



SPRUCE CREEK ASSOCIATION

TIDAL RESTRICTION MEETING: Notes On Options For Tidal Restriction *March 11, 2005, Kittery Town Hall*

Option: Leave/Replace/Fix It

CONS

- Structural integrity is questionable
- Doesn't allow for full tidal flushing
- Increasing development pressures on this part of the watershed; could cause a slow degradation of the Creek that might not get detected until it's too late

PROs

- Cheapest/easiest (least effort in the short term)
- Half-tidal flushing does occur and it is "working" (aka, keeping the Creek healthy) to some degree
- May be serving as a retention basin for sediments

Option: Partially/Gradually Remove It

CONS

- The dam could fail anyway

PROs

- At least we'd be doing something and could partially compensate for pressures put on the Creek by development
- We happen to have the option of partially removing as the structure is partially wooden
- Could experience an incremental return of plant and wildlife species
- Would allow for a potential study of the long-term effects of gradual return of the tide
- Better able to balance development pressures

Option: Remove It Completely

CONS

- Could cause a shock to the system
- Could compromise the value of property if low tide is ugly or smelly
- The effect of removal could be limited by the sill under I-95 if that is high enough to still block some of the tide
- Could have a negative aesthetic impact (exposed mud at low tide)

PROs

- At least we'd be doing something and could partially compensate for pressures put on the Creek by development
- Only way to avoid failure of the current dam
- Could have a positive aesthetic impact (exposed wildlife habitat at low tide)
- Allow for the return of the low marsh zone. (In impounded water areas what is missing is the "low marsh zone". This is a very productive part of marshes. Without the "low marsh zone" the water body is NOT contributing to the greater marine environment, thus, commercial fisheries of the area.)