

The Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission, established September 8, 1953 when the signatory states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont ratified the Compact which states, in Article I:

The principal purposes of this Compact are:

- a) To promote inter-state comity among and between the signatory states;
- b) To assure adequate storage capacity for impounding waters of the Connecticut River and its tributaries for the protection of life and property from floods;
- c) To provide a joint or common agency through which the signatory states, while promoting protecting and preserving to each the local interest and sovereignty of the respective signatory states, may more effectively cooperate in accomplishing the object of flood control and water resources utilization in the basin of the Connecticut River and its tributaries.

OFFICERS OF THE
CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION
AS OF JUNE 30, 2007

Myron Gildesgame, Chairman
Evan Hammond, Vice Chairman
Pauline M. Smiaroski, Executive Secretary and Assistant Treasurer

MEMBERS OF THE
CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION
AS OF JUNE 30, 2007

Connecticut

Charles D. Berger, Jr., 172 Blue St., Winchester 06094
Denise Ruzicka, 50 Creamery Rd., East Haddam, 06423
Barbara J. Ruhe, 915 Silas Deane Hwy., Wethersfield 06109

Massachusetts

Myron Gildesgame, Dir., Office of Water Resources, Dept. of Conservation and Recreation,
251 Causeway St., Ste. 700, Boston 02114-2104
Eugene Cavanaugh, Office of Waterways, Dept. of Conservation & Recreation, 349 Lincoln St.,
Hingham 02043
Michael Misslin, Office of Waterways, Dept. of Conservation & Recreation, 251 Causeway St., Ste. 600,
Boston, 02114

New Hampshire

Robert G. Kline, 51 N. Park St., Lebanon 03766
Fred S. Parker, 28B Union Sq., Union St., Keene 03431
Robert Grimley, PO Box 550, Grantham, 03753

Vermont

Evan Hammond, 126 Colby Rd., Lunenburg 05906
Gary Moore, Box 454, Bradford, 05033
William Pettengill, 103 Maple Hill Drive, Guilford 05301

OFFICE ADDRESS

PO Box 511, Greenfield, MA 01302
Tel.: 413-665-9761; Fax: 413-665-9761
e-mail: crvfcc@crocker.com
Website: www.crvfcc.org

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007

The ongoing efforts of the member states of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut provide significant benefits to the communities within the Connecticut River watershed. In cooperation with the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and the communities responsible for the operation and maintenance of local flood control works of improvement, the flood control system within the Connecticut River Valley functioned and operated as designed and without incident during the past year. The Commission offers its thanks to all those involved for their continuing dedication to ensuring the facilities' proper operation and provision of flood protection to the downstream areas.

The Commission recognized the need to purchase a new computer for Commission business, and Chairman Gildesgame arranged to have a new Dell system installed for the Executive Secretary.

New members on the Commission include Barbara Ruhe from Connecticut, Mike Misslin from Massachusetts, and Robert Grimley from New Hampshire.

One key issue of concern to the Commission was the notice from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding the levees on the Connecticut. In the wake of hurricane Katrina, all communities in the country are subject to decertification unless specific deficiencies are corrected. The communities were given about six months, which everyone felt was impossible. In Connecticut, the affected levees are those in Hartford and East Hartford, while Springfield and Chicopee are in Massachusetts. If the work is not completed, the communities risk FEMA changing the flood maps to show the protected areas as within the flood plain. This would mean the areas behind the structures would be shown as unprotected and the towns no longer would be eligible for federal funding to repair the structures after flood events.

There were a number of meetings about this issue and many letters were sent to the Army Corps, including one from this Commission, protesting the short notice. Subsequently, the Corps agreed to a year's time for resolving the issues.

Respectfully Submitted

Myron (Mike) Gildesgame
Chairman

SUMMARY OF THE MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION MEETINGS HELD DURING THE PERIOD OF THIS REPORT

September 15, 2006 – On this date, there were 3 vacancies on the Commission – Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. William Pettengill, new appointee from Vermont, was welcomed by all who were present. Proxies from Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont made it possible to conduct the meeting.

Minutes of the June meeting were accepted as presented. The Draft Budget was reviewed and discussion revolved around whether it was necessary to have a bond for the Chairman, thereby saving a few dollars. However, it was unanimously agreed that the Chair should be kept on the bond. Polly also questioned how the purchase of the new computer should be shown. It was decided to call it a One-Time Expense for Equipment. Motion was made and voted unanimously to accept the Budget, even though it showed a deficit. Everyone agreed it was a deficit because of the purchase of the computer.

Polly said she had received a fax yesterday afternoon indicating a new appointee by Governor Rell of Connecticut. She is Barbara Ruhe from Wethersfield. She is an attorney and has a vested interest in the work of this Commission. Mike Gildesgame said he would check with Mike Misslin from the DCR office to make sure that he intends to be a Commissioner from Massachusetts.

Greg Cloutier resigned and Governor Lynch's office had inquired as to the role of the Commissioners, etc. This indicates that they are working on finding a replacement for Greg. Polly said her records showed that Greg had been active on the Commission since 1985 and Mike submitted some appropriate words in appreciation of his work and Polly prepared and sent the letter to him.

As a matter of interest, Robert Kline talked about the Boston Lot Dam Construction taking place in NH and he introduced Scott Hazelton of Pathways Engineering who gave an interesting and thorough explanation of what had been done.

Polly reported that she had mailed out invoices for support money in early July and had already received money from Vermont, but no response yet from NH, CT or MA.

Those present at the meeting signed a Get Well card for Fred Parker who has been ill.

December 1, 2006 – Minutes of the September 16, 2006 meeting were unanimously accepted as presented. Word has been received from the NH Governor's office that Robert Grimley of Grantham, NH has been appointed to the Commission. However, he will not be confirmed until November 29, so he will not be able to be at our December meeting. His appointment will bring New Hampshire's delegation to full strength and the Commission's Board to full strength for the first time in a long time.

SUMMARY OF MINUTES (continued)

December 1, 2006 cont'd -The new Commissioners who were present today were introduced – Mike Misslin, Deputy Chief Engineer for Parkways and Water Engineering with the Massachusetts Dept. of Conservation and Recreation, and Barbara Ruhe from Wethersfield, CT, an attorney who practices Family Law.

Tax Loss Figures for 2006 were approved. Polly explained the Compact for the new members. In September, 1953, many flood control dams began to be erected in the 4 states that were impacted by the Connecticut River. Since land had to be taken from communities in order that dams could be built, it was decided that a sum of money would be paid to those towns and villages that had lost their land to the dams. She also explained that in the 1980's amounts being paid to the communities were "frozen" after a lengthy discussion by the Commission.

The Annual Report for 2005-2006 was approved. Barbara Ruhe questioned the quote at the bottom of page 5 where it says, "*the foregoing is a summary of the Minutes of meetings held during 2005-2006 and are available for inspection at the office by anyone appropriately authorized.*" She said she's familiar with the Freedom of Information Act and pretty much everything is open. Gary Moore suggested it should say, *they are available for inspection* and that should do it.

Mike said he was going to turn the meeting over to Denise who will give a briefing about the Corps of Engineers decisions regarding some of the flood control facilities and their relationship with FEMA. The Corps is proposing to decertify levees in Hartford and East Hartford, CT as well as those in Springfield, West Springfield and Chicopee, MA unless specific deficiencies are addressed before 12/31/06. Ramifications include current dike restoration work which must be completed, otherwise FEMA may not recognize the levee system in its revised flood maps. Required Remedial Actions say, "Complete the dike remediation plan."

Denise said in the case of Hartford, they are well underway to getting this work done. East Hartford had been receiving consistently good readings on their dikes and levees, so they were really hit hard when they were told there's a failure mode that hadn't been anticipated and should be corrected.

Mike Gildesgame said he would be more than happy to have a letter go out from the Commission over his signature with cc's to governors, FEMA, affected mayors, congressional delegations, etc. Motion was made by Barbara Ruhe that the Commission authorize the drafting of a letter. Denise said she might have an opportunity to go to a meeting in Washington about this and wanted to know if she could go as a representative from the Commission. Barbara motioned to authorize members of the Commission to participate in any such meetings in Washington. The decision was unanimous.

March, 2007 - The March meeting was omitted since there was no urgent business to attend to.

SUMMARY OF MINUTES (continued)

June 15, 2007 – Chairman Gildesgame asked everyone to introduce themselves and indicate the states that they represented and he welcomed the newest Commission member, Robert Grimley from New Hampshire.

Chairman Gildesgame asked Denise to return to the levee issues that we became aware of at the December meeting. She said in the case of Hartford, they just got provisionally certified and were being taken off the list. (They were in the middle of spending \$10 million out of \$30 million upgrading levees, taking down trees, etc. and spent an additional \$500,000 to expedite the work.) In East Hartford, the ACOE took a new look at their levees and there was a potential new failure mode similar to what they had seen in Katrina. They decided they'd better go back and take a look at their design and see if it could handle that failure mode, and they decided that it couldn't. The Corps said they needed to do a "retrofit" but because of endangered bats and bald eagles, which require environmental permits which usually takes a year the Corps pulled back nationwide and has said they'd give everybody a year.

This is really important in that communities are not mapped within FEMA-mapped flood plains if they're protected behind a levee or a dike. If they de-certify the levee, flood plain insurance could be too high. If you have a mortgage, you are required to have flood insurance. Many of these communities harbor low or middle-income homes and families and it would be a hardship for them. It's not too clear what East Hartford's retrofit fix is going to be but they are getting some money to work on their design. Colonel Thalken has been very supportive. Denise thanked the Commissioners for their support and for sending the letter last year on the issue. The levee issue highlights the relevance of the Flood Control Commission.

The draft budget was reviewed – Polly explained, for the benefit of new commissioners how things were set up – there is a checking account, an account where support money from the four states is deposited and drawn upon during the year, and a CD of \$40,000. This amount has been deemed necessary in case we were ever sued.

The Nominating Committee had nominated Evan Hammond as Chairman and Denise Ruzicka as Vice Chairman of the Commission for the upcoming two years. The slate would be presented at the September meeting, at which time other names could be presented and if none were presented, the Commission could vote for the new slate.

The foregoing is a summary of the Minutes of meetings held during 2006-2007. They are available for inspection.

CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION
P. O. BOX 511
GREENFIELD, MA 01302

2006 TAX LOSSES AND REPAYMENTS

<u>MASSACHUSETTS</u>	<u>VALUATION BASIS</u>	<u>TAX RATE</u>	<u>TAX LOSS</u>
<u>Knightsville</u>			
Chesterfield	\$ 16,670.00	\$14.23	\$ 250.00
Huntington	238,190.00	12.64	4,990.00
<u>Littleville</u>			
Chester	487,480.00	17.40	9,618.00
Huntington	29,360.00	12.64	615.00
<u>Birch Hill</u>			
Phillipston	110.00	8.55	1.00
Royalston	38,200.00	7.90	382.00
Templeton	694,670.00	9.44	7,433.00
Winchendon	323,620.00	11.64	6,919.00
<u>Tully</u>			
Athol	7,900.00	9.57	77.00
Royalston	180,000.00	7.90	<u>1,800.00</u>
<u>Barre Falls</u>			
All state land – no tax losses			
TOTAL			\$32,085.00
 <u>NEW HAMPSHIRE</u>			
<u>Otter Brook</u>			
Keene	\$115,090.00	\$25.54	\$3,166.00
Roxbury	26,740.00	16.81	758.00
<u>Surry Mountain</u>			
Surry	238,190.00	17.78	<u>7,765.00</u>
TOTAL			\$11,689.00

The figures included with this report voted and approved by the Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission at its quarterly meeting, December 7, 2006

CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION
P. O. BOX 511
GREENFIELD, MA 01302

2006 TAX LOSSES AND REPAYMENTS

<u>VERMONT</u>	<u>VALUATION BASIS</u>	<u>TAX RATE</u>	<u>TAX LOSS</u>
<u>Union Village</u>			
Norwich	\$3,590.00	\$19.62	\$78.00
Thetford	203,380.00	17.81	3,675.00
<u>North Hartland</u>			
Hartland	110,140.00	15.40	2,324.00
Hartford	328,470.00	28.68	7,292.00
<u>North Springfield</u>			
Springfield	32,880.00	37.60	960.00
Weathersfield	554,510.00	31.00	10,092.00
Perkinsville	11,760.00	7.90	10.00
<u>Townshend</u>			
Jamaica	42,420.00	30.97	1,756.00
Townshend	204,780.00	29.71	5,656.00
<u>Ball Mountain</u>			
Jamaica	12,460.00	30.97	516.00
Londonderry	176,020.00	24.21	<u>2,341.00</u>
TOTAL			\$34,700.00

REIMBURSEMENT FOR TAX LOSSES

<u>CONNECTICUT PAYMENTS IN REIMBURSEMENT</u>			
	<u>TAX LOSS</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>PAYMENT</u>
TO: Massachusetts	\$32,085.00	40	\$12,834.00
New Hampshire	11,689.00	40	4,676.00
Vermont	34,700.00	40	<u>13,880.00</u>
TOTAL OF PAYMENTS TO BE MADE BY CT			\$31,390.00

<u>MASSACHUSETTS PAYMENTS IN REIMBURSEMENT</u>			
	<u>TAX LOSS</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>PAYMENT</u>
TO: New Hampshire	\$11,689.00	50	\$5,845.00
Vermont	34,700.00	50	<u>\$17,350.00</u>
TOTAL OF PAYMENTS TO BE MADE BY MA			\$23,195.00

CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY
FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION
BUDGET
7/1/06-6/30/07

<u>RECEIPTS</u>	<u>FORECAST</u> <u>7/01/07-6/30/08</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u> <u>7/01/06-6/30/07</u>	<u>BUDGETED</u> <u>7/01/06-6/30/07</u>
Support Money	**\$20,810.00	\$20,310.00	\$20,810.00
Interest Received	<u>1,300.00</u>	<u>2,294.45</u>	<u>1,200.00</u>
TOTAL RECEIPTS ***	\$22,110.00	\$23,104.45	\$22,010.00
 <u>EXPENSES</u>			
Salary	\$13,518.96	\$13,518.96	\$13,518.96
Payroll Taxes	<u>3,913.36</u>	<u>3,952.36</u>	<u>\$3,965.52</u>
GROSS PAYROLL	\$17,432.32	\$17,471.32	\$17,484.48
 <u>OFFICE EXPENSES</u>			
Maintaining an Office	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Supplies	150.00	181.71	175.00
Telephone (Verizon)	485.00	483.48	450.00
Postage & Box Rent	150.00	100.50	125.00
Insurance: Bonds – Ex. Sec. and Chair	390.00	390.00	390.00
Worker’s Compensation	225.00	226.00	200.00
Travel & Meetings	2,100.00	1,687.68	2,100.00
Annual Report	100.00	86.00	100.00
Petty Cash	25.00	25.00	25.00
Miscellaneous	100.00	70.20	100.00
On-Line/Website	<u>200.00</u>	<u>139.10</u>	<u>250.00</u>
TOTAL OFFICE EXPENSES	\$4,425.00	\$3,889.67	\$4,415.00
 TOTAL EXPENSES	 \$21,857.32	 \$21,360.99	 \$21,899.48
(surplus/deficit)	 +\$252.68	 +\$1,743.46	 +\$110.52

Support money is received as follows:

Vermont	\$2,000.00
New Hampshire	\$2,000.00
Massachusetts	\$7,500.00
Connecticut	\$8,810.00 **

In addition to its annual payment of \$7,500.00, the State of Massachusetts, as an “in kind” payment, supports the Commission by providing a meeting site and record storage space. Connecticut commits \$1,310.00 more than the required \$7,500.00 for a total of \$8,810.00 for its support of the Commission.