

BARRINGTON
BROOKFIELD
DOVER
DURHAM
FARMINGTON
LEE
MADBURY
MIDDLETON
MILTON



NEW DURHAM
NEWMARKET
NORTHWOOD
NOTTINGHAM
ROCHESTER
ROLLINSFORD
SOMERSWORTH
STRAFFORD
WAKEFIELD

Strafford Regional Planning Commission Meeting
Thursday, September 27, 2018
4:00 P.M.-5:30 P.M.

Rochester Performance & Arts Center
32 North Main Street, Rochester, NH 03867

AGENDA

1) Welcome/Introductions

2) Presentation: Housing Affordability

Presenters: Christopher Parker (City of Dover), George Reagan (NH Housing and Finance Authority), and Sarah Wrightsman (The Workforce Housing Coalition of the Greater Seacoast)

3) Actions Items (motion required)

- a) Approval of Draft Minutes of the June 28, 2018 Commission meeting (**Enclosed**)
- b) Approval of Executive Committee recommended FY 2020 Dues Rates (**Enclosed**)
- c) Acceptance of the FY 2018 SRPC Annual Report and Commissioner's Handbook (**Available at meeting-online at: http://strafford.org/cmsAdmin/uploads/ec_docs/finalannualreport2018.pdf**)
- d) RIC Minutes (*Special Vote by RIC Members Only*)
 - i) Draft Minutes of the Oct. 24, 2017 Riverwoods RIC Meeting (**Enclosed for RIC Members**)
 - ii) Draft Minutes of the Mar. 6, 2018 MiTeJo RIC Meeting (**Enclosed for RIC Members**)

4) Other Business

5) Citizen's Forum

6) Adjournment

Reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities are available upon request. Include a description of the accommodation you will need including as much detail as you can. Also include a way we can contact you if we need more information. Make your request as early as possible; please allow at least 5 days advance notice. Last minute requests will be accepted, but may be impossible to fill. Please call (603) 994-3500 or email rpc@strafford.org

Rules of Procedure

*Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Strafford Metropolitan Planning Organization, and
Strafford Economic Development District*

Meeting Etiquette

Be present at the scheduled start of the meeting.

Be respectful of the views of others.

Ensure that only one person talks at a time. Raising your hand to be recognized by the chair or facilitator is good practice.

Do not interrupt others, or start talking before someone finishes.

Do not engage in cross talk.

Avoid individual discussions in small groups during the meeting. When one person speaks, others should listen.

Active participation is encouraged from all members.

When speaking, participants should adhere to topics of discussion directly related to agenda items.

When speaking, individuals should be brief and concise when speaking.

The Strafford Regional Planning Commission, Economic Development District, and Metropolitan Planning Organization holds both public meetings and public hearings.

For public meetings, guests are welcome to observe, but should follow proper meeting etiquette allowing the meeting to proceed uninterrupted. Members of the public who wish to be involved and heard should use venues such as Citizen Forum, Public Hearings, Public Comment Periods, outreach events, seminars, workshops, listening sessions

BARRINGTON
BROOKFIELD
DOVER
DURHAM
FARMINGTON
LEE
MADBURY
MIDDLETON
MILTON



NEW DURHAM
NEWMARKET
NORTHWOOD
NOTTINGHAM
ROCHESTER
ROLLINSFORD
SOMERSWORTH
STRAFFORD
WAKEFIELD

**Strafford Regional Planning Commission Annual Meeting
Governor's Inn
78 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH**

June 28, 2018

DRAFT Minutes

SRPC Members Present: Donald Hamann (Rochester), Marcia Gasses (Barrington), Lindsey Williams (Dover), Leslie Schwartz (Durham), Fred Kaen (Lee), Jon Hotchkiss (Middleton), Sandy Keans (Rochester), Victoria Parmele (Northwood), Peter Nelson (Newmarket), Tom Crosby (Madbury), Dave Landry (Dover), Wayne Burton (Durham), Scott Martin (Northwood)

SRPC Staff Present: Jennifer Czysz (executive director), Kyle Pimental (principal regional planner), Shayna Sylvia (communications and outreach specialist), Colin Lentz (regional transportation planner), Kathy Foster (financial consultant), Rachel Dewey (data analyst), James Burdin (regional economic development planner), Nancy O'Connor (communications & engagement assistant), Ken Mayo (transportation editor), Stef Casella (data collection & analysis assistant), Monique Duchesne (data collection intern)

Guests: Liz Kotowski (Nottingham), Celia Abrams (Nottingham), Susan Mooney (Nottingham), Deb Kimball (Nottingham), Charlie Moreno (Moreno Forestry), Steve Pesci (UNH), Denise Roy Palmer (WEDCO), Barb Holstein (Rochester Youth Reach), Chris Scott (Sen. Jeanne Shaheen's office), Paul Schumacher (SMPDC), Toni Weinstein (Newmarket), Anne Melvin (Barrington), Todd Selig (Durham), David Watters (NH Senate), Sarah Gartska (WHC), Kirsten Howard (DES Coastal), Liz Durfee (EF Design & Planning), Mary Friedman (UNH), Robert Strobel (Northwood), Alexis Rudko (New Hampshire Bureau of Trails), Katie Lafond (Northwood), Susan Austin (Northwood), Bruce Woodruff (Milton), Tom Reinauer (SMPDC), Glenn Davison (NHDOT), Diane Hardy (Newmarket), Stacey Marchionni (Rochester Riverwalk), Linda Smith (Northwood), Julia Belshaw (J.RED Digital Arts), Dan Barufaldi (Dover), Chris Parker (Dover), Stephanie Benedetti (Dover), Edward Levasseur (Somersworth), Mary Ellen Humphrey (Durham), Dennis McCann (SEDC), Judd Newcomb (Credere Associates), Dave Carpenter (Dover), Steve Bird (Dover), Chuck Cox (Lee), Laurel Cox (Lee), Jim Campbell (Rochester)

1. Welcome/Introductions

Chair Victoria Parmele welcomed guests and Commissioners to the meeting at 1 p.m. V. Parmele noted the organization's transition over the past several months, which resulted in the hiring of SRPC's new executive director, Jennifer Czysz. V. Parmele called J. Czysz the ideal candidate for the position and thanked the executive director search committee and staff for their efforts during the recruitment process.

a. Reading of letter from special invitee – Peter Clark, Office of U.S. Senator Jeanne Shaheen

V. Parmele introduced Chris Scott, special assistant for policy and projects for Senator Shaheen. He thanked to group and read a letter Senator Shaheen prepared for the annual luncheon. In the letter Senator

150 WAKEFIELD STREET · SUITE 12 · ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03867-1300

TEL: 603.994.3500 FAX: 603.994.3504 E-MAIL: SRPC@STRAFFORD.ORG

WWW.STRAFFORD.ORG

Shaheen recognized the work of SRPC and its volunteers, welcomed J. Czysz in her new role, and talked about the importance of the meeting's topic, trails. She noted that trails are a vital resource for New Hampshire and have a positive effect on the state economy.

b. Recognition

J. Czysz introduced herself and thanked V. Parmele for the warm welcome. She said she is excited about her new role and noted she wanted to recognize the contributions of some current and former members of the Commission and staff before the presentation began.

J. Czysz recognized Brian Tapscott, former Commissioner, who recently passed away. She noted that Brian was chair of the Executive Committee and Commission from 2013 to 2016. Jen said that his contributions to the Commission and his public service will be missed.

J. Czysz recognized former Commissioners Tony McManus and Judy Nelson, who were stepping down from their positions. J. Czysz added that S. Keans, while remaining a Commissioner, would be stepping down from the Executive Committee. J. Czysz thanked each Commissioner for their service to SRPC and their volunteerism over the years. J. Czysz recognized Kyle Pimental for his ten years at SRPC and congratulated him on reaching this milestone.

J. Czysz introduced panel moderator, Nancy O'Connor.

2. Presentation: Trailblazing the Way: A Guide for Trail Planning, Implementation and Maintenance Panelists: Alexis Rudko (NH Bureau of Trails), Charlie Moreno (Moreno Forestry), and Stacey Marchionni (Rochester Riverwalk)

N. O'Connor introduced the topic of the presentation, which was trail planning, implementation, and maintenance. She then introduced panelists Alexis Rudko, program specialist for the Recreation Trails Program (RTP) at the State Trails Bureau; Charlie Moreno, forester at Moreno Forestry; and Stacey Marchionni, chair of the Rochester Riverwalk Committee. The presentation was organized in the following sections: organizational overview, what makes a good trail system, how we do this, and trail maintenance.

In the first round, N. O'Connor asked each panelist to provide a background on their role and the entity they were representing. A. Rudko thanked SRPC for inviting her to speak. She explained that the NH Bureau of Trails is part of the Department of Natural and Cultural Resource's Division of Parks and Recreation. It is entirely funded by state park fees. A. Rudko reviewed the number of miles of trails managed by the RTP and the breakdown of trail types, i.e., snowmobile trails, ATV trails, rail trails, etc. She explained that the RTP is a federally funded competitive grant program supported by gas taxes and OHRV use and registration fees. RTP grants fund multiple trail types. A. Rudko reviewed eligibility requirements for applicants and reviewed her role helping them through all phases of the process.

C. Moreno thanked SRPC for being invited to speak with the Commission and guests. He shared his background as a graduate of the UNH forestry program. He talked about his initial experience with woods roads planning, and his subsequent transition to trail planning. He said his client list often includes municipalities, land trusts, and private land owners. C. Moreno noted that most of the work he does is in forests, so his experience may be different from A. Rudko's and S. Marchionni's.

S. Marchionni thanked SRPC for the invitation to speak. She shared her background, explaining that she is a business owner in Rochester and involved with the Rochester Riverwalk Committee. She acknowledged the work done prior to her joining the committee in 2016, noting the group's completion of a design charrette and plan for the Riverwalk in 2004. This initial plan included linking a downtown trail to Hanson Pines and down to the Intervale. There is currently

a small paved section of the Riverwalk downtown and some pocket parks. S. Marchionni added that the committee is close to completing an update of the 2004 Master Plan and will soon turn its focus to applying for grant funding. S. Marchionni shared that the committee had a site walk that morning for potential funding to expand the Riverwalk from Hanson Pines to the Fairgrounds and the Intervale.

N. O'Connor introduced the next round of discussion on what makes a good trail. She asked A. Rudko what she looks for in an application to the RTP. A. Rudko used the Cotton Valley Rail Trail as an example of a successful trails project that received multiple rounds of funding through the years. The 12-mile trail runs from Wakefield to Wolfeboro and supports hiking, biking, horseback riding, and putt-putt cars. The RTP began funding the trail in 2002, and the trail has significant community support. A. Rudko said that many applications she receives are missing pieces, so a complete application is very important. She offered advice for those applying for RTP grants, including reaching out to her with questions and attending the yearly RTP information sessions.

N. O'Connor asked S. Marchionni what key factors the Rochester Riverwalk Committee has identified that will make its trails attractive and heavily traveled. S. Marchionni said accessibility is a big factor, and the committee hopes to have many access points to the trail. She also addressed the importance of respecting and taking advantage of the natural landscape and environment, like the Cochecho River and Hanson Pines. S. Marchionni noted the relation of the trails to Rochester schools and said the committee is interested in creating outdoor classrooms and educational placards along the trail system. She said that this helps to tie the community in to the project. She added that creating recreational access to the Cochecho and including public art along the trails is also important. She gave examples of trails in other parts of the state and their assets.

N. O'Connor asked C. Moreno to speak about Moreno Forestry's work planning and blazing trails. C. Moreno thanked S. Marchionni for sharing about the Rochester Riverwalk, and he elaborated on the importance of Hanson Pines and its frontage along the Cochecho. In addressing what makes a good trail, C. Moreno spoke about a project he was involved with, Plummer's Ridge Forest and Farm hiking trails, which is located on privately owned land in Milton. He noted that the landowner, Cynthia Wyatt, is a great conservationist. He worked with her and several others to design over six miles of trails, with frontage on the Branch River, connecting Cynthia's Branch Hill Farm with McKenzie's Farm and the NH Farm Museum. He talked about the importance of creating a forest management plan and completing a natural resource assessment that includes the types of wildlife, plants, and other important natural aspects of a piece of land. C. Moreno discussed strategies for marking trails including signs, kiosks, and maps. He gave examples of trail systems he has worked on and their various uses. He said that leaving some areas trail-less is important to certain landscapes.

N. O'Connor introduced the third section of the panel presentation, how do we create great trails. She asked S. Marchionni to talk about the Riverwalk Committee, the need for funding and public support, and some of the challenges the committee has faced during its planning processes. S. Marchionni said that funding is a large challenge. Fundraising and outreach are two strategies being implemented by the committee to meet its funding goals. She added that another challenge lies in the fact that process was halted after the 2004 master plan and only recently regained momentum. The Riverwalk project is laid out in phases, which is helpful for moving forward with implementation. The excitement in the city over the Riverwalk is important to its success. Volunteer efforts will be vital to the project. S. Marchionni noted a project like the Riverwalk will yield economic returns and will have a positive effect on businesses downtown.

N. O'Connor asked A. Rudko if she had advice for groups looking to take advantage of the RTP program or other state funding sources for trails. Due to the FAST Act, which was signed by President Obama, the RTP program has funding until 2020. A. Rudko reminded interested parties to attend the RTP information sessions in the spring and reviewed the timeline for the RTP grant process. Applications are due in the spring, funding announcements are made a few months later, and funding is available the following calendar year. A. Rudko noted that RTP is a competitive grant program. She said that grants from other programs often awarded in conjunction with RTP grants, and gave as examples the grant aid program specifically for snowmobile trails and the land and water conservation fund grants. A. Rudko

explained that changes in priorities each year effect which projects get funded. She said good connections with the owners of land surrounding the trails is also very important. She concluded by saying there are many pre-qualifying processes that must be completed, and an application cannot be accepted until all parts of it are complete.

N. O'Connor asked C. Moreno to discuss how an interested party would start the process of creating a trail system. C. Moreno broke down the process into three parts—planning, construction, and management. C. Moreno shared an anecdote about the Strafford Town Forest and a population of rare orchids which determined where trails could and could not be built. There were also nesting sites for the common night hawk. These examples show why land assessments and conscious trail planning are so important. C. Moreno said that working with stakeholders is important because you need to know who will use the trails and what their needs are. C. Moreno explained that the trails are mapped out by completing on-the-ground work and by using aerial imagery. This involves different levels of difficulty depending on the type of property. He added that management is important and includes having maps of the trails and a plan to keep the trails accessible.

N. O'Connor continued the conversation on management by asking C. Moreno to elaborate on trail maintenance. He said that maintenance usually occurs in the spring and can include erosion control and removing tree and branches. Encouraging people to keep trash off the trails in also important, as is connecting people to the land. C. Moreno talked about using educational signage along the trails and how it can engage users. Trails can also provide educational opportunities for students and other groups. C. Moreno elaborated on a number of factors that go into trail planning and maintenance.

A. Rudko said maintenance is a very important factor considered by the RTP and best management practices are addressed on the RTP application. Some trails require rebuilding every year. Smaller trails should have maintenance plans in place for volunteers, municipalities, or other managing bodies to follow. Getting the community involved is a great idea for continued support and maintenance of trails.

S. Marchionni said that getting the community involved in the Rochester Riverwalk is also an important goal of the committee. She said that engagement items like the kiosk in Hanson Pines will help with this. The Riverwalk will rely on volunteers, students, and the public works and parks and recreation departments to maintain the trails.

N. O'Connor thanked the panelists and opened up for audience questions. Attendees had the opportunity to share other resources and ideas for supporting and maintaining trails, and to ask the presenters follow-up questions.

Attendees applauded for the panelists.

3. Annual Excellence Award

J. Czynsz presented SRPC's annual excellence award to the City of Dover's Planning and Community Development department for innovation and excellence in planning. J. Czynsz shared an anecdote about working with Chris Parker before she became SRPC executive director, and she talked about the great planning processes and outcomes happening in Dover. She listed several of Dover's recent accomplishments, including being the first community in Northern New England to adopt Form Based Code, receiving the 2018 Plan of the Year award from the New Hampshire Planner's Association for the climate adaptation chapter of the Dover master plan, and finishing its Silver Street complete streets project.

C. Parker accepted the award on behalf of the Dover Department of Planning and Community Development, thanking the Commission and recognizing Dover in its entirety including its citizens, municipal staff, and volunteers. He said that without this great, innovative, and forward-thinking community, none of the accomplishments J. Czynsz listed would have been possible.

V. Parmele introduced the next agenda item.

4. Action Items

a. Draft minutes of February 22, 2018 Commission Meeting

Tom Crosby **MOVED** to approve the draft minutes of the Feb. 22, 2018, Commission meeting. Marcia Gasses **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

b. FY 2019 Annual Budget – Approval of Executive Committee-recommended FY 2019 Budget

M. Gasses **MOVED** to approve the FY 2019 budget. T. Crosby **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

c. FY 2019 Officers and Executive Committee Member Election

Sandy Keans **MOVED** to approve the FY 2018 Officers and Executive Committee members. T. Crosby **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

d. Adoption of the 2017 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Annual Update

M. Gasses **MOVED** to adopt the 2016 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Annual Update. T. Crosby **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

5. Other Business

6. Citizen's Forum

There was no other business.

7. Adjournment

M. Gasses **MOVED** to adjourn. V. Parmele **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**. The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

**Shayna Sylvia
Communications and Outreach Planner**

**Victoria Parmele
SRPC Chair**

Strafford Regional Planning Commission

FY2020 Draft Dues

Recommended by the Executive Committee on Aug. 17, 2018 for adoption by the full Commission on Sept. 27, 2018

Community	2017 Population Estimates Source: NH OSI	FY2020 Per Capita Rate for up to 5,000 Population using 2.9% CPI Increase	FY2020 Per Capita Rate for above 5,000 Population using 2.9% CPI Increase	FY2020 Recommended Dues (Based off of 2017 Pop Estimates)	Dues Change from FY2019-FY2020
Dover	30,817	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$21,049.13	\$667.53
Rochester	30,224	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$20,706.38	\$693.29
Durham	16,439	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$12,738.80	\$540.16
Somersworth	11,751	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$10,029.19	\$320.21
Newmarket	9,358	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$8,646.06	\$348.18
Barrington	8,922	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$8,394.05	\$281.00
Farmington	6,847	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$7,194.73	\$232.69
Wakefield	5,087	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$6,177.47	\$190.62
Nottingham	5,035	\$1.2254	\$0.5780	\$6,147.41	\$238.39
Milton	4,578	\$1.2254		\$5,610.05	\$192.85
Lee	4,369	\$1.2254		\$5,353.93	\$191.58
Northwood	4,240	\$1.2254		\$5,195.85	\$185.93
Strafford	4,085	\$1.2254		\$5,005.91	\$173.42
New Durham	2,613	\$1.2254		\$3,202.06	\$96.32
Rollinsford	2,547	\$1.2254		\$3,121.19	\$111.90
Middleton	1,796	\$1.2254		\$2,200.88	\$60.92
Madbury	1,807	\$1.2254		\$2,214.36	\$87.50
Brookfield	713	\$1.2254		\$873.74	\$31.80
TOTALS	151,228			\$133,861.18	\$4,644.28

FY2020 per capita rate is the FY2019 per capita rate with 2.9% increase for June 2017 to June 2018 CPI change
Population based on 2017 Population Estimates by NH OSI



MINUTES
Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Regional Impact Committee
150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A
Rochester NH 03867
October 24, 2017

DRAFT

RIC Members Present: Chair Wesley Merritt (Durham), Fred Kaen (Lee - Member), Marcia Gasses (Dover - Alternate),

RIC Members Absent: Sandra Keans (Rochester - Member), Victoria Parmele (Northwood – Alternate)

Staff Present: Cynthia Copeland, AICP, executive director, Shayna Sylvia, communications and outreach specialist, James Burdin, regional economic development planner

Others Present: Mark Avery (Madbury), Tom Crosby (Madbury), Stephen Pernaw (Pernaw + Co., Inc.), Jeff Clifford (Altus Engineering), Sharon Somers (Donahue, Tucker + Ciandella)

1. Welcome/Introductions

Chair Wes Merritt called the Regional Impact Committee (RIC) meeting of October 24, 2017 to order at 10:10 am. W. Merritt requested the introduction of Regional Impact Committee members and alternates. Introductions were made around the room.

a. Appointment of alternates, if needed

W. Merritt asked for a motion to appoint an alternate to serve as member for the duration of the meeting as one member was absent. Fred Kaen **MOVED** to appoint Marcia Gasses as a member for the duration of the meeting. W. Merritt **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**. The motion **CARRIED**. W. Merritt declared that there was a quorum.

W. Merritt reviewed the structure of the meeting, and explained that the Regional Impact Committee would be reviewing *Case SRPC/RIC 2017-02; The RiverWoods Group – Construction Related to Proposed Continuing Care Facility (Tax Map #11, Lot 8-0, Lot 8-1 – 8-15) located on Stone Quarry Drive in the “Office and Research District – Route 108” Zoning District of Durham, NH.*

W. Merritt introduced James Burdin to review the *Strafford Regional Planning Commission Preliminary Review - Development of Regional Impact – RiverWoods Group, Construction Related to Proposed Continuing Care Facility project.*

2. Regional Impact Study

a. Project Review and Completion of Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Checklist

J. Burdin explained the process through which the RiverWoods Group project was declared as a project of regional impact. This declaration was related to traffic concerns as a result of earthwork and construction. The review taking place is not relative to the operating of the RiverWoods facilities, but the impacts of constructing the facility.

J. Burdin referred to a PowerPoint point presentation to show site plans, pictures, and maps of the proposed location for the RiverWoods Group project. He explained that the maps were created by SRPC relative to the project site and traffic concerns. The proposed project lots are located on Stone Quarry Drive in Durham.

J. Burdin shared that Durham residents submitted comments concerning local schools, which are outside of the scope of SRPC's technical review. Other comments from the same individuals were regarding a nearby hill and visibility concerns.

J. Burdin explained his sources of data for some of the maps, including traffic count data from counts set by SRPC. J. Burdin explained that hazards were also reviewed. One parcel appears on a list from NH DES of environmental hazards as a result of a heating oil spill in 2001, but available information shows that the site was remediated within six months.

Following this introduction, J. Burdin began to review his preliminary report based on the 45 question *Development of Regional Impact Checklist*.

Transportation – Access – Parking

1) **Will the proposed development cause an increase in motor vehicle traffic or other traffic that will impact the safety of the transportation system?**

As outlined below, site work is expected to generate an average of 46 trips per day to import and export necessary materials. For calculation purposes, these trips are assumed to be dump trucks capable of carrying 16 cubic yards (CY) of material. These trucks are expected to use Route 108 and Route 4, which are already frequently travelled by trucks of this size and the increase in truck traffic is not expected to significantly impact the safety of the transportation system. However, accidents involving trucks of this size do have a higher rate of injuries and fatalities. The Applicant and Town of Durham may wish to provide outreach materials on road safety protocols (blind spots, safe passing, backing, safe following, etc.) that can be shared with residents of Durham and neighboring municipalities. The number of trucks accessing Stone Quarry Drive or construction activity related to extending water and sewer service may warrant coordination between the applicant, the Town of Durham, the Public Works Department, and NH DOT to ensure that adequate signs are provided during the period of construction and may warrant notice to residents of Durham and neighboring municipalities online and in Durham's "Friday Updates" emails.

2) Will the proposed development cause an increase in motor vehicle traffic or other traffic that will increase congestion on the transportation system in the adjacent town?

The applicant has indicated that excavation and earthwork related to site preparation will be the largest drivers of traffic to and from the site. Preparing the site will require onsite cut of approximately 51,000 cubic yards of earth. 22,000 CY of fill can be reused onsite, leaving 29,000 CY of spoil to be removed. The applicant anticipates 2,800 CY of loam spoil, so that a total of approximately 31,800 CY of earth will be exported from the site.

Earthwork import and export will be conducted via trucks with a capacity of 16 CY. Assuming two “trip ends” per load (one entering and one leaving the site), the applicant calculates a need for roughly 3,975 trip ends to export the necessary earth.

Approximately 24,000 CY of select materials will be imported to the site. It is anticipated that all trucks importing materials on inbound trips will be able to pick up a load of export materials for the outbound trip, meaning importation of materials is not expected to result in additional trip ends. The applicant has suggested a five percent contingency to account for variation in amounts of materials needed, resulting in a total estimated trip generation of 4,200 during the construction period. The applicant will also need to remove mature timber and other vegetation from the site, but the number of trips anticipated will be “orders of magnitude” lower, and logging activities should be complete prior to beginning earth removal. Using the applicant’s proposed timeline for site work of June 1, 2018 – August 31, 2018, site work will generate an average of 46 trips per day.

The applicant has indicated that 75 percent of trucks accessing this site will travel to or from the contractor’s excavation operation on Mast Road in Dover. This would mean an additional 35 construction vehicle trips per day on Route 108 through Dover and Madbury. The remaining 25 percent of trucks would come from the south, either via Route 4 or Route 108, resulting in 12 new construction vehicle trips per day.

SRPC has prepared a map of “Traffic Volumes”, using 2015 traffic counts submitted to NH DOT that shows Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of 11,000 trips at a count location on Route 108 just south of Stone Quarry Drive. The 46 total trips generated by this site would account for 0.4 percent of the daily traffic at that location.

A map of “Regional Traffic Volumes” using 2014 data indicates a total of 9,100 AADT at the Dover/Madbury municipal boundary. The 35 trips headed north to Mast Road would be an increase of just under 0.4 percent. This map also shows AADT of 20,000 trips on Route 4 heading towards Dover and Newington, 13,228 trips on Route 4 heading towards Lee, and 12,024 on Route 108 approaching downtown Newmarket. The 12 trips leaving this site to the south would account for 0.06 percent of traffic on Route 4 to Dover and Newington, 0.09 percent of traffic on Route 4 towards Lee, and 0.1 percent of traffic approaching downtown Newmarket. These increases in traffic volume are not statistically significant on any of the roads analyzed.

3) Will the proposed development create the need for infrastructure improvements?

This project includes the proposed extension of water and sewer service north along Route 108 to this site. The applicant has prepared a “Conceptual Off-Site Utility Extension Plan” identifying the proposed location of off-site infrastructure along the east side of Route 108. Any work in the right-of-way for either Route 108 or Route 4 would likely require coordination between the Applicant, the Town of Durham, and NH DOT.

The “Site Preparation Plan” submitted by the applicant includes proposals for construction facilities, including construction security fencing, stabilized construction exits, and silt barriers.

4) Will the development result in inadequate emergency access?

Stone Quarry Drive is currently maintained at a sufficient standard to provide access to the Town of Durham Department of Public Works. Construction at this site is not expected to result in insufficient access to the interior of the site or to other facilities on Stone Quarry Drive.

5) Does the development meet minimum local parking standards or are there provisions for other modes that reduce the need for parking?

Parking requirements for the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

6) Does the plan provide for safe access within the development for all modes (ADA compliance, sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting)?

Construction notes contained in the “General Notes and Legend” indicate that site construction shall comply with the rules and regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Access provided in the final site design falls outside the scope of this review.

Conflicts with Policies, Plans, and Programs – Noise

7) Will the development expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

The Town of Durham has a noise ordinance that restricts the use of construction vehicles between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Construction notes contained in the “General Notes and Legend” indicate that construction hours will be agreed upon between Riverwoods and the Town of Durham and that standard work hours shall be 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., which are consistent with the terms of the noise ordinance.

8) Will the development expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Construction of the proposed facility is expected to require blasting and crushing of rock to prepare the site for development. The Planning Board may wish to seek additional information about outreach, proper notification, and mitigation practices used to protect abutters impacted by noise and vibration as a result of these activities.

9) Will the development substantially and permanently increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

Construction activities related to the proposed facility will not permanently alter ambient noise levels.

10) Will the development substantially increase temporary or periodic ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

Construction of the proposed facility is expected to require blasting and crushing of rock to prepare the site for development. These blasting events are highly likely to result in substantial temporary increases in noise levels. The Planning Board may wish to seek additional information about outreach and mitigation practices used to protect abutters impacted by noise and vibration as a result of these activities. Vehicle motion alarms activated by dump trucks backing up onto the site can also be expected to result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels.

11) Is the development located within an airport zone or within two miles of an airport or airfield, where the project would expose residents or employees in the project area to excessive noise levels?

The proposed site is located roughly five miles from Portsmouth International Airport.

Hazardous Materials or Substances

12) Will the development create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Information provided by the applicant does not indicate that routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be necessary.

13) Will the development create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

The "Site Preparation Plan" identifies an existing septic leach field that will be abandoned and removed per NH DES standards upon extension of municipal water and sewer. NH DES standards should prevent any reasonably foreseeable upset or accident.

14) Will the development produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

The proposed site is located approximately 0.3 miles from Oyster River High School and 0.7 miles from Oyster River Middle School. The Little Tree Education School (infants, toddlers, and preschoolers) is roughly 1.4 miles from the site on Route 108 in Madbury. Information provided by the applicant does not indicate that routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be necessary.

- 15) Will the development be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the NH Department of Environmental Services and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

Research conducted by SRPC staff found a prior environmental hazard on parcel 8-0 as depicted on the “Environmental Hazards” map. This was the result of a minor heating oil spill in 2001. Contaminated soils were removed within six months of the incident, and no lasting impacts are anticipated.

Ecology and Resources

- 16) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Any potential impacts on wildlife species would relate to the overall development of this site rather than specific construction practices and would fall outside the scope of this review.

- 17) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

See above.

- 18) Will the development have substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as de-fined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

The “Site Preparation Plan” submitted by the applicant indicates that site work will not occur in areas identified as wetlands, and that a double silt barrier will be installed at the perimeter of the site to prevent impacts on identified wetlands.

- 19) Will the development interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Any potential impacts on wildlife species would relate to the overall development of this site rather than specific construction practices and would fall outside the scope of this review.

20) Will the development conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a conservation easement, tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Any such ordinances would apply to the development as a whole and not to specific construction practices, and therefore fall outside the scope of this review.

21) Will the development conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

Any such habitat conservation plans would apply to the development as a whole and not to specific construction practices, and therefore fall outside the scope of this review.

22) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on Groundwater Quality?

Construction would be most likely to impact groundwater quality as a result of sedimentation and erosion. The applicant has provided detailed illustrations of proposed sediment and erosion control measures on “Detail Sheet C – 6.1”. Other potential impacts may be associated with rock blasting, including the release of a regulated or unregulated substance to the groundwater, and agitation of the subsurface that causes turbidity in groundwater to increase. Recommend the applicant follow Best Management Practices to prevent contamination of groundwater including, preparing, reviewing, and following an approved blasting plan; proper drilling, explosive handling and loading procedures; observing the entire blasting procedures; evaluating blasting performance; and handling and storage of blasted rock.

23) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on Air Quality?

The greatest threats to air quality would come from construction vehicle emissions and dust as a result of site work. The estimated number of construction trips is not expected to have a substantial impact on vehicle emissions along Route 108, and the applicant intends to limit vehicle trips by using all trucks that import materials to also export materials on outbound trips. Durham may wish to discuss dust control measures during excavation and site work as this project proceeds towards the construction phase. In both cases, any impacts to air quality would be temporary.

M. Gasses asked if there were residents in the area who currently had private wells. J. Burdin responded that there are homes further down Route 108 where town sewer and water haven't extended yet. M. Gasses explained her concerns related to the blasting activities, and whether they would have an effect on private wells. J. Burdin explained that the applicant could speak to this his explanation of SRPC's technical review.

Hazards – Public Health and Safety

24) Will the development expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides or flooding?

The applicant will require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, which would consider possible impacts as a result of landslides or flooding and would require the applicant to mitigate expected negative impacts.

25) Will the development result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?

Information submitted by the applicant indicates that approximately 51,000 CY of earth will be removed. The applicant estimates that roughly 22,000 CY will be recycled as fill onsite, while remaining cut materials and loam spoil will be removed from the site. The applicant expects to remove roughly 31,800 CY of spoil. Construction notes submitted by the applicant make provisions for erosion control during construction. The applicant will require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, which would require the applicant to mitigate offsite impacts long before they impacted neighboring municipalities.

26) Will the development be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The applicant will require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, which would consider the stability of soils onsite.

27) Will the development be located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of wastewater?

Not applicable. Plans submitted by the applicant propose extending municipal water and sewer to this site.

Facilities

28) Will the development require new or expanded Fire protection facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

Construction activities related to site work or the extension of utilities are not expected to have an impact upon facilities in neighboring municipalities. Potential impacts of the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

29) Will the development require new or expanded Law Enforcement facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

Construction activities related to site work or the extension of utilities are not expected to impact facilities in neighboring municipalities. Potential impacts of the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

- 30) Will the development require new or expanded School facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?**

Construction activities related to site work or the extension of utilities are not expected to impact facilities in neighboring municipalities. Potential impacts of the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

- 31) Will the development require new or expanded Parks facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?**

Construction activities related to site work or the extension of utilities are not expected to impact facilities in neighboring municipalities. Potential impacts of the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

- 32) Will the development require new or expanded Solid Waste facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?**

The applicant has indicated that approximately 75 percent of trucks entering and leaving the site will import select materials from, or export spoils to, a private facility located on Mast Road in Dover. This activity is not expected to impact public facilities in Dover or other neighboring municipalities. Potential impacts of the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

- 33) Will the development cause an increase in new or expanded utilities, treatment facilities, storm water, water supplies, etc., that would result in a negative financial or environmental impact to the adjacent municipality?**

This project includes a proposal to extend municipal water and sewer to this site. Construction activities related to site work or the extension of utilities are not expected to have an impact upon facilities in neighboring municipalities. Potential impacts of the completed facility are outside the scope of this review.

Scenic and Visual Character

- 34) Will the development convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural use?**

Construction activity is not expected to have independent impacts upon agricultural activity. Impacts of the developed site are outside the scope of this review.

- 35) Will the development conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?**

Construction activity is not expected to have independent impacts upon agricultural activity. Impacts of the developed site are outside the scope of this review.

- 36) Will the development involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?**

Construction activity is not expected to have independent impacts upon agricultural activity. Impacts of the developed site are outside the scope of this review.

37) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Construction of this facility will require removal of mature trees and other vegetation as well as excavation of approximately 51,000 CY of earth. While an active construction or excavation site may be aesthetically unappealing, any detrimental impacts as a result of construction will be temporary. Aesthetics of the completed development are outside the scope of this review.

38) Will the development substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

This portion of Route 108 was designated as part of the Mills Scenic Byway by the New Hampshire Scenic & Cultural Byways Council on May 10, 2014. As noted above, construction and excavation may result in detrimental visual impacts, but such impacts will be temporary. Aesthetics of the completed development are outside the scope of this review.

39) Will the development substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

As mentioned above, construction of this facility may temporarily impair the aesthetics of the site. However, there is nothing to indicate that construction of this project would differ substantially from any other construction project. Aesthetics of the completed development are outside the scope of this review.

40) Will the development create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely impact day or nighttime views in the area?

The applicant has indicated that peak site work activity will take place from June 1 — August 31, 2018. This will allow the applicant to take advantage of daylight to reduce the need for artificial light sources onsite. Information submitted by the applicant indicates standard work hours of 7AM — 6PM or as agreed between Riverwoods and the Town of Durham.

41) Will the development conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation including, but not limited to the Master Plan or Zoning Ordinance?

The scope of this review is limited to potential regional impacts related to the construction of the facility. Construction of this facility appears to require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, and installation of utilities impacting Route 108 and Route 4 will require coordination with NH DOT and utility providers. Construction may be subject to requirements imposed by those organizations or by the Durham Planning Board as conditions of approval.

Housing and Population Growth

42) Will the development induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

This project includes the proposed extension of water and sewer service north along Route 108 to this site. The applicant has prepared a “Conceptual Off-Site Utility Extension Plan” identifying the proposed location of off-site infrastructure along the east side of Route 108. The scope of this review is limited to installation of utility infrastructure, which is likely to cause temporary inconveniences to motorists along this section of Route 108, particularly at the Route 4 interchange. Construction impacting either of these roads will require coordination with NH DOT.

43) Will the development displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Not applicable. The scope of this review is limited to potential regional impacts related to the construction of the facility.

44) Will the development displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Not applicable. The scope of this review is limited to potential regional impacts related to the construction of the facility.

45) Is the development compatible with existing or planned cross border development?

It should be noted that this facility will result in a larger construction project than existing development along Route 108 in Madbury. However, the site is far enough from the border that the most significant impacts upon Madbury will be traffic-related as described above. The compatibility of the completed facility is outside the scope of this review.

W. Merritt asked for questions and comments. Cynthia Copeland asked about the applicant’s proposed timeline for June through August, and whether traffic calculations included business working days only. J. Burdin replied that traffic estimates assumed all days of the week for a total of 92 days. If construction includes no weekend days, then traffic calculations would vary slightly.

W. Merritt asked if any of the other RIC members had questions. No members had other questions. W. Merritt introduced the developer, Jeff Clifford of Altus Engineering. J. Clifford thanked J. Burdin for his presentation, and introduced his partners Sharon Somers of Donahue, Tucker + Ciandella, and Stephen Pernaw of Pernaw + Co., Inc. He shared that RiverWoods is based out of Exeter, where there are three different size facilities. He added that these existing locations provide RiverWoods with a good sense of how the construction phase of the project will unfold. He gave a background of RiverWoods, adding that the company uses a senior housing consultant, and explaining the different contractors the company uses for construction. The trucking company is local entity Severino Trucking. J. Clifford shared that the statistics concerning the number of truck trips were provided by Severino. J. Clifford explained that clearing the lots will require the most amount of truck traffic.

J. Clifford addressed M. Gasses and her question concerning wells, explaining that RiverWoods Group would be submitting an alteration of terrain permit. This will include a review of erosion sediment control and a look at public wells within 2000 feet, including the well at Durham's DPW facility.

Relative to trucking, J. Clifford explained that 4.5 acres of mature woodland will be cleared, which should equate to 22 truckloads, or 44 trips of logs and chips coming in and out. This information was as a result of recent calculations and was not available when SRPC prepared the preliminary report.

M. Gasses opined that Severino Trucking is a good, local company. She expressed concern over truck routes and asked if they would only be utilizing Route 108. J. Clifford explained that Route 108 is the expected route, and indicated that the Town of Durham was concerned with this as well.

W. Merritt invited municipal officials from abutting towns to share their input. Mark Avery, Madbury Planning Board member and SRPC Commissioner, reiterated what M. Gasses had stated about the truck routes. He expressed concern with trucks seeking alternative routes in Madbury if there was blockage on Route 108. He added that load limits are not marked but that weight cannot exceed 10 tons on certain roads in Madbury. M. Avery expressed concern over current well contamination plumes in Madbury spreading due to groundwater drilling activities.

T. Crosby cited similar concerns with truck traffic on Freshet Road. T. Crosby asked whether the state is going to widen Route 4. J. Clifford explained that NHDOT isn't planning to widen Route 4, but may upgrade the off ramp with a traffic signal. There were no other comments.

b. Citizen's Forum

W. Merritt opened the citizen's forum. There were no citizens present.

c. Acceptance of Technical Review

W. Merritt asked for a motion to accept the SRPC Technical Review provided by J. Burdin. F. Kaen **MOVED** to accept the document. M. Gasses **MOVED** to second the motion.

M. Gasses asked if language could be incorporated to the technical review regarding the discussion of trucks solely using Route 108. Language addressing this concern will be added. A discussion ensued concerning how to best change the language.

All were **IN FAVOR** with the proposed edits, and the motion **CARRIED**.

3. Meeting Adjournment

M. Gasses **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting. W. Merritt **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 pm.

DRAFT 10/24/2017

Respectfully submitted,

Shayna Sylvia

SRPC Communications and Outreach Specialist

Minutes approved on _____

By: _____

Wesley Merritt, Chair- SRPC Regional Impact Committee

*Comments in red were questions made during the explanation of SRPC's technical review.



MINUTES
Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Regional Impact Committee
150 Wakefield Street, Suite 12, Conference Room 1A
Rochester NH 03867
March 6, 2018

DRAFT

RIC Members Present: Chair Wesley Merritt (Durham), Fred Kaen (Lee - Member), Marcia Gasses (Dover - Alternate), Victoria Parmele (Northwood - Alternate)

RIC Members Absent: Sandra Keans (Rochester - Member)

Staff Present: James Burdin, regional economic development planner

Others Present: Robert Myrick (Milton Three Ponds Protective Association), Steve Hayes (Milton), Tom (Milton), Betsy (Milton), Sharon Ponte (Milton), Joel Ponte (Milton), Chris Boldt (Donahue, Tucker, and Ciandella), Dan Flores (SFC Engineering), Donald Hamann (SRPC), Richard Burke (Milton), Rhonda Burke (Milton), Paul Philorick (Lebanon, ME), Jen King (Milton), Robert Silva (Milton), and Bruce Woodruff (Milton)

1. Welcome/Introductions

Chair Wes Merritt called the Regional Impact Committee (RIC) meeting of March 6, 2018 to order at 9:05 a.m. W. Merritt requested the introduction of Regional Impact Committee members and alternates. Introductions were made around the room. W. Merritt reviewed the structure of the meeting, and explained that the Regional Impact Committee would be reviewing *Case SRPC/RIC 2018-01; MiTeJo Campground – Special Exception related to proposed expansion of the MiTeJo campground (Tax Map #28, Lot 4) located at 111 MiTeJo Road in the “Low Density Residential” Zoning District of Milton, NH.*

a. Appointment of alternates, if needed

W. Merritt asked for a motion to appoint an alternate to serve as member for the duration of the meeting as one member was absent. Fred Kaen **MOVED** to appoint Marcia Gasses as a member for the duration of the meeting. W. Merritt **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**. The motion **CARRIED**.

M. Gasses asked about quorum requirement. This was discussed.

W. Merritt introduced James Burdin to review the “Strafford Regional Planning Commission Preliminary Review - Development of Regional Impact – MiTeJo Campground, Campground Expansion.”

2. Regional Impact Study

a. Project Review and Completion of Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Checklist

J. Burdin explained the process through which the MiTeJo Campground project was declared as a project of regional impact. He reviewed SRPC’s mandated function to complete Region Impact reviews, and the process by which this is completed using the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) checklist. He explained that Strafford Regional Planning Commission does not have any regulatory authority, but is tasked with compiling information to supply to the municipality regarding the project they have identified as a project of regional impact. This assists the town in making an informed decision. He added that this review will be helpful to the ZBA in their processes, and also to the Planning Board if it ends up completing a site plan review on the project.

J. Burdin shared that MiTeJo campground is located off of Townhouse Road in Milton. He referred the committee and guests to two Google Map images of Townhouse Road, and on MiTeJo Road (a private road to the subject parcel and to the rear of the campground). The applicant provided three expansion plans as part of their Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) submittal. J. Burdin referred to a PowerPoint point presentation to show the site plans. J. Burdin added that SRPC had created relevant maps including a soil drainage map (relative to MiTeJo’s new proposed septic tank). This map will be provided to the ZBA.

W. Merritt asked for clarification about a pond formed off of the river, and whether it was on the site. J. Burdin explained the different water bodies represented on the map. He added that SRPC reviewed the State Wildlife Action Plan, but no highly ranked habitats extend onto the MiTeJo site. There are 100 year floodplains and wetlands on this site. He explained that the maps created use UNH’s Granit data source, and that information from the applicant’s survey might be more accurate.

J. Burdin explained that the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) checklist is a 45 question lists used in all regional impact reviews.

Transportation – Access – Parking

1) Will the proposed development cause an increase in motor vehicle traffic or other traffic that will impact the safety of the transportation system?

Both the Traffic Impact Assessment, and the subsequent technical review concluded that the proposed site expansion was unlikely to result in large increases in traffic volumes. Additionally, analysis of crash data in the study and technical review concluded that the proposed expansion and traffic volumes would not have an undue adverse effect on the safety of Townhouse Pond Road. The

third party review contains recommendations for further review that could positively impact safety conditions.

2) Will the proposed development cause an increase in motor vehicle traffic or other traffic that will increase congestion on the transportation system in the adjacent town?

Third party review of the Traffic Impact Assessment found that the applicant's consultants used accepted practices for an effective traffic study. Both the Traffic Impact Assessment and the subsequent technical review concluded that the proposed site expansion was unlikely to result in large increases in traffic volumes or additional congestion.

3) Will the proposed development create the need for infrastructure improvements?

The Traffic Impact Assessment and subsequent technical review both indicated good to excellent levels of service provided by the transportation facilities under consideration. The proposed expansion is expected to require additional on-site transportation infrastructure to allow for increased circulation. Milton may consider whether off-site improvements for traffic calming, visibility, or signage could improve vehicle and pedestrian safety as part of this project.

4) Will the development result in inadequate emergency access?

Proposed expansion at this site is not expected to result in insufficient emergency access to the interior of the site or to other facilities on Town House Rd. Consideration should be made during site review to ensure that safe access throughout the site is maintained.

5) Does the development meet minimum local parking standards or are there provisions for other modes that reduce the need for parking?

It seems reasonable to expect that parking access for proposed site expansion would be consistent with existing conditions and purposes (e.g. campsites). This site is not expected to result in insufficient parking. Additional consideration for minimal parking requirements will occur during site plan review.

6) Does the plan provide for safe access within the development for all modes (ADA compliance, sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting)?

The Traffic Impact Assessment and subsequent technical review both indicated good to excellent levels of service at relevant access points. However, in light of existing pedestrian safety concerns, Milton may consider whether off-site improvements for traffic calming, visibility, or signage could improve pedestrian safety as part of this project. Additional consideration for interior circulation and vehicle and pedestrian safety will occur as part of site plan review.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on the first section. W. Merritt asked about the bridge, which is expected to have the biggest regional impact when restored. He asked J. Burdin if staff reviewed traffic counts near that bridge when it was in use. J. Burdin responded that staff compared the applicant's study with DOT traffic counts but that they didn't think they were comparable as DOT data is based on seasonally adjusted annual average daily traffic and wouldn't reflect traffic in the peak period of use. The most recent SRPC count in that area was done in similar locations to the applicants traffic study, and Townhouse Road at the Maine State Line, but it was not

clear whether the count was conducted when the bridge was open or closed. J. Burdin reiterated the issues with comparing annual daily averages to summer traffic, and that other data SRPC would have from this area would be back from 2008.

M. Gasses asked if there was any information on traffic patterns when the bridge was open. J. Burdin responded that members of the public in attendance may be able to comment on this during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

J. Burdin introduced the next section, Conflicts with Policies, Plans, and Programs - Noise.

Conflicts with Policies, Plans, and Programs – Noise

7) Will the development expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Noise levels in the expansion portion of the campground should be similar to the existing campground facilities. Construction activities related to the proposed expansion may create a temporary increase in noise, but will not permanently alter ambient noise levels. Milton may wish to consider limitations on the hours of construction and site work for the expansion. Additional consideration of screening during site plan review may help to mitigate any noise coming from the campground.

M. Gasses shared that many campgrounds have quiet hours. She asked about the distance between the campground and the closest occupied lot. J. Burdin added the applicant may be able to talk to this topic later in the meeting. M. Gasses asked for clarification on the map showing residential lots and the campground. A discussion ensued about the Town of Milton's setback requirements, which James shared should be considered by the town. J. Burdin explained that some natural buffers should be able to be maintained.

F. Kaen asked about the proposed addition of campsites, in relation to noise. J. Burdin explained that there are currently 223 sites, and that MiTeJo is looking to add an additional 173 sites.

8) Will the development expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

A campground is not expected to generate excessive ground borne vibration or noise levels. Any possible exposure would likely be a result of construction related to the expansion and would be temporary.

9) Will the development substantially and permanently increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

Noise levels in the expansion portion of the campground should be similar to the existing campground facilities. Construction activities related to the proposed expansion may create a temporary increase in noise, but will not permanently alter ambient noise levels.

10) Will the development substantially increase temporary or periodic ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing levels?

Additional information related to clearing the site and constructing the proposed expansion is necessary to determine whether substantial temporary increases in noise level are likely. Activities such as the clearing of trees or construction vehicle motion alarms activated by onto the site could be expected to result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels. Milton may wish to consider limitations on the hours of construction and site work for the expansion.

11) Is the development located within an airport zone or within two miles of an airport or airfield, where the project would expose residents or employees in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No. The proposed site is not located within two miles of an airport.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on this section.

V. Parmele noted that there may be a noise increase due to the increase in sites. J. Burdin responded sharing that a similar amount of noise would be generated in the new proposed portion of campground, as in the current portion.

W. Merritt asked if the new proposed sites are closer to any abutting residences. The current sites are near the river, and close to some waterfront properties. Some of the new sites could be closer to abutting residences.

M. Gasses shared that the Milton Planning Board may want to consider special events that the campground may have and noise generated from those.

J. Burdin shared that he struggled with where to include information about local regulations in terms of the project being considered. He directed the audience and RIC members to look at item 41: **Will the development conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation including, but not limited to the Master Plan or Zoning Ordinance?**

Per Article III – Establishment of Zoning Districts of the Town of Milton Zoning Ordinance, campgrounds and youth camps may be permitted in the Low Density Residential district by a Special Exception from the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Per Article VIII – Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Town of Milton Zoning Ordinance, the ZBA must affirmatively find the following criteria exist to issue a Special Exception:

1. That the specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use or structure.
2. That the use will not be injurious, noxious, offensive, or detrimental to the neighborhood.
3. That there will be no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking.
4. That adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided to insure the proper operation of the proposed use and structure so that the use will not be contrary to the public health, safety, or welfare.
5. That the proposed use or structure is consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan.

The Milton ZBA initially heard this case on September 7, 2017 and affirmatively found criteria 1, 2, 4, and 5 to exist. The ZBA found that criteria 3 did not exist and subsequently denied the request for a special exception. The applicant requested a rehearing on October 26, 2017 to provide additional information, and the ZBA agreed to a limited rehearing covering information related to criteria 3. A

public hearing was held on December 28, 2017, at which the applicant presented the findings of a traffic impact assessment. After testimony from abutters, the ZBA tabled the case to allow the traffic impact assessment to be subjected to third-party review. The ZBA held a public meeting on February 22, 2018 at which it was determined that the application had the potential for a regional impact related to all five criteria.

J. Burdin shared that the ZBA acknowledged that SRPC might have information to contribute regarding more than one of the five criteria outside of the transportation item.

J. Burdin stated there would be an opportunity for the planning board to consider if MiTeJo's proposition will meet their site plan regulations. For example, if it has the setbacks, and if there are specific ways to improve the design to buffer for noise. J. Burdin explained that these details are worked out at the site plan level. He opined that the applicant should be able to provide information in response to the five justification criteria for a special exception

J. Burdin introduced the next section, Hazardous Materials or Substances.

Hazardous Materials or Substances

12) Will the development create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Information provided by the applicant does not indicate that routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be necessary.

13) Will the development create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Information provided by the applicant does not indicate that routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be necessary. NH DES standards applied as part of Alteration of Terrain permit, subdivision permit, or septic plan approval should prevent any reasonably foreseeable upset or accident.

14) Will the development produce hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Information provided by the applicant does not indicate that routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials will be necessary.

15) Will the development be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled by the NH Department of Environmental Services and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No environmental hazards have been identified for this site.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on this section. There were no questions or comments.

J. Burdin introduced the next section, Ecology and Resources.

Ecology and Resources

16) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Expansion of the campground will not be introducing a new use to this parcel. Expansion of the campground to new locations will modify habitat in new locations, but there is not expected to be a substantial adverse impact. Any adverse impacts as a result of expansion should be expected to be similar to those of the existing campground.

17) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

See above.

18) Will the development have substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

The "Expansion Plan" submitted by the applicant does not appear to impact areas identified as wetlands onsite. Additional required review, including permits from NH DES and site plan review by the Town of Milton Planning Board will continue to monitor plans for possible impacts to wetlands.

19) Will the development interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Expansion of the campground will not be introducing a new use to this parcel. Expansion of the campground to new locations may impact wildlife in the impacted areas, but there is not expected to be a substantial adverse impact. Any adverse impacts as a result of expansion should be expected to be similar to those of the existing campground.

20) Will the development conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a conservation easement, tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The proposed use is already established onsite. The proposed expansion is not expected to contain uses or facilities that differ significantly from the existing facility in relation to biological resources.

21) Will the development conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

The proposed use is already established onsite. The proposed expansion is not expected to contain uses or facilities that differ significantly from the existing facility in relation to conservation plans.

22) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on Groundwater Quality?

The proposed expansion is most likely to impact groundwater quality as a result of increased septic needs. The applicant will require an Alteration of Terrain Permit, subdivision permit, and approved septic plan from NH DES. Acquiring approvals for the above plans should prevent substantial adverse impacts. The Town may consider subjecting septic, stormwater, and water supply plans to third party review as they become available to ensure compliance with the Town's regulations.

23) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on Air Quality?

The greatest threat to air quality would likely come from vehicle emissions. Milton may wish to discuss dust control measures during construction and site work as this project proceeds towards the construction phase. In both cases, any impacts to air quality would be temporary.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on this section. V. Parmele asked about the effect of campfires on air quality. This was not addressed in the preliminary review, but can be added if the members decide it should be noted.

F. Kaen reiterated the increase in campsites, and a potential increase in traffic into the site. He addressed potential droughts in the summer and how this could affect an increase in dust due to the increase in traffic down the dirt road to the campground. M. Gasses shared that dirt roads are often treated with calcium chloride to prevent this. J. Burdin responded that this could also be added to report if the group decides. This topic may be discussed during the site plan approval process.

W. Merritt addressed the current uses on the site, and how an increase in volume would affect the outcomes of this use. J. Burdin opined that the impacts would be duplicated, as the new sites would have a similar effect as the current. J. Burdin responded to W. Merritt sharing that invasive species and boating traffic could be marked as an important concern, if the members decided to include it.

M. Gasses opined that it would have been helpful if the applicant gave an overview of the site to begin with. She offered the example of the lack of information regarding parking for boats, or allowing boats on the site. J. Burdin thanked M. Gasses for her feedback on the process.

J. Burdin introduced the next section, Hazards - Public Health and Safety.

Hazards – Public Health and Safety

24) Will the development expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides or flooding?

The applicant will require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, which would consider possible impacts as a result of landslides or flooding and would require the applicant to mitigate expected negative impacts. Plans submitted by the applicant do not appear to include new development within the 100-year floodplain. A portion of MiTeJo Road accessing the existing campground and west expansion area crosses the 100-year floodplain. The applicant appears to have secondary access via Hide Away Lane and Lyman Road in case of emergencies.

M. Gasses opined that when looking at sites within to 100 year flood plain short term sites versus seasonal sites should be considered. She explained that short term sites can be broken down a lot easier than a seasonal site. J. Burdin shared that the sites do not appear to fall within a 100-year floodplain. This could be clarified with updated plans from the applicant.

25) Will the development result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?

The applicant has indicated that proposed site work would require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, which will consider potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Plans for erosion control during construction and site stabilization after construction are typically considered during site plan review, but the applicant may be able to provide information about the types of strategies that will be applied if the ZBA has concerns.

26) Will the development be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The applicant will require an Alteration of Terrain permit from NH DES, which would consider the stability of soils onsite.

27) Will the development be located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of wastewater?

The existing campground already has a state-approved septic plan for the existing facility. Suitability of soils will be further considered as part of the Alteration of Terrain permit, subdivision permit, and septic plan approval from NH DES to ensure that local soils are capable of supporting expanded septic service on this site.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on this section. V. Parmele asked if the location of the additional septic had been proposed. The applicant shared that they were aware of wellhead protection areas and were trying to avoid those. J. Burdin added that the applicant could probably speak to this following the review of the DRI checklist.

M. Gasses asked if this would be subjected to state shoreline regulations. J. Burdin responded that the applicant could address this. The fish pond identified might be a factor.

There was an oversight and J. Burdin skipped the next section, Facilities. The information is relevant and should be reviewed.

J. Burdin introduced the Scenic and Visual Character section.

Facilities

28) Will the development require new or expanded Fire protection facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

Expansion of the campground may impact interior circulation for fire protection services. Consideration should be made during site review to ensure safe access throughout the site. The proposed expansion is not expected to require expanded facilities or services in adjacent communities.

29) Will the development require new or expanded Law Enforcement facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

Expansion of the campground may impact interior circulation for law enforcement services. Consideration should be made during site review to ensure safe access throughout the site. The proposed expansion is not expected to require expanded facilities or services in adjacent communities.

30) Will the development require new or expanded School facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

The proposed expansion is a seasonal recreational use and is not expected to impact school facilities.

31) Will the development require new or expanded Parks facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

The proposed expansion is a seasonal recreational use and is not expected to impact park facilities in neighboring municipalities.

32) Will the development require new or expanded Solid Waste facilities or services in the adjacent municipality in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance standards?

The proposed expansion is a seasonal recreational use and is not expected to impact solid waste facilities in the adjacent municipalities.

33) Will the development cause an increase in new or expanded utilities, treatment facilities, storm water, water supplies, etc., that would result in a negative financial or environmental impact to the adjacent municipality?

The applicant has indicated that this site will require an Alteration of Terrain permit, subdivision permit, and septic plan approval from NH DES. Review of stormwater, water supply, and onsite treatment facilities will be required as part of these permitting processes. Further review of these calculations will be conducted by the Planning Board during site plan review. In order to ensure compliance with provisions of the Town of Milton Zoning Ordinance and the Town of Milton Site Plan Review Regulations, either the Planning Board or Zoning Board of Adjustment may consider subjecting

septic, stormwater, and/or water supply plans to third party review as they become available. The applicant has not indicated to date that any variance or waiver to these provisions will be requested.

Scenic and Visual Character

34) Will the development convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural use?

No. There is no Prime Farmland located on this site.

35) Will the development conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use?

Agricultural uses are permitted by right in the Low Density Residential district.

36) Will the development involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

The campground use is already established on the site, and undeveloped portions of the site are not currently used as farmland.

37) Will the development have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The existing campground is concentrated near the shore of the Northeast Pond/Salmon Falls River. Expansion of the campground is not expected to alter views from this location. While the existing site is heavily wooded, it is possible that the "East Expansion" will be visible from Townhouse Road. Both expansion areas may be visible from "Fish Pond".

38) Will the development substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The proposed expansion is not likely to be visible from White Mountain Highway.

39) Will the development substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

As mentioned above, alterations to this site may be visible from Townhouse Road and Fish Pond. However, the expansion is not anticipated to be different in character from the existing campground. Milton may consider whether additional screening is necessary to mitigate the impacts of the expanded campground.

40) Will the development create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely impact day or nighttime views in the area?

Information submitted as part of the Special Exception application does not suggest that development will create a substantial source of light or glare. If the Special Exception is granted, the Planning Board should consider onsite lighting as part of site plan review and could consider requiring additional screening as a condition of approval if necessary.

41) Will the development conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation including, but not limited to the Master Plan or Zoning Ordinance?

Per Article III – Establishment of Zoning Districts of the Town of Milton Zoning Ordinance, campgrounds and youth camps may be permitted in the Low Density Residential district by a Special Exception from the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Per Article VIII – Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Town of Milton Zoning Ordinance, the ZBA must affirmatively find the following criteria exist to issue a Special Exception:

6. That the specific site is an appropriate location for the proposed use or structure.
7. That the use will not be injurious, noxious, offensive, or detrimental to the neighborhood.
8. That there will be no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking.
9. That adequate and appropriate facilities and utilities will be provided to insure the proper operation of the proposed use and structure so that the use will not be contrary to the public health, safety, or welfare.
10. That the proposed use or structure is consistent with the spirit of this ordinance and the intent of the Master Plan.

The Milton ZBA initially heard this case on September 7, 2017 and affirmatively found criteria 1, 2, 4, and 5 to exist. The ZBA found that criteria 3 did not exist and subsequently denied the request for a special exception. The applicant requested a rehearing on October 26, 2017 to provide additional information, and the ZBA agreed to a limited rehearing covering information related to criteria 3. A public hearing was held on December 28, 2017, at which the applicant presented the findings of a traffic impact assessment. After testimony from abutters, the ZBA tabled the case to allow the traffic impact assessment to be subjected to third-party review. The ZBA held a public meeting on February 22, 2018 at which it was determined that the application had the potential for a regional impact related to all five criteria.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on this section. There were no questions or comments.

J. Burdin introduced the next section, Housing and Population Growth.

Housing and Population Growth

42) Will the development induce substantial growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing 223 site campground by adding 173 new sites. This is a roughly 78% increase in the total number of sites on a 225-acre parcel. Average density would increase from approximately 1 site per acre to 1.76 sites per acre. These sites would be supported by on-site improvements for water, septic, and other amenities, but are not likely to result in substantial growth or infrastructure off-site. The campground is a seasonal, meaning the most intense impacts of on-site growth would be during the summer.

43) Will the development displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No. No housing – permanent or temporary – will be displaced by this proposal. The proposed project is to increase the number of available campsites.

44) Will the development displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No. The proposed project would increase the number of temporary campsites on this property.

45) Is the development compatible with existing or planned cross border development?

MiTeJo Campground is adjacent to Northeast Pond, which is formed by a widening of the Salmon Falls River and forms the boundary between Milton and neighboring Lebanon, ME and Acton, ME. Existing development on the Maine side of the river consists primarily of single unit residential development, and many waterfront properties contain docks, boat launches, or other equipment providing access to the river. This site is immediately across the river from the Town of Lebanon, ME, whose Shoreland Zoning Ordinance identifies land in the 100-year floodplain as part of the "Resource Protection" district. Other waterfront property along the Salmon Falls is part of the "Limited Residential" district. Campgrounds are allowed in both the Limited Residential district and the floodplain portion of the Resource Protection district with a permit from the Planning Board.

J. Burdin asked if any members had questions or comments on this section.

W. Merritt asked whether the "Resource Protection" district applies to Acton or Lebanon. This applies in Lebanon because of the river access. M. Gasses noted that the state itself has requirements for campsite sizes.

J. Burdin stated that the applicant may now share their input. W. Merritt reviewed the process by which the applicant, municipal officials, and then members of the public will be able to speak on the items addressed in the DRI checklist. A five minute break was instated.

Dan Flores, SFC Engineering representing Three Ponds Resort, LLC, introduced himself. He noted the full size plans he brought for reference. He explained the map identifying access points, where the closed bridge is location, where the pond and current campsites are, and the location of the proposed expansion areas. He shared that the applicant went before the ZBA in September, and were found to meet the criteria of all except one of the requirements for a special exception permit. The item they did not meet was, "That there will be no undue nuisance or serious hazard to pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including the location and design of access ways and off-street parking." In response to this, the applicant underwent a complete traffic study, which did examine the bridge reopening. He added that the bridge repair would most likely cause a 25% increase in traffic. The study did go through a third party review process and there were some comments, which were addressed. He opined that from a traffic standpoint the applicant has addressed all concerns.

D. Flores explained that following the first ZBA meeting the applicant decreased the number of newly proposed campsites by 10. He shared that many comments made during the explanation of the preliminary technical review will be addressed by the applicant at the Planning Board meeting. He added that the applicant will also be going through NHDES for an Alteration of Terrain permit, and will be tasked with creating a stormwater management plan that will be submitted to the state. There will be state subdivision approvals which will include testing soils to justify the number of campsites allowable. Septic system approval is another process that the applicant must go through in order to place an additional septic tank on the property.

D. Flores reviewed the map with the lot, boundaries, setbacks, and the proposed new sites. He added that the applicant can get a preliminary review from the Fire Department. W. Merritt asked D. Flores to specify which section in the technical review he was addressing.

D. Flores continued to explain the map, and proposed project. He included an explanation of the ways in which the applicant can mitigate certain concerns. He reviewed changes the applicant had already made in response to comments at the ZBA meeting.

D. Flores addressed item 2 on the study related to bridge traffic, explaining the research from the conducted traffic study. M. Gasses asked about the 25% increase. This would be an increase on the road in general if the bridge reopened, not attributable to the campground itself. No serious overuse of intersections would be caused by proposed project. D. Flores reminded the audience and RIC members that the campground is seasonal.

D. Flores directed the audience and RIC members to item 16. As part of the NHDES permitting process a natural heritage bureau study is conducted. In this process NHDES assesses the site for rare exemplary plants or endangered species. There were none found during this process. V. Parmele asked if there were any corridors identified. D. Flores shared that they have not looked for any corridors.

D. Flores addressed item 18. He explained that the Town of Milton has established a 50-foot wetland buffer. The project stays completely out of that buffer. The applicant hired a wetlands scientist and a soil scientist to do a full delineation of wetlands and a soil survey. He reviewed the results of the test.

D. Flores addressed shoreland protection, sharing that the Town of Milton does impose shoreland protection. He explained the requirements for impervious area is under 20%, and they are compliant with that maximum. The applicant is under 14% impervious surface for the entire site.

D. Flores referred the audience and RIC members to item 20. The intent of the campground is to save as many trees as possible. M. Gasses asked if the utilities are underground. They are all underground.

D. Flores addressed item 24, sharing that access via Hide Away Lane and Lyman Road is for emergencies only.

He addressed the discussion on boats. The plans don't propose any additional access to the river, or any additional docks. The camp already has a designated boat launch area, with a wash station. M. Gasses asked if they have someone monitoring the boat area for concerns such as milfoil. D. Flores added that the boat washing requirements are in place.

He addressed concerns about lighting and quiet hours, explaining that lighting would be limited, and that quiet hours are enforced.

D. Flores addressed item 42. There will be a 73% increase in sites. He added that the expansion area is approximately 30 acres, which is just under one site per acre. The entire parcel is 225 acres. Campgrounds are allowed here. He opined that the applicant has met the five criteria for a special exception.

V. Parmele asked about air quality issues related to campfires. This has not been addressed. V. Parmele asked what criteria would be used to address this. D. Flores addressed the issue referring to the current sites, and sharing that the applicant could look into this. W. Merritt asked about the

distance from the turnoff to the registration area, or from Townhouse Road. D. Flores responded that the distance was 750 feet. M. Gasses ask about a queuing area so that there is no backup to Townhouse Road. There are two lanes in, and parking near the registration area. This hasn't been an issue to date. W. Merritt thanked D. Flores.

W. Merritt asked if there were any representatives from Milton, Acton, or Lebanon that would like to address the checklist items. Bruce Woodruff responded that he was the Town Planner for Milton and would like to speak. He added that he is a longtime resident of Milton and a camper at MiTeJo. He also added that he keeps his boat across the pond, and has to access the marina by taking the long way considering the bridge is out. He explained the he was on the Zoning Board of Adjustment when the applicant first came before it, but has since recused himself due to his role with the applicant as the Town Planner. He corrected an item on the checklist sharing that there is a closer airport than Sky Haven, which is an airport in Lebanon.

He addressed item 42, sharing that the zoning ordinance in Milton does not place a density requirement on campsites. Instead the number is determined by soil characteristics, the ability to get approved septic systems, stormwater pollution control plans and other permitting at the state or federal level. All of these items are affected by planning board members. Campgrounds are an allowed use if you meet the five criteria for a special exception. Milton thanked SRPC for their review as it will be helpful if the project is brought to the planning board.

B. Woodruff addressed trip assignments and whether the trips generated by the additional campsites would be coming from Maine over the bridge once it is rebuilt. He added if you look at the historical count of campers coming from Maine, it is historically low. He opined that traffic to the campsite won't increase significantly. He opined that historic counts at the Maine State Line can be used if calculated in a way to reflect projections with increased populations. A discussion ensued concerning use of traffic counts.

He added that the biggest trip generator would be the marina and the ice cream shop on the other side of the bridge. He shared that this may have been taken into account with the traffic study. B. Woodruff opined that many items of the DRI checklist don't relate to regional impacts.

He commented on boating, sharing he has kept his boat at the campground and that they charge extra. MiTeJo permits a certain amount of boats, but are normally at capacity. The project does not propose more slips.

B. Woodruff shared that quiet hours were enforced strictly by the previous owner, and it is assumed that the same policies would be enforced with the new owner.

Paul Philorick shared that he was in attendance representing the Lebanon Planning Board, but that he had no comments at this time.

b. Citizen's Forum

W. Merritt opened the citizen's forum.

Robert Myrick introduced himself, sharing that he represented the Three Ponds Protective Association (TPPA). He shared that the TPPA is a non-profit association of homeowners on and near the lake. He explained that the group's focus is on the quality of lakes, the water, its usage, and the watershed within the Three Ponds region. He added that the group takes no position on the project itself, but that they have concerns with water quality, boating uses on the lakes, and the quality of the septic system. He shared that the Salmon Falls is regional, and therefore the quality of the water is important. This area has one of the longest running water quality programs in the state which is run by the University of New Hampshire. He explained that in the last four years the water quality has plateaued, and that this could be due to a decrease in boat traffic due to an increase in gas prices. He expressed concern with new boats coming in with the increase of camp sites. The boating and the potential of erosion concern the TPPA.

Chris Boldt of Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella introduced himself. He is representing a group of the abutters. He explained that he was hired after the special exception was originally denied, and the petition to rehear was filed. He noted that the schedule for review has changed as the applicant's attorney's request for continuance was filed on Monday, Mar. 5. This means that the project would be brought forward for action on April 5, if the continuance is approved.

C. Boldt thanked J. Burdin for his timeliness and effort to complete the preliminary report. He explained that there are some sections in the report that the abutters do not agree with. He shared that the transportation studies requested by the applicant were completed in the last week of August, which is not in peak season. He added that the peer review identified the study as "in high season", which he opines is not accurate. He agreed that old counts could be used to project possible traffic, but that counts should be used from when the bridge was open. He noted that the traffic study did not include information on pedestrian traffic. There is a narrow bridge on Townhouse Road, and a beach, so pedestrian traffic should be considered.

C. Boldt expressed concerns with language stating use and noise should be similar, as the number of campsites are increasing significantly. He added that the group recognizes camping as an existing use, however the amenities area is planned to see changes with a waterpark and mini-golf setup, which is also a significant change. This is a significant redevelopment of this site.

C. Boldt noted concerns with water quality identifying wetlands and other water bodies not noted on the applicant's map. He reiterated that there is no density requirement related with campsites, but that there are requirements relative to manufactured housing units. He opined that the ZBA might have overlooked a section of the applicant's plan addressing park model RVs. This is not addressed in the preliminary report. These units could have a significant impact on impervious coverage, water quality, and how much tree coverage will be removed.

C. Boldt shared concerns with propane filling tanks, water treatment for the waterpark, and air quality due to campfires. He explained the importance of ensuring that Lyman Road is for emergencies only. He added that tree removal and the amount of tree that would need to be cleared is concerning. He opined that the ZBA should readdress all five items on the special criteria checklist, and opined that SRPC's report shouldn't deter a complete re-review from happening.

C. Boldt asked SRPC to make the language stronger, i.e. using "should" and "strongly recommend" versus "may." He shared that his clients are located between the river, and the development. He

explained an example project in Enfield where boards are entitled to look at cumulative impact. He added that this is a low density area and the increased use is significant.

V. Parmele asked about C. Boldt's thought on the issue of noise. He shared that the abutters are concerned about this. He explained that the abutters are not opposed to expanding the property, but are opposed to the level of expansion. Park models will require a larger amount of clearing. M. Gasses opined that park models can be smaller than some fifth wheel campers. A discussion ensued concerning park models versus RVs and the potential effects.

Richard Burke introduced himself, sharing that he lives with his wife at 36 Lakeside Drive. His wife's family has owned this property since 1939. He noted that he wanted the Town of Milton to know that he had acquire property that previous owners of MiTeJo had used to access Northeast Pond, but that the land was not a right-of-way for MiTeJo. He explained that he and his wife built their home where a cottage used to be located, and explained how they used to have more water frontage and shoreline before the water levels were raised to support boating and access at the campground. This has affected his neighbors as well. He explained that when building the house he had to set it back further from the water due to decreased shoreline. This originally affected his cottage, which ended up being 5 to 8 feet from the water.

R. Burke explained that the proposed increase in campsites would affect the backyards of residences due to decreased tree coverage. This will affect the wildlife in the area. He also questioned the 500 foot required distance to the water, and whether the new sites were at this range. The new septic system will also require removal of trees. He shared that his neighbors are affected by the smoke and campfires. He opined that the new sites would decrease his quality of life. He thanked the Committee for their time and opined that the expansion was too large.

Jen King introduced herself, sharing that she was a neighbor of R. Burke. She explained that she had sent a letter in for the record that morning. She wanted to make sure the letter was received, which it was. She thanked the others for sharing their thoughts. J. King thanked C. Boldt for addressing the waterpark and manufactured housing. She added that transient versus seasonal residents have different concerns regarding water and this may affect their actions in ensuring they wash their boats, etc.

Steve Hayes shared that he is a resident on Lakeside Drive. He explained that the haze created from the campfire smoke creates visibility problems at his seasonal residence. S. Hayes opined that this also affects residents in Lebanon. This is the effect on the current number of sites, and so he is concerned with the significant increase.

R. Burke referred to the Milton Master Plan, stating the quality of life is identified as an important factor to strive for. He opined that the proposed expansion of MiTeJo would negatively impact current residents' quality of life.

Bob Silva introduced himself sharing that he grew up in Milton since 1983. He shared that his property abuts two sides of the campground. He explained the current noise and its adverse impacts, along with the effect of the smoke. He is concerned with an increase in smoke and noise.

Joel Pointe introduced himself as a resident of Lakeside Drive. He expressed his concern with water quality and invasive species, sharing that through grant funding the issue is beginning to be tackled.

He explained how he would hate to see progress halted with an increase in boaters who are not properly cleaning their boats. He added that boat traffic and safety is an issue of concern for him as well.

J. King shared two additional concerns including decrease in tree coverage for the septic tank leach field, and asked why the septic system would be so close to the water's edge.

R. Myrick commented on the Lebanon's shoreline, which is predominantly deep sand. There is a concern for the new septic system affecting resident wells.

D. Flores addressed the question of park models, which are close to manufactured homes. They have different uses, i.e. seasonal versus year round. He explained that there are criteria from the state for the septic system, for instance a nitrate setback system must be included. He discussed more specifics related to the proposed septic system.

D. Flores shared that the owners of MiTeJo have one other campsite in NH. A traffic study was referenced from the other campsite on Memorial Day weekend. M. Gasses asked about the vacancy rate at the campground that weekend. D. Flores was uncertain. W. Merritt closed the public hearing.

b. Acceptance of Technical Review

W. Merritt asked for a motion to accept the SRPC Technical Review provided by J. Burdin. M. Gasses **MOVED** to accept the document. This motion did not carry. W. Merritt asked if there was any discussion. M. Gasses shared that she does not see the transportation issue being a huge concern regionally. She opined that the planning board should pay close attention to the buffering between the development and abutters, such as adding screening. She opined that the separation from the neighbors is important.

W. Merritt asked if air quality could be addressed in the report. J. Burdin shared that abutter comments about the smoke and air quality would be conveyed in the minutes. M. Gasses shared that the Fire Department might have regulations concerning this. A discussion ensued concerning fire regulations. M. Gasses noted concerns with a propane filling stations.

M. Gasses stated that the planning board could review the waterpark. She does not see this as a regional issue, especially as it is centrally located on the site. M. Gasses shared that septic concerns are addressed through external permitting. She noted the concern of having more boats, but reminded everyone that the campsite is not looking to increase the number of slips.

The report will be amended to address concerns of smoke and air quality.

W. Merritt asked if the propane filling station onsite should be noted. J. Burdin stated this could be added as a hazard. M. Gasses opined that it not be added as there are already codes that the campsite must follow to have propane on site.

V. Parmele addressed the water quality concerns, and shared that this needs to be looked at carefully. She opined the language in the preliminary report needs to be stronger. M. Gasses opined that the alteration of terrain permit would take care of this. F. Kaen recommended some additions to cover the watershed and its protection. He explained his hesitation with proposed attractions and

added that he would like more information on this area. J. Burdin shared that this information would most likely be reported to the Town of Milton, not to SRPC.

V. Parmele opined that noise may not be a regional issue. J. Burdin will add language reflecting concerns about campfires (item 23) and strengthen the language about protecting water (item 18 and 22). M. Gasses addressed buffering and how it could be increased to dissipate the noise. This will also be included in the modified preliminary report under item 7.

V. Parmele addressed the wildlife corridor issue. This was discussed.

M. Gasses **MOVED** to accept the amendments to the technical review. F. Kaen **SECONDED** the motion of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

M. Gasses **MOVED** to accept the technical review. F. Kaen **SECONDED** the motion of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

3. Meeting Adjournment

W. Merritt thanked all attendees, and thanked J. Burdin for his report.

M. Gasses **MOVED** to adjourn the meeting. F. Kaen **SECONDED** the motion, of which all were **IN FAVOR**.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Shayna Sylvia

SRPC Communications and Outreach Specialist

Minutes approved on _____

By: _____

Wesley Merritt, Chair- SRPC Regional Impact Committee

**Comments in red were questions made during the explanation of SRPC's technical review.*

