| PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE | Workshop participants discussed what they value about living in the Nashua Region, what could use improvement, and what some of the region's needs are. | |
|---|---|---|
| What Works | Challenges | Regional Needs |
| 1- local control is good | 2 & 3-aging infrastructure, all is reaching end of life in northeast | 3- funding |
| 1-the consent decree from EPA is a good incentive program in the city of Nashua | 2-regulations are more narrative at the expense of science | 3-increased demand from increase in population |
| 1-abundant conservation land for water infiltration | 2- aging infrastructure, funding gap, any increase is seen as too much | 3- long term cost and development |
| 1-Wilton Fire Department upgraded building for storm water | 2- not enough FUNDING!! | 3- MS4, is confusing and cost is high |
| 1-good education about where water is going | 2- Ground water - how it is treated or isn't treated | 3- regional coordination on MS4 and education |
| 1-abundant unpolluted water supply, but isn't always where needed | 2-competing water interests, Milford's supply in Amherst and Hudson's in Litchfield | 3- regional infrastructure |
| 1-communication between water groups | 2-towns compete with each other for limited resources | 3- want sewer for increased economic opportunity but no money |
| 1-communities making investments for upgrades | 2- need local aid | 3-better inventory of existing infrastructure maintenance (asset management) |
| 1-economic engines for investments | 2- Milford fish hatchery | 3-build pipes and storm water gets taken to small water supplies. I.e. brooks |
| 1- strong infrastructure in individual communities but not all | 2- Milford sewer is not sufficient | 3-cooperative approach to help solve economy of scale issues |
| 1-effective incentives in Nashua | 2- not enough regional collaboration | 3-more community collaboration |
| 1-good residential conservation | 2- storm water doesn't follow political boundaries | 3-need money for good ordinances in all towns and ability to enforce |
| 1-good regulations, depending on community | 2- cost burden on tax payers | 3-need to charge more for water (undervalued) |
| 1-capital improvement funds are a good way to budget for needs but isn't always adequate | 2- too much rain can't handle and dumps into Merrimack river, CSO's | 3-older infrastructure, very expensive to replace |
| 1-relatively low population | 2-better ordinances needed, funding to create them, enforcement | 3-regionally consistent municipal controls and ordinances needed |
| 1-supply is currently adequate | 2-water supply costs to ensure adequate fire suppression | 3-create a fee structure based on property characteristics |
| 1-water conservation increasing | 2-innovative retrofits still expensive | 3-planning for co-incidence of projects |
| | 2-competing priorities between water and schools, transportation, etc. | 3-sewer, disagreement about whether it is needed, development and density vs. rural character |
| | 2-increasing water needs, everyone wants a pool | 3-storm water infrastructure needs should be treated like all other water infrastructure needs |
| | 2-lack of ongoing investment results in huge infrastructure costs in long run | |
| | 2-limited resources leading to reactionary approach vs. proactive | |
| | 2-contamination from past industrial development along rivers | |
| | 2-people want green lawns, which results in fertilizer contamination, increased water demand | |
| | 2-residents expect water infrastructure everywhere, but who pays for it? | |
| | 2-sustainability depends on local users funding water infrastructure, not state or fed government | |
| | 2-voters won't approve infrastructure funding, seen as a threat to rural character | |
| | 2-water boundaries don't match political boundaries can be a challenge | |
| | 2-water infrastructure not always where it needs to be | |

| REGULATIONS | Workshop participants discussed what they value about living in the Nashua Region, what could use improvement, and what some of the region's needs are. | |
|---|---|---|
| What Works | Challenges | Regional Needs |
| 1- 50 foot buffer works! | 2- money drives projects | 3- break through in large septic system technology |
| 1- changing technologies increase more LID projects | 2- challenge with communication with public officials of why we need these regulations | 3- density vs. open space |
| 1- land use regulations (Pelham) | 2- examples and models to encourage consistency between towns | 3- let people know what the regulations are |
| 1- parking restrictions (Pelham) | 2- infrastructure changes | 3- NRPC help with guidance |
| 1- porous pavement works well | 2- ordinances not supportive | 3- show people that if they do not follow these regulations how they will be negatively affected later |
| 1- rain gardens are great! | 2- Route 28 Pelham - sewer | 3- why MS4 not a negative |
| 1- well head protection system helps (Pelham) | 2- Shore land protection act, local regulations conflict | 3-economic incentives for collaboration |
| 1-carrots are better than sticks | 2- unfamiliar technology, encourage LID and BMP's | 3-guidance for each community on what they need for regulations but don't tell them specifically what to adopt |
| 1-education might work better than enforcement | 2-agriculture has too much flexibility in terms of what they can put on ground in source water protection area | 3-need to coordinate regulations with overall planning |
| 1- pre-treatment of water | 2-contributions to sprawl | 3- short term vs. long term maintenance costs, long term costs have been ignored |
| 1-groundwater regulations are effective | 2-costs of new storm water regulations and timeframe too short | 3-using education on regulations regionally or in other areas |
| 1-goals in new MS4 are good | 2-lack of staff to enforce regulations | 3-regional aquifer protection needed, model guidelines for all towns |
| 1-major initiatives have worked, many good examples of good regulations | 2-manure management, private residents difficult to regulate (ex horse farms in Amherst) | 3-go beyond state identification of WHPA's and Sanitary Protective Radii |
| 1-relations with state agencies is good | 2-narrative -based permit regulations vs. science-based | 3-redevelopment is now a priority, regulations maybe antiquated and encourage sprawl |
| 1-tackle storm water on site and when development first occurs | 2-NH relinquished primacy for MS4 permit to EPA | |
| | 2-no regulation for residential storm water, the only tool towns have is education | |
| | 2- increase buffer size for decreased impervious surface | |
| | 2-MS4 costs are high, standards are based on old data, back log at EPA | |
| | 2-old regulations don't match modern priorities | |
| | 2-program implementation lags behind targets | |

## PUBLIC EDUCATION

Workshop participants discussed what they value about living in the Nashua Region, what could use improvement, and what some of the region's needs are.

| What Works | Challenges | Regional Needs |
|---|---|---|
| 1- the dump police are great! | 2- Developers do not understand that it's "onerous" | 3- money go into conservation |
| 1- porous sidewalks work well | 2- lack of interest - sewer | 3- be the example for your community |
| 1- program by DES promoting "soak up the rain" | 2- man-made boundaries: focus on watersheds | 3- education continuing process - PRIORITY |
| 1- public gets message | 2- public vs. developers: competing interests | 3- education for public officials |
| 1- public recycles = more investment in community | 2-are we targeting the right people | 3- we should promote green products |
| 1- recycling education should be the model for teaching about water | 2-commercial sites are cleaner than residential sites | 3- jurisdiction where competing thoughts can appeal to a higher person to put pressure on neighboring communities |
| 1- town image maintained by current use taxation | 2-disconnect of public to services | 3- let people know what the regulations are |
| 1- UNH storm water center: lots of examples | 2-have to convince people they have skin in the game | 3- look at bigger picture |
| 1-awareness becoming more culturally ingrained | 2-how do you encourage people to do the right thing? | 3- NRPC more regional coordination |
| 1-catch basin signs do work | 2-lack of visibility compared to schools /fire & other | 3- recycle: create incentives to do it |
| 1-consumer confidence reports to tell users about their water quality | 2-more self-promotion, better marketing | 3- revenue from recycling |
| 1-drainage maintenance in wilt on | 2-no catch basin cleaning program in Nashua | 3- towns in the same watershed work together |
| 1-elementary school programs | 2-personal resistance to programs and projects | 3-capacity to educate agriculture and golf course related pollution |
| 1-enforcement provides opportunity for education | 2-services taken for granted | 3-need more data for analysis |
| 1-good knowledge base and progressive mentality overall | | 3-emphasize needs for emergency prep. |
| 1-growing bmp awareness | | 3-good and timely data |
| 1-increasing accessibility to data | | 3-guidance for each community |
| 1-lots of education outlets, local cable, town website | | 3-keep doing regional -approach meetings |
| 1-Milford has mandatory industrial per treatment, gives them foot in the door to observe other potential contaminations | | 3-lake host programs depend on volunteers |
| 1-Nashua found it cost effective to produce educational materials for specific trouble areas | | 3-let people know who in town they can report violations to |
| 1-road salt reduction program | | 3-more awareness for private well testing, partnership with public health officials |
| 1-school curriculums are working | | 3-NRPC stay ahead of planning boards |
| 1-storm water is now part of school curriculum | | 3-post information on roadside storm water swales |
| 1-tours of waste water treatment plant for school kids, good opportunity for overall environmental education | | 3-reach the masses |
| 1- Lake host for Robinson and Ottarnic ponds, Hudson | | 3-regional approach |
| 1-ability to go online and anonymously report violations | | 3-regional clearinghouse of ideas resources data |
| 1-painting storm drains "drains to..." | | 3-stronger recommendations from nap |
| 1-funding for souhegan fluvial erosion | | 3-target champions |
| 1-water efficiency kits | | 3-water usage and lawn care for residents (pinchcock currently targets school kids) |
| | | 3-charge more for water proportional to value |
| | | 3-promote use of gray water |