

Appendix H: Catalogue of Concern

Email from Peter Ladd – 2/14/16

Sam, and All,

Thank you for your consideration and that responsive suggestion. I also will indeed review HB 1595.

In reply, may I say for the record while river "Designation" could certainly impact me directly, the issue also has significant impact upon many other land-owners and residents - whether they are aware of it yet or not. I speak as one of many. People that we in fact represent, through this committee.

Moreover, as I said at the meeting, the issue of the Warner River as a potentially important clean and renewable energy resource is in a larger sense of both regional and global relevance regarding our communities' future prosperity - and to our moral responsibilities to protect the greater environment also.

My sense is growing that the (well intended) legislative options proffered in this designation program are relics of a more innocent time and an entirely localized perspective - already rendered outdated and even regressive by the unforeseen but rapidly emergent planetary climate and energy crises. Particularly in the reduction of carbon emissions, and small-scale low-impact local hydropower.

Recall the slogan "Think Globally, Act Locally?" It is today truly our opportunity and imperative to do both. The Warner River gives us very special resources with which to do so.

Since my intensive personal research, involvement, and actual experience have made me individually very aware of the implications, my position on this River committee may be that of a coal-mine canary, appearing oversensitive but providing early warning. (Hopefully a canary, not a sacrificial goat.). My personal stake represents a wider picture. If my statements sound extreme, I would suggest that the many credible reports mounting up daily in fact fully warrant and demand our very extreme concern.

Finally, given that we will be committed by law to the terms of "designation", and permanently relegating our right to consider options or adopt future alternatives, I am quite anxious at the urgency with which this committee is apparently intending to proceed to a conclusion based on much data which appears to me to be partial and unverified.

Thank you again for listening and being so responsive to my earlier input.

Peter Ladd

Response of the WRNC:

The committee pointed to the classification definitions in RSA 483 and explained that Mr. Ladd would be able to rebuild and maintain his dams and produce hydroelectric power under a community classification. The committee made edits to the river classification and made sure all of Mr. Ladd's dams were under a community classification.

Email from Peter Ladd – 2/20/16

Nancy, and All River People,

First, may I thank you each for the remarkable grace with which you have listened to my concerns regarding the Warner River, and "Designation." I am humbled and grateful.

In response to some questions asked, and to specifically illustrate the potentials I envision, I am attaching two YouTube links. I hope this may sponsor some positive forward-looking discussion by the group. These relate to pioneering "green" community projects in Europe, and a type of fish-safe hydro-turbine being used there to facilitate them.

After more than a decade of personal contact and communications with many these folks, I can testify that these ideas are not 'pie-in-the-sky' like so many green schemes we see in the news. Some actually sent engineers to to Warner, to assess the potential of our historic Warner River sites with me. (They were extremely enthusiastic about them.)

The possibilities are real, even vitally important, given courage and vision. The Queen of England has made exactly such an installation at Windsor Castle! But as yet there is not a single example in the United States - although there are literally thousands of ideally suitable sites in New England alone.

Moreover - several citizen's environmental groups in Europe have found great success with their grass-roots community based initiatives, on sites with far less natural potential than the rare and wonderful resource our own river has given us. They have found great and unexpected rewards to their communities socially, as well as economically and environmentally. When the people lead, our leaders may eventually follow.

As we enter a new and crucial era globally, I believe environmentalism must transition from being merely restrictive, to being proactive, creative, and productive. I hope you will spare just fifteen minutes to view these links (below) and consider the possibilities for discussion. Thank you.

Pete Ladd

"Improving the Privilege"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EuCbUZYZQ-c>>

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=umiO6YcyVZk&list=PLEC6416030A608CA9>>

Also another example, at a related website... <http://braemarhydro.org.uk/>

Emails from Peter Ladd – Relative to pushing for legislative hearing during the 2016 session

2/19/2016

I for one feel the next few weeks are overbooked already.

I also thought that was the meeting consensus - plus that that our work would benefit from fewer deadline pressures, and a longer timeline.

The discussion and conclusions of our 2/16 meeting were extraordinary, and the plan for moving forward seemed clear and very positive. Frankly, Sam's minutes and comments are a discouraging surprise to me. I felt a good energy and great potential for our new initiative when I left the meeting. Less so now.

It almost could appear like an effort from outside and above to "walk back" our meeting's agreement (and apparently unanimous enthusiasm) for an authentic and locally generated alternative to "Designation" by legislation.

Whether that is so or not, why the rush?

Peter Ladd

Response from Nancy Martin – WRNC Chair

I hear you Peter. This does feel like resistance from "outside and above." My feeling is that the group should get together to develop our position before March 16th so we can present a strong argument to representatives from the State. I wonder if we are feeling the same concern that other groups have felt as they went through the designation process. Some dropped out. And...You're right; there is positive energy from the members of our group that could be the genesis of a different approach. However, I'd like to consider what we might be giving up before we decide how to proceed. Would we lose grant funding opportunities, for example, if the river is not part of the RMPP? Just thinking out loud.

2/26/2016

With Respect, I again would ask, what is the big hurry, and why? Several community members have already plainly expressed the sense that - A) we are each extremely busy in the run-up to Town Meeting, and - B) the Rivers process has in any case already been moving too fast for us to do good work.

I'd also point out it seems the folks now suddenly pushing for an extra meeting are for the most part salaried or compensated in some way, but the rest of us are volunteers, and I for one already have FOUR other community meetings scheduled in this coming week. Whose benefit project is this ultimately supposed to be for?

If the matter is so important, why propose to meet knowing several members will be absent? Whose ox is being gored here?

Pete Ladd

Letter emailed from Alan Wager (Warner resident, riparian land owner, dam owner)

Hi Sam, I'm not sure everyone on this email list saw/read my letter of complaint from March 1, 2016.
Thank you, Alan Wagner

March 1, 2016

Town of Warner, NH
Board of Selectmen
Conservation Commission - Warner River Management Committee
Meeting Minutes Sep 29, 2015

To the Board of Selectmen and the Conservation Commission:

I have only just recently learned about your Warner River Committee. There does not seem to be any information about it on the Town of Warner's web site. Why were the Tax paying Landowners along the Warner River not notified in writing about these group's activities? I have not seen it mentioned in the town newsletter either. It sounds like you want to take away our deeded water rights in secret.

Martha Mical mentions in the minutes (Sep 29, 2015), that the voters should have a say in whether they want to do this, apparently the conservation commission and the Selectmen did not want to notify the voters. I had no idea this has been going on for 2+ years. **The State of NH has already passed in July, 2008 the Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act.** As you know this added many new restrictions to Landowners. Why do you feel the need to add additional restrictions to the Landowners? If you restrict my deeded water rights, you have devalued my property **and others** along the Warner River, who's going to pay for that?

I bought the Old Mill in Waterloo in May 1978 because of the deeded water rights to the property. The mill has had deeded water rights since it was built in the 1830's. (That's over 185 Years.) I have spent endless hours filing for permits with the State of NH and spent thousands of dollars rebuilding the dams, gates, penstock & generators. There is a second hydro sight on my property that I want to restore and it would produce clean electricity that could be sold back to the grid.

Also, I believe you need to notify ALL Landowners along the river about what you have been trying to do for the last 2+ years.

Thank you,

Alan Wagner
33 Newmarket Rd
Warner, NH 03278

The WRNC's Response:

Mr. Wagner's letter, presented at the March 16th, 2016 monthly meeting brought to question the need to give notice of the WRNC meetings. After Mr. Wagner's letter, The WRNC began noticing its monthly meetings on the town of Warner's website. Sam Durfee of CNHRPC reached out to the NH Municipal Association for clarification as to the applicability of Right-to-Know Law to the WRNC. After speaking with two attorneys on different occasions, Mr. Durfee came away with opposing answers so the WRNC settled for full transparency, noticing all meetings and posting minutes and agendas on the Warner town website.

Email from Peter Ladd – 3/3/2016

Thank you each for your responses.

My request regarding the Guidelines was not for the "link" but in fact a suggestion that each member might usefully have been provided a full print copy, at minimum, as a courtesy to help them in meeting their responsibilities.

I believe that would have made for clearer and earlier mutual understanding of the larger impacts and consequences of River Designation, and still could.

Respectfully,

Peter

Reply to Peter's request from WRNC Chair, Nancy Martin:

3/3/2016

Hello Peter. I understand that you want a hard copy of A Guide to River Nominations. Central NH Regional Planning Commission has already overspent grant funds received for this project, so they do not have a printing budget. I will print a copy of the guide for you but you will have to come and pick it up at my house when you are ready. Please let me know if this arrangement will work for you.

Email form Nancy Marin in response to the 4/20/2016 Public Information Session:

4/22/2016

Good morning. Wednesday night's meeting was interesting. In my opinion it showed us that more work is needed in order to bring public opinion to the RMPP approach to the Warner River project. As promised, this e-mail will help determine a date to get together again, in the near future, to develop a strategy for "next steps."

On Thursday night I attended the Warner River Watershed Protection Program sponsored by Basil Woods Trout Unlimited and the Forest Society. I hoped I would gain some insight that might help us figure out how to move forward. What I learned is the TU has a grant they are using to pay a new intern who will reach out this summer to landowners in the watershed. Their goal will be to educate landowners about the value and importance of protecting the water quality to protect the fish (and us). TU has a number of projects planned for the summer months especially related to the streams feeding into the river. If we can work together to raise the awareness of the river and the watershed, we should be able to reduce negative feelings about our intentions to nominate the river into the RMPP. This would of course delay the application until next year, but I think the outreach opportunities to produce real collaboration among our towns, project volunteers and the public could reap long-term benefits.

Please click on and complete the Doodle below. I have selected dates after next week since that is school vacation and several people will be away. I will send out the date that's best for most as soon as you all reply. Thanks!

<http://doodle.com/poll/niv85akp5na6stkx>

Email chain relative to establishing a conversation between the WRNC and the Warner Energy Committee:

April 19, 2017

Good Morning,

Even though WRNC meetings have been limited lately, we want to keep the Energy Committee apprised of recent activities and continue an open conversation. We have met with the Rivers Management Advisory Committee (RMAC) as well as Senator Dan Feltes in regards to next steps.

I think it would be constructive for our two groups to have a conversation. I noticed the Energy Committee has a meeting scheduled for tonight, 4/19, and while I recognize this is short notice, I was hoping you all would have Nancy and I at the meeting for an update and conversation.

We will be submitting our draft to NHDES in early May for feedback before we formally submit on June 1st. This could be an opportunity to hear and incorporate comment from the Energy Committee into the draft.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Reply from Clyde Carson, Energy Committee

Hi Sam,

The Energy Committee is meeting at 7 tonight in the Selectmen's office.

Confirmation from Sam Durfee, CNHRPC & WRNC

Thanks Clyde,

We'll be there.

Response to emails from Peter Ladd after meeting (Peter Ladd did not attend the meeting)

In the interests of keeping "the Energy Committee apprised of recent activities and continue an open conversation" it would be nice if introducing a significant agenda item like this was given more than 11 hours notice. I'm not sure it is even legal.

These last second revelations have been an unfortunate trademark of the River Nomination committee, and are damaging to open democratic process, and to the public perception of the River committee's work - as I have pointed out at their previous meetings.

I do not work at a computer all day, and was not aware of this message until too late.

Peter Ladd

Response from Sam Durfee: 4/20/2017

Peter,

I do apologize for the short notice to appear before the Energy Committee, but we were invited by the Energy Committee for a discussion. If you have questions about the legality of the introduction of a "significant agenda item", bring it up with the Energy Committee. It is not the responsibility of the Nomination Committee to notice changes to the Energy Committee's agenda.

If you would like an opportunity to discuss the project under the auspices of the Energy Committee, we would be happy to attend a future meeting with sufficient public notice for further discussion.