

Original Message-----

From: Jim Breen [mailto:jimbosr@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 9:06 AM

To: Ives, Wayne

Subject: Re: Lamprey River Water Management Plan Report

Mr. Ives,

I am a resident of the Pawtuckaway lake area and listened to your comments this past weekend. I have some questions for you.

1. Was a legislative study, showing negative impact to the designated river area, done prior to enacting this legislation funding you and your study? It appears the whole focus of this report is to sell the river flow whether or not it makes scientific sense.
2. You studied the river flow for many years and used this to justify your report, but couldn't be bothered to study the history of the Pawtuckaway Lake pool levels during this time frame. Instead you use "Change in water level is based on a starting point of full pool. Lower starting points will result in larger changes in water level." This is where your report is totally unrealistic. If you are using drought figures for your river flow rates, justifying water draws, why wouldn't you use drought conditions for the level of your water source to draw from. No science here. Just political salesmanship. Much easier to justify just 3 inches from full pond level than 8 inches from a pond already down a foot!
3. You stated the draw down will only affect 75 acres 10% of Pawtuckaway's 750 acres. Since you didn't do any study of Pawtuckaway, is this using the volume of the lake as if it were a flat bottom with square sides? So if 50% of Pawtuckaway's acreage is located in the first 3 inches, at full pond level, your draw down could affect 375 acres. But that would require a proper study, which is not the case here.
4. Your 2 day draw is to restore a minimal flow to the designated area of study for 1 day. I have to ask if you looked at how many acres are we affecting with this restored flow? If the river area we are looking at is 12.05 miles long and the restored river is 25 feet wide (Optimistic), we have restored 36 acres of the river for ONE day. Yet you claim to be disturbing 75 acres of Pawtuckaway for the remainder of the drought period (Many Days). This doesn't make sense to me! Then you talked about the reclaiming properties of the lake. That requires rain. But if it rains you don't need the draw down?

I will admit I am not an engineer, however my common sense would tell me, running a couple of days of water across a dry river bed is not much help to the environment, when all areas of the environment are being stressed. Ask your "Grass engineers", who tell us not to water a lawn with a minimal amount of water, because the grass will be better able to take care of itself through a dry period without it.

Your comments Saturday, seem to indicate, all the water held in Pawtuckaway lake is un-natural and the reason for the river flow being low. Seems to me, if all the damns

were removed and all the water were allowed to flow into Great Bay all year long, a drought would have the same effect on your designated area as it does now. Plus, all the wetlands, marshes etc. now created from the damns would be gone also.

In conclusion, your study and report is far short of a truly impartial look at the benefits versus the side effects of this river flow plan. We need a third party impartial review of the whole thing prior to pulling or leaving boards in the damns of these lakes.

James Breen
14 Brustle Rd.
Nottingham, NH.