



# New Hampshire State Senate **NEWS RELEASE**

**For Immediate Release:**  
February 23, 2011

**Contact:**  
Carole Alfano, 271-7585  
[carole.alfano@leg.state.nh.us](mailto:carole.alfano@leg.state.nh.us)

## **Senate passes pro-business legislation**

*Bills cover unnecessary record keeping, plus permitting and deadline extensions*

(Concord)The state Senate passed three bills today with the goal of making it easier to do business in New Hampshire. The legislation covers eliminating unnecessary record keeping concerning water withdrawals for snowmaking; extending wetland and shoreline permits and giving developer's protection when approved projects are stalled due to poor economy.

Speaking in support of **SB 32**, Sen. John Gallus (R-Berlin) said, "Current law requires redundant record keeping for withdrawals of water for snowmaking at ski resorts which requires additional administrative work as well as the potential of costly water metering systems." He added, SB32 broadens an operator's option for measuring water use and, by doing so, ski areas will now be able to give the Department of Environmental Services (DES) more accurate information with less burdensome regulations.

**SB 38** covers extensions for wetland and shore land permits. During committee testimony on the bill, developers told lawmakers that in today's economy, many slowdowns and setbacks can occur for permitted projects. Sen. Amanda Merrill (D-Durham) stressed, "This bill serves as a measure of relief in such circumstances. SB 38 authorizes DES to issue extensions of permits for up to five years provided it's demonstrated they are moving towards progress in the original permitting. Mitigation measures must also be in place to ensure no negative effects to water occur during the extension period."

Sen. Gary Lambert (R-Nashua) sounded a similar theme with **SB 144** saying, "This legislation extends protection from zoning and regulatory changes for certain development projects that are stalled due to poor economic conditions." Lambert noted that SB144 follows in the footsteps of SB 93 that was passed in to law two years ago but needed revisions particularly in the area of time frames for beginning and substantially completing a project.

###