



**PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE ON WETLAND BUFFERS MEETING  
LOCATION: TOWNHALL LANDUSE OFFICE  
333 CALEF HIGHWAY  
BARRINGTON, NH 03825**

**Tuesday July 19, 2018  
3:00 p.m.**

**MEETING MINUTES**

Fred Nichols called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. There was a delay until a quorum was reached.

Members Present

Fred Nichols, Chair  
Jeff Brann  
Donna Massucci  
Doug Bowgen  
John Huckins

Member Absent

Ken Grossman

Staff

Marcia Gasses

*Without objection the minutes of May 8, 2018 were approved.*

1) Discuss RFP for wetland scientist services

F. Nichols asked if the minimum the Town needed for an RFP would be a scope of work or statement of problem.

M. Gasses explained the minutes reflected the committee was interested in identifying the different types of wetlands and developing buffers based upon the types of functions and values they had.

J. Brann expressed that ultimately the development of buffers based upon functions and values was what they wanted. Cynthia Balcius was going to develop an outline of the project to identify the different categories and put the cost together for what it would take to come up with the plan. Cynthia had offered to do that for free.

M. Gasses expressed that they could state that they were working to come up with a wetland buffer ordinance based upon functions and values and we would like them to assist the Board in developing the ordinance.

F. Nichols expressed we could start by stating that Barrington currently uses the inventory method of identifying wetlands, and functionality is not included in the definition of buffers. The goal would be to categorize buffers based on functionality and match a buffer to the category.

J. Brann expressed you would determine the categories and then the values. The buffer size would then be based upon the end values for that category.

F. Nichols expressed in identifying the category we would want to list the things that we were trying to protect; flood control, water quality, and habitat.

F. Nichols went on to express that we may want to break it down further that one buffer may be to protect larger animals and another to protect smaller.

J. Brann expressed that like the NH Method there are questions about what type of wildlife you are trying to protect. They look at where the well is, and whether there is infiltration before the wetland when trying to protect drinking water.

F. Nichols expressed we want an expert to break that out for us and give us enough information that we could then assign points.

J. Huckins expressed the scientist could.

J. Brann expressed that they wanted to design a ranking system that the wetland scientist would then utilize and go out and rank the wetlands for the applicant.

D. Bowgen expressed he thought they were getting away for the point system.

J. Brann expressed that the ordinance would set the standard for the rating of the wetlands and the scientist would rate the wetland according to the standard. The group had given Cynthia Balcius their top three priorities out of the fourteen in the NH method.

J. Huckins expressed that here are functions the wetland supplies, we are giving so much value to each function and the buffer would be increased according to the values starting with a base value. Cynthia Balcius seemed to understand what they were trying to do. The RFP could state we wanted to establish different wetland buffer requirements based upon functions and values.

J. Brann expressed that although Cynthia was currently tied up with a State project she could respond to the RFP if she was interested.

D. Bowgen expressed the key was whether they had what they needed for a complete RFP and Cynthia Balcius was going to help with that. Did they now have what they needed?

J. Brann expressed we need the scientists expertise on the functions and values and then we could develop an ordinance, we needed the technical expertise.

F. Nichols expressed they were looking for a wetland scientist to come in and give them three up to five categories with prime being the most functional we wanted to protect.

J. Huckins expressed the wetlands with the higher value would have the larger buffer.

J. Brann expressed with prime wetlands they could start with 100' as a minimum and go up from there based upon its values. Maybe with other wetlands there would be a minimum of 30'.

D. Bowgen thought the group should review the fourteen functions in the NH Method.

J. Huckins expressed that the important thing was to get the RFP out and get someone to help the committee decide what was important, so that the committee could move something forward.

J. Brann read the Functions listed under the NH method.

The 2015 edition of the NH Method included:

- Ecological Integrity
- Wetland –Dependent Wildlife Habitat
- Fish and Aquatic Life Habitat
- Scenic Quality
- Educational Potential
- Wetland-Based Recreation
- Flood Storage
- Groundwater Recharge
- Sediment Trapping
- Nutrient Trapping/Retention/transformation
- Shoreline Anchoring
- Noteworthiness

J. Huckins expressed that it was important to get the information from the wetland scientist, before deciding which additional functions were most important to Barrington.

F. Nichols expressed we would want to have a meeting with the scientists applying for the RFP so that the committee could discuss what they were looking for with them.

J. Brann expressed to be fair the committee should meet with the others because Cynthia Balcius had information that the others would not have.

F. Nichols expressed that they were looking for a certified wetland scientist to help the Town develop buffers based upon the functional criteria of the wetlands.

J. Brann expressed the RFP could state that on such and such a day any applicant could come in and discuss with the committee what they were looking for. That way everyone would have the same information that Cynthia had.

*J. Brann made a motion and D. Massucci seconded that we will have a generalized RFP to solicit proposals to assist the committee with development of wetland buffers based on functionality of wetlands and values and that we will have a pre-bid meeting with interested parties. The motion carried unanimously*

F. Nichols mentioned that a large wetland may have different functions and values in different locations and questioned whether the same buffer would be applied to the entire wetland.

J. Huckins expressed that this was already done. A prime wetland was part of a regular wetland and had a different buffer.

F. Nichols expressed that the next meeting would be set after the RFP went out and would be on a Thursday at 3p.m.

*Without objection the meeting was adjourned at 4:20.*

Respectfully submitted,

Marcia J. Gasses  
Town Planner & land Use Administrator