seek input from all eligible applicants. Size of money amounts distributed was discussed.

V. Sustainability Initiative Update – Jenn Rowden

LMAC and RMAC data subcommittee was trying to get more public outreach as to the health of waterbodies in the state. An online survey was developed and feedback from 600 people was received. The data subcommittee developed a prioritized list of possible indicators to use as part of an online information website to show short term information the public wants/needs to know, for example beach closures, drinking water/boil orders, etc. The goal is also to display long-term, trend data to see what the water quality status is doing over time. There is currently a shortage of IT resources within DES to begin developing an indicator website. Grants are being sought to help move this project forward. If anyone in the committee comes across a funding source that may be applicable please let Jenn know. The responses from the survey indicated people would like this information and it would be a good tool for the employees of DES to get the information out to people. Michele asked if other agencies would be interested in combining to possibly look for money from resources like NOAA to pilot something like this? This could be good for all agencies as it goes beyond just water resources. Jenn had an inquiry from the tourism division at Dept. of Resources and Economic Development regarding the survey and possible website development

VII. Other Business/Action Item Review:

None

VIII. Next Meeting(s)/adjourn:

The next meeting will be January 20th 9-12 at DES.*

Agenda items: 1) Legislative review
 2) Where we are with the Instream flow rules

- ***Allan Palmer made a motion to adjourn, second by Jim Ryan. Motion passed unanimously.***

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 A.M.

***NOTE: The next RMAC meeting has been rescheduled for Monday, January 24th from 12 to 3 at NH Fish and Game.**