

PRESENT: Vadney, Chairman; Bayard, Secretary; Flanders; Kahn; Bliss; Touhey, Alternate; Granfield, Alternate; Edgar, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

2nd PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING AMENDMENTS

Chairman Vadney called the Public Hearing to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Harold Wyatt Conference, 347 Daniel Webster Highway regarding the proposed Lake Waukegan Watershed Overlay District.

Because of absences on the Board, the two alternates were called to sit, Touhey and Granfield.

Tonight's meeting is to look at a special ordinance called an Overlay District for the Zoning Plan, which would put some restrictions on the vicinity of Lake Waukegan. One of the most common complaints the Planning Board hears about in various venues is the protection of the drinking water at Lake Waukegan and that in part has driven this idea. Kahn – I think before we get going I have a little bit of life history to relay to the Board and that is that I rented on Lake Waukegan for 18 years and I've owned a lot on Lake Waukegan for 19 years and I was on the Waukegan Shore Owners Association Board at one point, I was the Vice-President and my wife, who is sitting in the audience, is now on the Board and is the Newsletter editor and neither of us drink town water. Does the Board see those as a conflict of interest. Flanders – None of the things he mentioned constitutes a conflict in my mind. Vadney – I would agree with that, I was just thinking if we were subdividing a lot and you were an immediate abutter to it kind of thing then there's straightforward things, but in this form and in that case the Planning Board's decision is final unless appealed to Superior Court so in that case you would most likely want to recuse yourself. In this case, what we are really doing is putting forth a form of Legislation and the fact that you've announced it is good, but this is not a final decision, the final decision's made by the Town at a vote so I think if I recall a couple of months ago, we had a lawyer come in and talk to us about conflict of interest and if I recall something of a legislative nature is a little bit different than the final decision of a Planning Board thing. Edgar – That is a fair statement. Vadney – I'm not troubled by your sitting here because not only because I trust you, but the townspeople have the final say. Flanders – Before we get cranking here too, I just got this information tonight and I see Don Jutton has weighed in on this. I am an employee of Municipal Resources, Inc., which is Don's company so. Vadney – It's up to you, you have the final decision if you want to recuse yourself if you think it's a big problem. The Board can give you advice. Flanders – I guess I would be looking for advice from the Board on this. Granfield – Before we do this, I work for Don, too. I am a consultant on Police and management issues. Vadney – We've still got four without you. Herb – I would just mention that looking at the very first sentence of Don's letter, he says he's writing in the capacity of Chairman of the Greater Meredith Program and Economic Development Committee. Bayard – He does sign the letter as President of Municipal Resources, Inc. Bobbi Smythe – Have they had any meetings?. Is it an official group? Vadney – I don't know that that's even the business of the Board if they've had any meetings, the fact that you work for him is a little stickier but then again, you're not. Flanders – I'm kind of leaning to remove any doubt, I

probably ought to step down. Vadney – It is your call. Flanders – I think that's what I'm going to do, I don't want to jeopardize anything that may happen. Grandfield – Me either, I didn't even know this was here until we got up here to read it so I'd rather err on the side of caution. I don't want to create an issue where you don't need one. Vadney – Absolutely, perception is 9 points of this stuff. Vadney – The others are all committed here, I think. You've seen the problems of small town government here in action. I'd like to ask John to make a few comments. Over the last 6 or 8 years, we've worked to develop a new Community Plan, and we are currently working on a Zoning Ordinance and then there are many other things that will interface with that Zoning Ordinance and the Community Plan to kind of lay out the Town in a somewhat more modern fashion. John, would you give us a brief overview of the situation. Edgar – You call it modern fashion, I call it an appropriate fashion. Basically, I would just like to spend a few minutes to put this proposal in context on a couple different fronts and the first concept I want to introduce is in the context of our Community Plan. Anytime you look at a land use regulation, there should be a good planning foundation for it and the very first foundation is our Community Plan that several folks here in the audience helped us write several years ago. The colored map that I handed out is a watershed map that we have included in the 2002 Community Plan and the 2002 Community Plan, Chapter 5, the Natural Resources Chapter, places a very strong emphasis on water quality as a general matter and more specifically encourages the management of our resources in a watershed context and the purposes of sharing this map with you, those of you that have it handy, is the Waukegan Watershed, this is Lake Waukegan and on the map it captures A1 – A6, but in essence it's part of the Winnepesaukee Watershed that's why it's all on green and as a practical matter it extends all the way up to the north corridor of Waukegan and into four other communities and so there's a significant emphasis in the Master Plan placed on not only developing a management plan for our piece of the lake but trying to work with neighboring communities that contribute to the Watershed and then thereby the quality of Lakes Winona and Waukegan. As an outgrowth of the Community Plan, there was an initiative that began in 2005 to in fact implement that recommendation that we look on a watershed basis at a five-town watershed that affects our drinking water supply and in the summer of this year, there was this document that's been published and is on our website, which is a management plan for the five-town watershed. Chairman Bruce Bond is with us tonight and my guess is that he will have some things to share with us as well as several members of the Committee that are here this evening. I really do think that, especially for those that aren't familiar with watersheds and watershed planning, a little bit of this extra time paying attention to context is critically important and in the initial letter to the reader, there's a very carefully crafted letter that explains what we are doing and why we are doing the Watershed Management. I'm not going to read that to you, but I encourage folks to become familiar with this for a number of reasons. The Watershed as a whole does encompass portions of five towns and it's about 13.9 square miles in it's total land area and Meredith, this is the political boundary and obviously extends in these other four towns, but Meredith encompasses about a third of that watershed or stated the other way, two-thirds of the watershed are outside of our political boundaries. The report is the first of its kind effort to try to manage the land that contributes and influences the water quality in Waukegan and as part of that effort, the Committee, with the assistance of Jen Palmiotto, with the Northeast Rural Water Supply started pooling over all the e-lap data, like

assessment data that many of you are probably familiar with or probably responsible for it for those of you who are members of the Shore Owner's Association. We have DES data, Department of Environmental Services data and we have a lot of e-lap data in both Waukegan and Winona and a lot of that data was pooled over to try to see what it may indicate and Randy and Bruce are probably as versed as anybody in it, but in the long and short of it that there's very discernible negative trends in the water quality in the areas of dissolved oxygen, phosphorus and conductivity. I'm not going to get into all of the technical issues as to what the significance of that is, but there were very clear indications of degraded water quality. Further confirmed by anecdotal observations of increased algae in the lake, but then a very much confirmed and very alarming confirmation of the presence of a toxic algae bloom a year ago November, which is my understanding the first of it's kind reported bloom on a surface water supply in New Hampshire. The significance of this naturally occurring algae occurring at that level of a formal bloom is something that we can't necessarily treat for in our treatment plant so if this happens to get into our water supply and treatment plant, is something that is very, very serious so we have a lot of information, trend data, not spot data but trend data that suggests some things are being influenced by human activity and it's not good. Perhaps Randy might speak to it a little more concretely than that in terms of some of the indications in terms of how we're accelerating the aging process of the lake. The report details this existing data and analyzes it. The report also identifies potential non-point sources of pollution. If you think of a pipe that a factory could discharge a pollutant that would point discharge because you can locate a specific point where the discharge is occurring. Non-point pollution which is effectively what we are dealing with in today's day and age, all kinds of sources of pollution that don't have that very point, they are non-point meaning that there's not any discernible location from which a source could be attributed. Lawns, for example, fertilizers and pesticides might be an example of some non-point pollution so we spent a lot of time at the community level looking at the non-point pollution threats that are real to the Watershed. This plan has been accepted by the Selectmen as a framework for implementation. It includes all kinds of different strategies for protecting and improving water quality. The Committee went through a comprehensive evaluation process and prioritization process of these risks to water quality and identified existing measures and assessed existing measures as to their effectiveness to deal with water quality. One of which was the assessment of various zoning densities in the five communities looking at the intensity of development that is encouraged or allowed in the various five communities and it speaks in general terms to the general correlation between density, growth pressure and various non-point sources of pollution. The risks are identified in the plan in a priority order and for those of you who aren't familiar with the results of that prioritization, septic systems were a major concern, the effects of site development on water quality, motor boating, storm water issues, roads and road related issues, residential heating fuel, lawn care issues, railroad ties, issues relative to the sewer system and then various body contact issues with respect to the lake itself. As a general matter, the report notes that the greater the density, the greater degree of development pressure that you will have and with more development, there comes the potential for greater risks to water quality from various non-point source pollution. I emphasize that that is a general statement because there's an awful lot that at the end of the day comes down to the quality or lack of quality of that comes into play. The recommendations that are in the report likewise very

comprehensive and . There are four water quality goals in the plan each followed by objectives and strategies for recommendations in each area. There are over 60 specific recommendations or strategies in the document. Goal #1 addresses the issue of non-point pollution. Objective 2 of that goal calls for the reduction of pollution from site development projects and includes seven strategies dealing with everything from overlay zoning which is one of the recommendations we're talking about tonight to permanent protection, to improve erosion controls, introducing new concepts into the development of the review process and so on, including landowner education. It also calls for and this is not a focus of tonight's discussion, but it also calls for, we are trying to work with the neighboring communities to try to unify the approach to code enforcement so we have consistent laws, consistent interpretation, consistent administration, enforcement and compliance. Tonight's proposal addresses one of the recommendations that's contained within this overall framework of trying to reduce non-point pollution and that has to deal with the issue of density. I'm going to speak to that more concretely in a second. There's additional context I would like to share with you because some folks not familiar with all the workings of local government at the moment might feel that this is just one effort and we think that with this one effort everything will be taken care of. That's anything but the case, that's not the context within which this proposal is being generated. There are five things that are going on that I think you need to be aware of: (1) The Board of Selectmen has accepted that this plan is a framework for growth implementation, they have not signed off on every recommendation. They have not gotten through that level of it, but they have had a briefing from the Committee, they have had a real good meeting on this back in August I believe, they're very, very supportive of it and accepted it as a strategy for moving forward . More recently, the Selectmen have seen the necessity of trying to focus on implementation and worked with the Committee in amending their charge from creating a plan to actually working towards facilitation of implementing the plan. Thirdly, there are other regulations and tweaks to some regulations that we have advanced to and hope they will be advancing to the Town Meeting that there will be refinement and updating of the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the Shoreline District, in particular, Lake Waukegan there are some more intensive uses that are allowed in the Shoreline District in other parts of the community that we felt were not appropriate for what Waukegan, for example, I think some grocery stores by special exception, marinas, marine construction, recreation camps and the like that would no longer be permitted on the shoreline of this lake trying to minimize future conflicts between development and water quality and so we're looking at it in that context as well. Fourthly, there's a recommendation in this plan to not increase the capacity of the public beach but recognizing the history of public swimming at Lake Waukegan, if we're going to continue to have public swimming, we should probably provide a bathroom to folks that swim there to try to encourage bathroom, showering and changing of children's diapers and the like which currently is a porta-potty and so that proposal on a different tract has gone to the Capital Improvements Committee, it's been endorsed by the budget, the Recreation Commission is writing a grant to try to offset some costs and, hopefully, it will be up to the voters from a budgetary point of view, we are trying to advance that from a facilities perspective as well, so we're looking at planning, we're looking at regulation, we are looking at facilities and then finally, there is a large piece of Town property up in this part of Town (known locally as the Feltham property which is simply a predecessor in title to the Town of Meredith's ownership) and the

Conservation Commission has been working closely with the Board of Selectmen to develop a management strategy such that that property would be conserved into the future. Prior to that, the property was surplus property. The question was what do we do with it and the Selectmen have agreed to a, as I understand it, a conservation framework. There are still a lot of details that are being worked out about some other uses that might occur on the property, but this one I'm sure is moving forward toward some form of some conservation protection and if you look at this parcel map, that's pretty significant visually, it should be pretty obvious to everybody. So, in summary, we are looking at the planning aspects of implementing some planning which includes regulatory and non-regulatory issues, we're working the public facilities angle, we're working the zoning angle, we're working the conservation angle on some Town owned property. In that sense between the Community Master Plan and the activities that are going on in a couple different venues, I just wanted to make sure everybody was aware of that this stretch into a much broader context of a lot of other things that are going on with respect to looking at Lake Waukegan. I had spoken earlier about the issue of assessments of density and so if you can just visualize this boundary and I'm going to show the underlying map that does not include the boundary so I just want to orientate it so when you look at the next map, you don't get lost. This is Winona Road coming up off 104 so think of Winona Road as almost being the westerly boundary of the watershed, this is 106 Parade Road and think of that as being the southerly limit as a general matter, it goes into Route 3 and includes some of the Route 3 corridor and then going up from the canal for those of you that are familiar with Red Gate Lane kind of goes up that hill, goes up through this town-owned property heading up towards the landfill, the landfill drains to Hawkins Brook, but on the other side of Jenness Hill goes the other way so that's this divide here. That's the general orientation of the watershed in terms of the community. Then the question is why are we doing this, why are we looking at density and what do we have for, what's on the books. The reason why it's called an overlay district is because we have in this case, this is the Winona Road area, this is the Parade Road area, this is Route 3, back to the canal, heading up Red Gate Lane and then over again so that's the general area of the watershed on a zoning map. That includes five different zoning districts, what I would call underlying districts, they are underneath a proposed overlay. I want to explain the current densities that are on the books, that will help put in context what we are trying to do here. If it were a perfect world, which it's not, we probably wouldn't have an industrial district in the middle of the watershed, an industrial district with a lot of small lots to boot, but it is what it is so in this industrial district, it's not a mixed use, it's the only district where there's no mixed use, meaning that there's no residential uses permitted, the density really isn't an issue, but the proposal does establish minimum lot sizes so if we had properties in here that were to be subdivided in the B & I district, it would establish a two-acre minimum lot size for industrial subdivision or commercial subdivision. Currently, it's at one acre so for properties that would be affected by the lot-size change would be going from a one-acre minimum lot size to a two acre minimum lot size. There is one major commercial district in the current zoning which we refer to as Central Business that if you recall that zoning boundary that I mentioned, there's a little piece of the Route 3 area that gets caught up in the drainage. You all know where the medical clinic is, some of that drainage is cross-culverted right at the Harley-Davidson, runs down Lower Ladd Hill and then is intercepted by the railroad tracks so there is a small portion of the commercial district that lies within

that. Within that commercial district, the current density with town sewer and town water is 10,000 sq. ft. per dwelling and in rough terms I like to try to think of that as about ¼ acre so think of that as four to an acre in general terms. Those densities go up if you happen not to have utilities present, but in that part of the district, we pretty much have sewer and water. We also have three residential districts that make up the five underlying districts that are in this watershed. The first one is the Shoreline District which is yellow. The Shoreline District has a provision for Waukegan currently in it, which basically says for the waterfront portions and there are mostly waterfront properties and there's a couple that aren't, but for waterfront properties within the Shoreline District of Lake Waukegan, the density is between 2 and 4 acres and is on the books depending on utilities. If you have Town Water and Town Sewer, it's 2 acres in the waterfront shoreline area. If you don't have Town Sewer and Town Water, it's 4 acres so we have, depending on the utility status, we have 2 to 4 acres in the yellow for a waterfront property. For non-waterfront property depending on the utilities, it could be 25,000 to 30,000 or approximately a little less than half an acre for non-waterfront properties in the yellow area. We also have something called Forestry/Rural which is this bright green you can see in different parts of the community and that would include this part up in here, the Parade Road area and this area up in here, that's a 3-acre density currently on the books. The highest density that we have is this light green and if you have, under the current zoning, if you have sewer and water present there, it's again ¼-acre zoning, four to an acre and that could go up to 40,000 sq. ft. per unit or more depending on the status of utilities. Once you get away from sewer and water, it's driven more by land capability, soils and slopes, something that we call soils-based lot sizing which starts at 40,000 and can go from 1 to 4 acres, but for what we are focusing on and where the utilities are present, it's 10,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit. The assessment that we did in the Watershed Management Plan looked at the densities in all five towns. From what we've been able to gather, there's no absolute, it's not like if you say you go to 1 acre, 2 acres or 3 acres, there's no one absolute that you pick a number and all your issues are squared away. You've got to look at density in the context of a lot of other considerations. The density because it does drive the ultimate amount of development that's going to occur is one significant factor. The Town of Center Harbor recently went to 5-acre density which on a watershed basis is the whole northeastern end of the watershed for the most part going all the way up to Holderness so if you're familiar with Hawkins Pond, for those of you that know that part of Center Harbor, that whole area around Hawkins Pond is all within this watershed. Otter Pond, Bear Pond carries up in that neck of the woods, so Center Harbor's going to 5-acre density. We are not proposing 5-acre density. There are some communities that take very extreme measures and preclude all future development in the watershed and those are very extreme recommendations in the context of our watershed because of the nature of the existing development that we have so we are not going anywhere near 5-acre zoning or trying to stop development altogether. New Hampton has basically 1-acre zoning at it's end of the watershed and then by the time you get up to Ashland and Holderness, it's a little less critical because they are farther away, but it's comparable. So on our end when we look at the zoning side and there's a lot more to this than zoning, but when you look at the zoning aspects of what we encourage and where if you look at the big picture of the 13 sq. mile watershed, this is where the highest densities are that are allowed in the entire watershed, 4 to an acre, and they are also in closest proximity to our water intake, which is in the scheme of this lake,

which is right about there so they have to the extent there are correlations between the density of development and water quality, we have kind of the worst of situations in that we have the highest densities closest to the lake, which in this context of the north-south orientation of the lake, is closest to the intake pipe. That's an overview of the current situation of density in the watershed and in some of the planning context that this proposal falls. Vadney – As John has laid out, that's why we've been looking at this for a few years and why we are bringing forth a proposal at this time. Vadney – I think you gave a good summary. We can go on with many sentences, but basically this is to protect the lake and as John has mentioned, you could argue that New Hampton and Center Harbor are doing more to protect their drinking water than Meredith is so that is a major portion of it. The lot density is a good way to cut down the activity in the zone. We've looked at some of the technical procedures that are used and to be honest, they are wanting and since there is no really good way to stop non-point source pollution other than don't develop the land or at least be very careful how you do develop it. That's one of the reasons that we're extending it in this way. I don't know what more can be said. Edgar - Just to be clear, there's one element to the overlay district. That's not to say there shouldn't or couldn't be other features to it at some point in time, but at this point there's one position, different density. We looked at the different densities that I mentioned, we have 2-acre density on the books, we have 4-acre density on the books, we have 3-acre density on the books, but we also have areas where we have ¼ acre density on the books so effectively what the proposal does, it creates a 2-acre threshold, a 2-acre default such that if you have 4-acre zoning, you still have 4-acre zoning. If you have 3-acre zoning, you still have 3-acre zoning, but if you are in an area where you otherwise would have been allowed ¼ acre zoning or half acre zoning, it creates a 2-acre density on a gross area basis. It doesn't say two acres of buildable land, it's 2-acre density on a gross area basis. So effectively that's what this does in areas where the underlying districts would allow for densities greater than 2 acres, it establishes 2 acres as a, in essence, a default density. I just want to emphasize that as Herb was eluding to that the Board has gone to some training and I've been briefed on different things relative to some of the non-point stuff, the science of non-point pollution abatement is turning on its head as we speak. There's a lot of study that's been done down at the University of New Hampshire and other states that have confirmed that some of the typical Best Management Practices used all over the country and all over New Hampshire simply aren't doing what they were purported to do in terms of treatment, water quality treatment so the science community is in a state of flux trying to figure out how to deal with that and how to refocus their efforts and so the DES is responding trying to play a little bit of a catch up so the science at the moment is up in the air, science that for decades people have been relying upon various treatment technologies. That just sort of couples the issue of it with a little more difficulty than to just look to engineers and to the science of stormwater management and pollution abatement to expect there to be engineering point of view because that aspect of things is a little bit in a state of flux at the moment. There are lots of things in the management plan that speak to protecting water quality, there's a lot on education, there's a lot of permanent protection of the water, there's a lot of non-regulatory steps that are being looked at and as a practical matter it also has looked at regulation and this is one element of that, an overlay zone for the district to create a 2-acre default. Kahn – I just want to point out, John, you mentioned to me earlier and I was thinking about it that this is not the only zoning thing that we're doing this year

that looks to protecting Waukegan. It may be the major thing that we're doing this year, but in the zoning package that we presented earlier so with package with all of the districts, we've done a couple little twitches here and there that are intended to protect Waukegan. Trucking Terminals were a permitted use in the Business & Industry District. We decided that was too great a risk of petroleum products spillage and so they are no longer permitted there. I mean there are some other uses in that district that present risks, but not as big a risk as a big trucking terminal so that's one little change we made. We made some changes in terms of the permitted uses in the Shoreline District for Lake Waukegan and we basically ruled out high-traffic, high-population uses. It may be that they really weren't going to happen anyway in terms of recreational camps or rental cottages, there were some other things, Bed & Breakfast in the Shoreline zone and we took those out of the Waukegan Shoreline zone. The other thing that we did was we proposed to rezone the upper part of Jenness Hill Road from Commercial to Residential in the hope that will keep further commercial development out of that area. Randy Eifert, Forest Hill Road – I'm a Waukegan Watershed Committee member. I'm in support of this change, but I would like to emphasize that as far as the Committee has gone, in April or May it will be two years worth of effort and work so it's not something that, this has been going on since 2002. It has been a lot of research, a lot of papers, a lot of hours of effort researching this so it's not something we just came up with and in my personal opinion, I would have liked to have seen something stronger and maybe down the road something will become, there'll be more additions to it. One of the things our committee has done and was very religious about is not jumping to conclusions and doing it on a consensus basis. It seemed to take longer than it should and even now when we are trying to implement the plan, time seems to go by before we make a step forward so there has been a lot of work put into this and I think it's a just thing to do. The other thing is I've seen with my own eyes some of the dangers that can come out of the density. There are certain things, like we all know about the condo development of 58 units in the watershed and the runoff issues that we've had, and yes it was a 100-year storm on Columbus Day weekend and all that, but the silt running down the stream into the lake right near the water intake pipe, it's a visual impact I won't forget and you just see the lake getting dirtier as you're watching it and that's the direct result of density, I think, 58 units on a 13-acre parcel in the watershed. Hopefully, that is the last time we have something like that come in so this is one step I think that will help us eliminate that density. Certainly there are other areas of town you can do those kinds of things without impacting the water quality, the users of the lake and the 3,000 public residents drinking the water. Bruce Bond - I'm also on the Watershed Committee with Randy. The Committee was formed 2 years ago and John covered it extremely well so we don't want to repeat anything John said, but there were 16 members on the Waukegan Watershed Advisory Committee and in addition to that we were backed up with technical support from I guess its Granite State Rural Water now and also DES and the members of the Committee are made up of representatives from five different towns that are in the Watershed. In fact, a number of them are here tonight. I live in Center Harbor so I don't have the drinking water concerns, but I have water quality concerns, I have water aquifer concerns and recreational concerns. Caroline Goss and I'm from Ashland. We have a very small portion of your watershed and the majority of that portion is in conservation, but as I have said to the Committee before, I'll never look at a body of water in the same way again. This has been a real eye opener for me and we live very

close to Little Squam Lake and I can see that what is happening here, needs to happen in our town and I hope they will implement something. We do have an overlay district by the way, but they can go further. There's always one more step you can take to protect these waters for our grandchildren and their children. Roger Hogan, Committee member from Meredith, Tim Whiting, Committee member from Meredith; Peter Miller, Committee member from Meredith. John Hodsdon, Committee member from Meredith. I'm in the A-9 watershed that drains directly into Meredith Bay, not going through Waukegan. I was on that Committee as well as I'm involved in other water quality activities in the State, through the Conservation District, through the RC & D Council, the Winnepesaukee Tributary Monitoring Further Work Committee. This afternoon my duty was part of the State's Water Quality Standards Advisory Committee. I support this. I think controlling density is one of the best things you can do to slow down further degradation. There is a problem that overall Waukegan isn't too bad, it's fairly good but it's got a bad trend going on it now and development is really one of the biggest problems. If it stayed all in Forestry, we wouldn't be worrying about this at all now. I think John perhaps is overly pessimistic in what can be done to control non-point source pollution although some of the majors that are required can get very expensive. If you look at New York City's watershed up in the Catskills, they were able to avoid roughly 4 billion dollars worth of improvements in their water treatment from two of those watersheds by essentially keeping as much of the land as possible in farming rather than development and putting a lot of money into practically building berms around the fields that the dairy cows were using and with great effort, but for a lot less than 4 billion, they did a magnificent job. The first purpose and intent, it implies that this will protect the safety of the public water consumers. I'd like to point out that all surface waters in New Hampshire for public water supply must be treated and that will continue and that will protect it and as far as health and safety of our consumers are concerned, I think this may be unnecessarily alarmist and shouldn't be voted on on that basis, however, as the quality degrades, the treatment gets more expensive, more filtration, more chlorination, there is a question and a lot of debate about some of the chlorination byproducts. They have extremely small risk compared to the risk of not chlorinating and I think this is a first step like some of these other techniques on Alteration of Terrain and such should be looked at very carefully and perhaps go beyond what is now classified as the Best Management Practices. That will take time to have an effect, but I think it may reverse the trends that you see now. Bond – On behalf of our Watershed Advisory Committee, I want to say I commend the Planning Board for this action and I hope to see it go to the Town for a vote. Vadney – I'd like to make one comment, I'm not going to call on John to defend his earlier statement because that would take too long, but seriously, what he was speaking to when he mentioned the non-point source pollution was the same thing you said, do work. Yes, you can protect it by leaving the forest and stuff like that and to a degree that's what some of this is aimed at. The things he was specifically pointing at are some of the things regularly on the developments. Somebody comes in and they want to develop 10-15 acres right near the lake and the Best Management Practices are the best things we have out there, but they are not working very well. Some of the centrifuge, settling basin kind of things, some of the man-made weapons and things work to a degree, but they are very limited and the closer you are to the lake, the more valuable the land is and the studies at UNH and elsewhere would show that if you're going to protect an acre, you have to set aside close to a half acre in just these

dedicated kind of things. They take a lot of space and it's very difficult to get the kind of systems in place and the size required to really protect other than just trickling storms. Those were the things John was referring to, the more high density ones that you use at the end of a parking lot kind of thing. Many of them are high maintenance. They require various bags of vermiculite and various _____ and they require changing on a periodic basis and the maintenance costs become a problem and as the maintenance falls off and they become ineffective so that's one of the reasons we are not wildly enamored with those methods. John Prescott – I live in the Waukewan Watershed on Reservoir Road. I now have Town sewer and about to get Town water. Under the new regulations, it sounds like no matter what utilities, you will have to have 2 acres to get a house lot. I think it's ridiculous to say it will now need 8 times the amount of land than is now required with Class 1 utilities to build a house. There is obviously a real difference between municipal service and an on-site leachfield and to simply put both circumstances underneath the same blanket rule is not right. The zoning regulations that are currently in effect recognizes the difference. This area should be treated the same as every other district in town as far as acknowledging that municipal services are superior to on-site and should not be put in the same category. The town, if anything, should be pitching the fact that it's better to live where there's Town sewer not making it more difficult. Bayard – Is there any rule of thumb or anything that people use as to the advantage of Town sewer versus on-site septic disposal. Vadney – Rule-of-thumb, you mean as far as area goes? Bayard – Yeah, obviously a lot presumably gives off some pollution, whether it just be the fertilizer for the grass or whatever, but if you have septic on-site, presumably you would add additional burden to the area and, of course, the closer you get to the lake like you were saying.. Edgar – You hit the nail on the head. John is correct in the sense that obviously if you have municipal sewer, that aspect of non-point pollution is not on the table because it's in a pipe going from there, but there are several other sources of non-point pollution and with higher densities comes more cars, more parking lots, more roofs, more lawn care and all those kinds of things we looked at in that report so he is correct in that the septic issue obviously is vindicated, but there are a lot of other issues that come with development even with the sewer and with the higher densities comes a little bit more of everything, as a general matter, more black top and more storm water and the like. The management report speaks to what the effects are of the storm water management from water on water quality so the non-point issue is not limited to the issue of septic, it is one significant feature. Flanders – Just one point I would like to make. We had a meeting here a week or so ago on the water quality testing and specifically in regards to the issue of extending the sewer down Pinnacle Park Road and there was an expert here from UNH and the point that he made which I guess I wasn't aware of before and it kind of speaks to the question that Bill was asking, is a septic system is only designed to treat bacteria. A septic system does absolutely nothing for nutrient loads. Vadney – A nutrient is a major factor in, there are problems with what you need in a lake to cause it to go in a more polluted utrophic way and phosphorus I believe is the thing is our main lacking, if you were to put phosphorus in our waters, we already have enough nitrogen, oxygen and many other things, it's that phosphorus and so that's one of the things that does come out of septic tanks. John Prescott – I can only go by my own experience, but right now I'm in the middle of a subdivision and by the old rules, I could put 4 houses on my piece of property all hooked to Town sewer and your rules I can put 3 houses with on-site septic so I would say 4

houses hooked up to Town water is a lot better than 3 leachfields. Vadney – John, are you familiar with that property at all? Prescott – We haven't passed it in yet, I just got ready to go and now I've got to deal with this. Edgar – The ordinance doesn't preclude anyone from tying into the sewer. It does affect the density, there's no question about it and they are significant, if you had a 10-acre lot and with a density of ¼-acre could be 40 town homes whatever and with that same 10-acre lot, it would five units so there is a big swing. The ordinance does not if there's a 4 versus 3 or something like that and what's better 3 on septic or 4 on the sewer, there's nothing to preclude someone from putting a 2-acre lot on the sewer. There's nothing in the ordinance that discourages anyone from hooking up on the sewer. Vadney – Your lot is on Waukegan Street. Prescott – No, it's on Reservoir Road. What I'm saying is, I've already got Town sewer so this doesn't have anything to do with me that way, but if I was starting fresh now, the rules would be if I put a \$50,000 sewer system in, I could put four lots there. Now you are saying if I put in separate leachfields, I could put 3 septic systems in, would be what the new regulations would say. Vadney – I don't think that's correct. Prescott – I have 6 ½ acres so I could either put 3 2-acre lots or if I had to have a septic system, I'd have to put in a \$50,000 unit to put four. Vadney – I'm not going to try and do the math on that here tonight, but I appreciate your input and we can take a look at that. Prescott – What precludes me from going one way or the other if I was starting fresh would be a \$50,000 system or a \$5,000 leachfield. I'm going to go with the \$5,000 leachfield, there's no incentive to go the other way. Peter Miller – I also commend the Board for proposing this ordinance and I have a few questions for Mr. Edgar. John, I'm curious, do you know offhand.. Let me ask this first and see if my comprehension is correct that if this ordinance goes into effect, to be subdividable a parcel in the watershed must be at least 4-acres in size? Edgar – That's correct. Do you know offhand how many parcels in the watershed that are undeveloped parcels or parcels of undeveloped land that exceed 4 acres or roughly what their combined acreage is. Edgar – I don't have that kind of tabulation, but when we look at this from a workshop point of view with that parcel map, we tried to identify, you know, are there enough properties out there, coming from the other point of view that would likely have a lot of development that is the focus of concern from a density in other words if we had only 1.7 acre lots everywhere and there's really no subdivision potential, then why do this. We did look at it from that point of view to see if there are enough properties out there for us to even bother with it to be meaningful. So I do not have a calculation for you in that regard, but it's significant. We did look at the development potential of 6 or 8 properties that became obvious to us that are very likely to become developed. In fact, one of the letters that I'm going to read into the record is somebody else that's looking at one of the properties that we refer to as the Wickes property, the residentially zoned lot. It's not in front of us at the moment, but one of the correspondence pieces we recently received is someone with 10-12 acres in size, let's assume it's 10, might be putting 25-40 condominiums in there and it sort of illustrates the point that with the higher density comes the pressure to develop. In this particular case, it's a moderately sloped property with a stream and very large wetland on it. It has constraints, but with that high density comes more pressure to try to develop the properties many of which, not all of which, but many of which what we're seeing on the Board are these properties that are more and more stressed in terms of to a conservationist, they are assets, to a developer they are a liability, its wetlands, steep slopes and streams and all the kinds of features that we need to be mindful of. We are seeing

more and more pressure on these resources every other Tuesday night so that trend is going to continue here in Meredith and so I don't have a number for you in terms of how many from a buildout point of view how many more lots could we get, but it is significant in the sense that when you look at that parcel map and look at some of the sizes of some of the parcels there, there is a fair amount of subdivision to be had and what we are trying to do is not stop development, we didn't pick unreasonable densities, we're picking in the range of what we have in the watershed, between 2 and 4 acres, we sided on the very low end of that range to try to be cautious and respectful of the fact that this does affect property rights. There's no question about it and John is correct in that there is a swing, there's a significant swing and in zoning language, it's called down zoning and we are down zoning density in this area, so I don't have a number for you other than the fact you think there is a fair amount of subdivision potential, when you get up into the non-sewered areas, it's less of an issue because the soils and slopes are going to drive the lot sizes to 2, 3 or 4 acres anyway. What we're really talking about is an area where we have Town sewer and, quite frankly, another relevant point that the watershed group said is that if we ever were to run the sewer down Wall Street in that area, that's a dialogue that's been initiated with the Selectmen to at least start to contemplate trying to do some sewerage of the west shore at least of Waukegan, the concern is don't let the sewer increase densities because that's typically what happened. Look at what happened when the sewer went around Winnepesaukee to protect water quality. It did, it took the septic issue out of the equation and then added a plethora of other kinds of potential sources of pollution that come with high-density development and so it solved one problem and created a couple others. So the Waukegan report was very clear that sewerage is an important thing to consider for the west shore of Waukegan, but not for the purpose of trying to stimulate development. The long-winded answer to your question, Peter I apologize I do not have that kind of number other than to know, it's significant enough in our view to warrant this proposal. Vadney – Peter, before you ask your second question, so that everybody in the audience is clear as to what John was talking of, there is a letter, we've received four letters I believe and we'll end up reading all of them into the record, but I want to do this one right now so you'll know the exact thing he was talking of. This is from Mr. Hallett, who many of you may know is the fellow who is developing the Meredith Bay Village on the way up High School Hill on the left, the old Bickford Farm. (Vadney read Stephen Hallett's letter dated January 14, 2006, into the record, see attached.) That is a proposal that has not yet come to the Planning Board but he is certainly moving on with it to put 25-38 units and if you're are not familiar with that land go into the middle of Gerrity's (Wickes) parking lot, turn south and walk across the railroad track and it's that north facing slope that's just below Massachusetts Avenue and that little complex up in there. It's wet and he admits it's wet, he thinks he can get 25-38, but that is one of the letters that will be on the record for this. Peter, go ahead with the rest of your questions. Kahn – I just wanted to footnote to what John was saying, John said that in addition to those that would be requiring 2-acre zoning, there are others that he pointed out that as a matter of the application of soils and slopes would probably have fairly high requirements as to density. There are others that will be, indeed we have one proposal that's been brought before the Planning Board that hasn't been filed yet, but there are other areas that are going to be subdivided in the watershed district, but in those areas we have 3-acre zoning and so it's more restrictive than the proposal that we have and in the proposal, we preserve that 3-acre zoning. Peter

Miller – Just a thought related to extending the sewer line along the west shore of the lake in relation to this proposal, I recall the very interesting and informative discussion we had within the Watershed Committee about this, in fact my recollection is that we were hesitant to recommend that the Town become more pro-active with regard to engineering studies for a sewer line, etc., out of concern for the greater density of development that could occur if the sewer were put in. Ordinances can be changed so if a sewer line were put in, there's nothing to preclude this Town in the future from changing the ordinance and reducing the required lot sizes. Edgar – I'd like to speak to that Mr. Chairman, I think the answer to that question is "yes" and there are things that the Master Plan calls for to create additional planning tools for us to get more information on some of these issues. The Plan does speak to doing build out analysis, the Plan does speak to developing lot coverage models, which is a lot of when you take the septic out of the equation, a lot of what's left are lot coverage storm water related issues. These are tools we don't have. What we do know for a fact is that with density comes development pressure and we do know that we are experiencing a lot of development pressure right now. That's what we do know and so in a respectful way we are trying to address part of that with this proposal and I'm the first one to admit that this is not a silver bullet, this is not something that is going to just and therefore we have 2-acre zoning and nothing else matters. Quite the contrary, all the development projects would continue to have to be scrubbed very, very carefully and so I don't want anyone to think this is something that's being looked in isolation, we have to do a better job on erosion control issues, we have to figure out which way some of the storm water technique issues are going and be ahead of that curve a little bit and so forth so I would be the first one to agree with you that if we and this is an if, if this Board moves it forward and if it's voted in at Town Meeting, if circumstances and techniques and technology and such is different in the years in the future, everything could be revisited, but as a practical matter, we have to deal with what we do know and we do know that density to a large degree invites development pressure which correlates to risk and for that reason, this is on the table for consideration. Hopefully, and although we recognize it affects property rights, we've tried to be respectful about it and as we said, we looked at all of these underlying districts and the like we recognize that we can't buy the whole watershed, but we want to encourage more permanent protection. We can't, as a practical matter, recommend not allowing people to swim in the lake, but we sure as heck can try provide a bathroom for those that do at the public facility and so on the zoning side again trying to be somewhat balanced in that we could have picked lower numbers if we picked some ridiculously low number, we could almost guarantee almost no more road construction in the watershed. As a practical matter, that doesn't recognize a reasonable balance with the folks who were on the receiving end of the down zoning, so we picked the 2 acre and as Randy suggested, there's probably some folks that strictly from a water supply planning point of view could be critical of 2 acres not having gone far enough, but we tried to deal with that in a balanced way so I think that as we get more experienced and get better tools in the future, we could look at things, but I think as it relates to that sewer, if it ever were to happen just be very, very cautious that we don't solve a septic issue and then create other nutrient issues and one thing Bob is eluding to that you guys are learning about in Meredith Bay is that even if you take the septic out of the equation of lots as sources of nutrients, there's nutrients coming from lawns, there's nutrients coming from road runoff, there's nutrients coming from agriculture so we have to be careful about with

density there comes some risks. Peter Miller – One last statement, John, I think I heard you say that Center Harbor has more a restrictive ordinance, they have a 5-acre minimum. Edgar – Five-acre average density, yes. Miller – And New Hampton has one (1) acre. Has there been any dialogue with New Hampton officials about possibly following Meredith's lead if this ordinance is enacted. Edgar – Not directly, we have to have a lead to follow, so that's probably the most appropriate time is if the Planning Board and the public sees the value in doing this, then we've set the stage for the dialogue. Vadney – I think we should sick John on that and have him call New Hampton and see if they'll follow Center Harbor's lead. Edgar - We did do a presentation in New Hampton and of all the presentations we've done, including the Meredith presentation, I think that was the most constructive back and forth dialogue we had between the Committee and a packed albeit a small conference room, a packed room with lots of Town officials, Planning Board, Conservation, and Selectmen so there is interest there. There are a lot of differences of opinion if you will in New Hampton about the direction of the community so I'm not saying that the folks we met with in that room reflected consensus, but the folks received that initial briefing, I think we agree we had some really dialogue so I think there's a part of all these briefings and that's another good point is that the Committee has been sharing this information with presentations. We presented to the Main Street, the Greater Meredith Program, we presented to the Meredith Selectmen, Ashland early on, Center Harbor, New Hampton, I think we have a Lion's Club presentation coming up next week so they have been trying to get the word out in this broad goal of managing the watershed and of all those presentations, the New Hampton one was the most constructive. Roger Hogan – Resident of Meredith. I also work for the Belknap County Conservation District and I'm speaking just as a resident of Meredith at this point. I'm going to support this move, I think we're faced with a situation where we have a lake that's a water supply for a Town where there are no alternatives and that lake is starting to show signs of declining. I think the issues are clear and I would like to commend the fact that Meredith is willing to take the first step forward toward rectifying that problem. Vadney – Further comments. While you're thinking of your comments, I'll read one more letter into the record. These letters will be on file. This one is an e-mail from Don Jutton. (Vadney read e-mail from Don Jutton into the record, see attached.) Anyone else in the audience. Chris Knisely – I have to agree with that letter. It would create a hardship by increasing the lot size to 2 acres from a financial point of view as far as the sale is concerned, especially for those people who have invested in this land to hold it for their old age for retirement income. Kahn – Just a comment on the letter so it doesn't go without a response, Mr. Jutton I guess has not read the Waukegan Watershed Advisory Committee report and this proposal is part of something that's been going on for a couple of years. It's not something that just sort of sprang out by itself. They have been studying it for a couple of years. Another study is a way of killing it, you study something until its dead and so I very much disagree with his point that it should be studied more and I also don't agree that it's an incremental regulation. It's part of, the Watershed Committee report has a number of risks set out and the #1 risk is septic, but this is #2, site development. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, if I could just add something not about the letter but there's been a lot said about property rights and John had touched on the base of the pressure that we as a Board have felt and while we take the applicant's property rights in, we also have to take all the abutter's property rights into how it does change a neighborhood when a subdivision

comes in and unfortunately what we've seen in the past year have been a number of subdivisions and we have had neighborhoods up in arms because nobody wants it in their back yard and while I feel for both sides, I do think we have to do something to protect the water and to tighten up what's already out there. We're not saying no, you can't do it, but it does have to be tightened to some degree. Vadney – This issue does go beyond the normal definition of abutters because people a long distance from the lake are drinking the water and using it so that is a worthwhile point. Eifert - Was he representing the Greater Meredith Program? Vadney – It's not clear from his letter. I read it as he wrote it. He said I am writing in my capacity as Chairman of the Greater Meredith Program Economic Development Committee, but he signed it Don Jutton, President of Municipal Resources which is a company that he runs. Eifert – My comment on that because when we presented to the GMP, I don't believe he was there and I agree with Mr. Kahn, he probably didn't read our plan. I think it is an important thing to do before commenting on it and I agree that this waiting another year is a way to kill it. We have done a lot of study and the longer we wait, the more detriment to the lake. When you talk about abutters, we have 3,000 people drinking out of that lake. I consider them abutters in a way and I would think the GMP would be in favor of this if approved so I'm surprised he's speaking out on behalf of them because they were well receptive to our presentation and of course a lot of their business depends on the quality of the drinking water they serve to their clients. Bliss – I was just going to add that on the e-mail that we do have, it is carbon copied to Jeanie Forrester and Rusty McLear, but it wasn't sent out until today at 11:30. Vadney – There is always in this kind of situation where there's already a lot of development on the lake, the idea that we're locking the barn door after the horses are gone and we have all known since 1st grade that's not a wise move. However, in this case, I think it would be more appropriate to think we may be trying to at least close the door while some of the horses are still in the barn and to delay it a year as he recommends here would let several of those horses out of the barn so to speak. Vadney – Mr. Prescott, do you have another question or comment? Prescott – It sounds like the #2 problem with lawn area and lawn production, what's to stop a house on a 2-acre lot to have 2 acres of lawn. Vadney – That's a good point. Prescott – Are we going to regulate that next? We've had that recommendation; we have not gone with it yet. Edgar – Mr. Chairman, I think a lot of that particular threat is addressed through some of the educational recommendations in the plan. I don't think this plan is intended to regulate lawn areas, but John's point is well taken that you can have a conventional subdivision with large lots and if the entire lot is lawn area, you have other risks and that's why I said at the outset from the word go that this is not the only piece, it's an important piece, but it's not the only piece and there's a lot of other things when you take into the whole, the management plan has recommended this to try to address various aspects of it, including lawns and other sources of potential pollution. I don't believe the plan calls for the regulation of lawn areas, but it does recognize a correlation between density and some of the things that come with density. John Hodsdon – I would like to agree with what John just said and essentially I also favor the incremental approach. If you took everything under the sun and put it into one regulation and let it do or die, it would die. We should go forward and do these other things as well as this. As far as some of the regulations on lawns, an awful lot depends not only on the soils and slopes, but management and other things, but as far as regulating the total amount of lawns, if you look at what is coming down through EPA and DES on the anti-degradation program,

depending on the state of a watershed and body of water that they are talking about, there will be some regulations on that and it will probably be first and more impaired waters that there will be regulations such as 65% or more shall be kept in the undisturbed state and less than 20% shall be impervious surface, paving, roofs, etc., so what falls in between those two, things like lawns. Kahn – Could we enter the Waukegan Watershed Advisory Committee report in our record. Vadney – I think it is part of the record, as far as this meeting goes, certainly. The Waukegan Watershed Advisory Committee report is part of the record for this hearing. We have a letter here from Tom Swaim, President of the Waukegan Shore Owners Association. (Tom Swaim's letter read into the record and included as part of these minutes, see attached.) (Another letter addressed to Herb Vadney, Chairman of the Meredith Planning Board from Wadleigh, Starr & Peters on behalf of James and Peter Gerrity, Stephen Hallett and Brad Leighton was also read into the record and included as part of these minutes, see attached.) Vadney - All letters will be on file at the Town Office. Anybody wish to make any additional statements? This is a sticky wicket so to speak when it comes to Planning Board business because we realize that there are diametrically opposed people involved here. We do think in this case, we want to lock the barn door before all the horses are gone and we do think that the drinking supply of the 3 or 4 thousand people in the village would have to take priority. We recognize it is an incremental thing, but somebody mentioned, it may have been John, but anyway when you try a total comprehensive rewrite particularly when dealing with a zoning ordinance that's over 30 years old, you will find it is almost impossible to do a comprehensive look on that entire plan. That, by the way, is why about two weeks ago, we had a public hearing on a proposed change in the village District just to carve that down to a manageable size that the people can really understand, a year ago we tried doing that in a more comprehensive way and it got so big that it would have taken a 3-credit course at college to start to comprehend it and it was just really too much for us and it was too much for the citizens. And this admittedly is incremental, but I think it's incremental out of necessity. That being said, I'd like any last comments. Bayard – If we have sewer run by a place, it is required that they hook up. Vadney – That is true. Bayard – One of my concerns was that this could sort of preclude people from putting in sewer if we set it at 2 acres, but I think that's taken care of by the mandatory requirement to hook up to the sewer. Kahn – In the course of that letter that you read, I heard Mr. Leighton's name go by and I thought it would be a good idea to let the record show that he owns a fairly significant piece of property in the Business & Industry District where the zoning, John, if I'm correct right now would be 1 acre and I suspect that from his standpoint that the change from 1 acre to 2 acres as a practical matter is not really a very significant change in terms of lot size for a business of any significance. We ought to try to get that information to him so he doesn't unnecessarily spend on legal fees. Vadney – I don't want to leave any impression that we're making Mr. Leighton's mind up for him here. He had his name included in this letter as opposing this proposal. Edgar – The interest that the lawyer's eluding to which Steve indicated in his letter is that he has the property under agreement. He is not a property owner in the watershed, but he's developing plans for the possible development of that property. Vadney – They've teamed up in this one letter from the lawyer. Edgar – If I could just add one thing that I think is important because if the Watershed District obviously has its limitations, it's intended to effect property that drains into the lake and we wouldn't want anybody to leave the room thinking that Meredith Bay

or other water bodies don't matter. This is a little bit different for the reasons we've all spoken, but I think for those that are looking at Meredith Bay, the Selectmen, there's been a lot of discussion about Meredith Bay, if you look at that map and if you understand where the water goes, everything we do to protect this watershed drains into Meredith Bay so in a very direct way to the extent that we are successful collectively on a lot of fronts with respect to the water quality in this watershed, it'll contribute to improve water quality in Meredith Bay and, similarly, I think Ed Touhey is the Planning Board representative to a newly formed group that is going to involve a collaborative effort between our Conservation Commission, our Planning Board, the Lake Winnepesaukee Association, the Belknap County Conservation District, the North Country Resource Conservation Development Area, the Town of Gilford and the City of Laconia to try to jointly look at a management plan for the Paugus Bay, Meredith Bay, Saunders Bay and Winnepesaukee and even though this district is being set up for the purposes that we've spoken, we wouldn't want to leave anybody with the impression that it doesn't matter elsewhere and that Meredith Bay is a shared concern as are other water bodies. Vadney – For those of you who don't know this, that Lake Waukegan Watershed team from the five involved towns, that's the first or one of the first major studies done in the State on a localized watershed like that, but I'm quite sure you can look for more of it and that's why Ed Touhey is now on that one looking at Lake Winnepesaukee and down through involving the towns further downstream and of course we dump into that. Touhey – I find this difficult, we are weighing quality of our drinking water, I quite honestly don't know what the Town would really do if we ever lost this source of water, Lake Waukegan, it's going to be utilized more as time goes on for sure as the water lines are laid into different areas that are developed. I suppose we would have to go to wells, John, if we ever lost this source. Edgar – One of the things that we looked at early on at the Committee level is what would Plan B be if we lost this source and the only area that has any chance of providing the yield that we would need would be the stratified drift aquifers, the sand and gravel under Route 3 north and when you get into Route 3 north, you have a series of underground tank failures, you have a series of landfills, you have a major state highway corridor, you have several junkyards, you have all the things that would preclude us from tapping into that water supply for a municipal drinking source. And then you look at possibly cross-connecting to municipalities and the nearest municipality that we would have any kind of a chance would be Laconia and then just the elevational differences and the distance from Weirs Beach up to here is difficult. There's probably, and I don't know this for a fact, there's probably some short-term contingency planning if we had a major event on a short-term basis, we could probably pull from Meredith Bay or something like that, I wouldn't be surprised, but here again Meredith Bay isn't without its issues, it's got more boating and concentrated activity than Waukegan will ever see so we did look at that as a general matter and wells are really not an option. Vadney – There again, I want to reemphasize what John mentioned. This isn't a scare campaign, there is no immediate threat and most things that would occur can be treated for, but it gets expensive so the idea that Meredith would just simply lose its water supply is a bit far fetched. Touhey – I'm weighing that and I'm also weighing what Mrs. Knisely has said, property rights, we do have people who purchased these properties and held them in their family for probably many years, have not developed them up to this time, perhaps planned to develop them or

at least have them as an asset and I don't want your remarks to go unnoted. This is difficult and thank you for sharing.

Bliss moved, Bayard seconded, RECOGNIZING THAT THIS IS A FIRST STEP AND THAT WE WILL PROBABLY RE-LOOK AT THIS IN THE FUTURE, I WOULD AT THIS POINT MOVE THAT WE SEND IT TO THE BALLOT FOR A VOTE. Voted 5-0 in favor of the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.