

Bristol Mills Dam ad hoc Advisory Committee

Minutes of Meeting Tuesday, November 28th, 2017
Bristol Town Office

Committee members present: Pam Allen, Phil Averill, Bill Benner, Claire Enterline, Chuck Farrell, John Freburger, James Hatch

Absent: Jim Albright, Abby Ingraham

Also present: A. Beaudet, R. Bizarro, R. Davidson, M. Farrin, M. Hanly, S. Hope, J. McLean, K. McLetchie, R. Poland, L. Prentice

The meeting was called to order by chair Enterline at 6:02 pm with a quorum present, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Minutes/Agenda

A motion to accept the minutes of 11/14 was proposed by Farrell and seconded by Averill. The motion carried unanimously.

Agenda items were passed. Two items were added to the agenda: Facebook and communications from BFR.

Facebook

Farrell opened a conversation about the inaccuracies posted on Facebook and suggested the committee try to correct this. He thought an explanation to the public about why the project was started would be beneficial.

Overall, BDAC understood the need for factual information to reach the public. They all admitted they were not Facebook users and asked users of this social media what was entailed to have a Facebook page. Bizarro commented that she would speak to J. Westhaver, a co-worker, who was more knowledgeable on the subject.

****Benner suggested having their January meeting at BCS and reaching out to the community for attendance.**

****Enterline suggested posting the newsletters on the town's website, issuing a press release addressing these concerns and/or a letter to the editor.**

****It was thought the 'dummy down' comment came from discussion about BDAC writing an executive summary for the feasibility study.**

****Freburger thought they have been trying to keep people informed.**

****Hatch commented that people opposed stop listening after a while. He also pointed out that the Facebook comments were weeks old.**

M. Farrin suggested clearing up questions that repeatedly come up.

L. Prentice thought there was more of an audience on Facebook rather than the town's website. (She did think the Town's website was user-friendly.)

M. Hanly commented that what happens at the Bristol Mills Dam site affects other towns in the area.

Communications from BFR

Committee received a petition-like form titled "Display of support to maintain the current Bristol Mills Dam location" Enterline read the statement of action out loud to committee members and suggested it be added as an addendum to the feasibility study. On 10/10, the Ellingwood water supply site (option C) was first shown to Chief Leeman and he attended the BDAC meeting that same day to give comment on the plan. Enterline re-iterated that Leeman had said the Ellingwood option wouldn't provide everything but it would work and that he would like to review the plan with other members of BFR. Enterline did not feel confident that

all three options were shared with all members of BFR. Enterline commented that the petition was received after the draft report was issued.

On a motion by Benner, seconded by Hatch, it was voted that the BFR petition be made part of the public record and acknowledged in the next press release.

Davidson suggested the wording (page 6-7 of study) "...BFR may be amenable to replacement of the existing dry hydrant arrangement and/or development with an alternate supply scenario" be changed. He pointed out there have always been other sources of water, BFR prefers the dam.

Beaudet asked how long the dam had been in place and how how long BFR had been using it.

Communications from P&R

A similar petition-like form was received from Parks & Recreation. Enterline reviewed the meeting her and Benner attended with them on 11/21. It was noted the petition was received at the Town Hall on 11/27.

Allen suggested communications be sent to BFR and P&R that the petitions had been accepted. Enterline suggested requesting comments from both about the feasibility study.

Feasibility Study Review

Section 3.1

A suggestion to add a sentence that data was collected to help with providing information for all three options (A, B, & C). McLean noted they were done to create a baseline.

Section 3.2.3

Albright expressed concerned that options B & C would have major impacts on residences above dam. Majority of committee felt this section is for a description of what's there and not a place for potential impacts.

Table 4.2

It was suggested that CFS (cubic feet per second) be defined.

McLean reviewed the definition of hydrology & hydraulic.

Table 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5

It was agreed that the tables contained good information on water levels.

Enterline referred to a discussion from the 11/14 meeting about the current usage and safety of stoplogs for water level control. She thought Hall had misunderstand BDAC's request for a safer alternative. He understood it as a request for \$60,000 for gates that could be raised and lowered from the side. The BDAC confirmed they were seeking a less expensive, temporary fix.

Page 4-7

Last line -- game should read gate.

Page 4-9

Last paragraph -- Appendix D1 should read F1.

Section 5.1

First sentence -- Albright commented he thought the study was driven by alewives not connecting aquatic habitats. Majority of committee agreed with how report was written.

Page 5-2

Fourth paragraph -- Add a definition of stoplog.

Page 5-3

Albright suggested adding eel passage costs in this section. It was surmised that NOAA is the permitting agency for eel passage and there was little BDAC could do.

It was noted that a single Denil fishway will not meet the proposed 600K need of alewives passing through. Funding should include the beginning costs of putting a second Denil fishway in.

Section 5.3

Ingraham expressed that the title was misleading. Discussion to have first sentence read something similar to 'dam removal with a nature-like fishway and constructing water level controls'. The word simply removed on the second line.

Page 5-5

Albright suggested adding pictures of what the impoundment would look like with no water. Add definition of weir (a low dam built across a river to raise the level of water upstream or regulate its flow), third paragraph.

Page 5-6

Receipt of the petition should be noted in second paragraph.

McLean stated he was unsure how to address the petition.

All agreed to strike the first sentence of 2nd paragraph and the word satisfactory in second sentence. Change fire department to fire chief.

It was noted that excluding the dam, BFR preferred the Ellingwood option over all other water supply options in town listed on pages 6-2 through 6-6. BFR prefers option A when considering the three options the feasibility study addresses.

Farrell wondered if possible grant money for option B should be placed in the report. Enterline felt the study was an engineering study and may not be the place for that information. Having this information in the executive summary seemed more appropriate. Freburger noted that BDAC was currently not in the market for funding and it would be up to the Selectmen later. Enterline suggested presenting potential grant money sources for all three options.

Albright suggested retaining sides of dam for historical purposes and presenting corresponding costs accordingly.

Albright wondered about alga blooms from alewives in upper lakes (as noted in China Lake). Enterline and McLean both stated that there was no evidence on file.

Section 5.4

Farrell suggested information about dry hydrants from second paragraph be added to Option A.

Overall, everyone thought an introduction to the report should include a biology of alewives and the purpose of doing this feasibility study.

Adjournment: 8:10 pm, the next meeting to be held Tuesday, December 5, 2017 @ 6pm at the Bristol Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Bizarro