

## WINNIPESAUKEE RIVER BASIN PROGRAM

### ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

June 18, 2020 – Conducted Electronically

**Members Present:** The meeting was called to order by Wes Anderson (Laconia), chair, at 10:02 am. Sharon McMillin (NHDES), Rene Pelletier (NHDES), Ron White (DAS), Johanna Ames (Tilton), Jeanne Beaudin (Belmont), Glen Brown (Northfield), Scott Dunn (Gilford), Ray Korber (Bay District), Brian Sullivan (Franklin), and Phil Warren (Meredith), were present at that time.

Wes announced that due to the ongoing COVID-19 crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order No. 12 and Executive Order 2020-04, that the meeting would be conducted electronically, and was being hosted via Laconia's Zoom Video Communications account.

**Minutes:** Scott moved, seconded by Brian, to approve the May 21, 2020, meeting minutes as amended. The motion passed.

**Monthly Summary Report:** Sharon distributed the *Monthly Summary Report* for May 2020 by email prior to the meeting. A review of the summary report was not presented at the meeting since Wes indicated most items would be covered later in the meeting. Scott indicated he thought there might be an error in one of the entries on the report for the governance section. Wes indicated he would check the previous minutes.

**Citizens Comments for Agenda Items:** Wes indicated that there were no guests participating on the Zoom call. As there were none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

**Governance Guidelines, MOA, & Laws:** Wes asked everyone to refer to the handouts that were distributed by email prior to the meeting, specifically to handout Item 4, which was entitled Review of Governance Guidelines, Current MOU, and Possible By-Laws. He put the handout together in order to have a rough idea of what the by-laws and upcoming schedules were, so that the AB could make changes as it saw fit. He asked if the Governance Study Group was an official sub-committee; or, an ad-hoc group, as he did not know. On the handout, he proposed changes for consideration such as biennial and annual budgets reporting and quarterly budget presentations. He asked if there were any motions or if anybody had questions, comments, or concerns.

Sharon was concerned with the 60-day prior review of the biennial budget since the DES was provided with only a three- or four-week window to prepare the budget as a bureau and then have it compiled into the agency version before the budget request was due to the NH state legislature. She asked what type of information the Board was looking for since DES might be able to provide the information in another way. Phil was looking for operational updates on a semi-annual, if not quarterly, basis. Wes asked if Phil looked at performance management updates as the same thing, and Phil affirmed that he did.

Sharon asked if the annual CMOM report that DES submitted to EPA would be a helpful model upon which to build to provide the operational updates since it included current year and proposed future work for the upcoming year. Phil acknowledged that the CMOM reports were helpful but more of an after-action report. He wanted the information ahead of time or in real time. Wes agreed to add a discussion about performance management updates to next month's meeting agenda.

In answer to Wes' question regarding the Governance Study Group, Scott said to the best of his knowledge it was not an official subcommittee. He asked if CIP Subcommittee and the Governance Study Group members were voted on or appointed and who they were, as he could not recall. Wes asked if anybody knew the answer. As no one knew, Wes offered to review past meeting minutes in order to determine an answer to the question. Scott was not sure that mattered, as positions on both may need to be reaffirmed annually by Advisory Board vote. Wes recommended adding a vote to next month's meeting agenda and annually in July going forward.

**Rate Assessment Formula Update:** Wes asked everybody to refer to the handouts that were distributed by email prior to the meeting, specifically to handout Item 5, which outlined his proposed modifications to the rate allocation model that DES had proposed. He updated his table from handout item 5 yesterday and sent out the updated table by email last night.

Wes explained that he had met with Belmont and Tilton and those two member communities had a concern with regard to I&I and the model method. His table tracked the I&I through the model. He asked if there were any questions, comments, or concerns regarding his table.

Brian acknowledged that approximately 75 percent of Franklin's flow traveled through the River Street pumping station and that I&I has already been accounted for in that flow. His other area has water meters and I&I for that area was currently unknown; although, he plans to have Underwood Engineer's determine what it was for that area. He asked if Wes realized that the Underwood number for the River Street pumping station included I&I. Wes affirmed that in order to make the model work he had assumed a 67% I&I for Franklin's entire system and used it only against the water metered area to derive the numbers in column 11 of his model. The numbers were less important than the model and could be adjusted later.

Brian asked where the numbers were in the table for the I&I at the pumping stations in the north. Wes affirmed that they were in column two. Sharon was concerned because a factor was added to column 13 for the northern member communities, too. Wes affirmed that a factor had been added because doing so made the model work correctly. Sharon was concerned because all flows in the northern member communities were already sewer metered. Calculating in the manner that he was suggesting might result in double billings, as there would be a charge for both the flow and more for I&I that had already been accounted for by the sewer flow meters.

Sharon was also concerned with where his table indicated that I&I entered the system. Wes suggested for them to meet offline to discuss the differences. Sharon asked about the number of sewer connections, which were multiplied by a factor of 135 gallons per day for Belmont but less for Tilton, and noted that this did not differentiate between seasonal and other business uses. Wes suggested that to improve the accuracy here, more money must be spent. Sharon disagreed, reiterating that the spreadsheets for each community used for her model addressed the issue by tallying flow for each property. Wes asked if there were any questions, comments, and concerns regarding the logic behind his table and not the actual numbers.

Brian and Ray expressed concern with it. Brian suggested Wes get together with Sharon to work on it. Ray asked if there was GIS data for the problem areas in the four southern member communities and whether the size and length of the pipes were known. Brian acknowledged that the data was included

in the Underwood report for Franklin. Ray suggested gathering the data as it may be the best way to address I&I as there was no way to determine the accuracy per capita. The only solution otherwise (outside of an infiltration study) was to apply an industry standard number to the size of the collection system – inch miles of pipeline. Sharon noted that age and materials would also need to be taken into consideration and could be done by using industry standard numbers. For instance, Northfield has replaced its entire system with new PVC pipe. She noted that the unknown flow volumes were a very small percent of the total; only 3-4% was unaccounted for by sewer metering in the models.

Jeanne noted that she had provided Wes with Belmont's I&I data from Underwood. Wes noted that column 9 took that data into account. Sharon asked with regard to his calculations for Belmont, what the 659 added to the number of sewer connections represented and also asked if she could get the Belmont I/I study to review. Wes suggested that he and Sharon discuss the numbers offline. Brian expressed his intent to have Underwood work with Sharon to address the percent on Franklin's end. Underwood has done a lot of camera work in Franklin, and Brian wanted them to continue helping out. Wes asked if Tilton and Northfield had I&I data. Johanna acknowledged that an I&I study had not been conducted in years. Glen was not sure and agreed to find out if any information was available.

Scott was concerned about additional I&I given what Sharon had said. Since Gilford is 100% metered, more I/I was being added. Brian shared Scott's concern. Wes noted that there was I&I in other areas, not just at the River Street pump station but for everything south of Laconia's sewer meter, and that it may make sense to divvy it up between all of the member communities. Somehow, I&I had to be defined for Belmont, Franklin, Northfield, and Tilton, and hyper-accuracy would come with a price tag. He did not believe that hyper-accuracy was the way to go.

Wes asked if everybody generally agreed with his table outside of the actual numbers which he would continue working on if they were in general agreement. Brian was confused, because Sharon had a model and Wes had a model. He suggested blending the two. Johanna had serious concerns because the surrounding communities have either conducted I&I studies or have new PVC pipe. She felt as though unexplained I&I would be attributed to Tilton, and that attributing all of it to Tilton may not be fair if not all of it was coming from Tilton. Wes believed that his table best addressed Tilton's concern since it divided I/I for the main interceptor between all communities.

Belmont agreed with Wes' model. Tilton still had questions but agreed in concept. Brian was in agreement; however, he asked Wes to work with Sharon in order to blend his table into Sharon's model. He was not willing to go with just one or the other. Brian reiterated that Wes needed to discuss his table with DES, the four northern member communities, and Underwood. Wes did not believe that it was necessary to blend the two and that his table was the better option. Northfield still had questions. Laconia agreed with the model. Ray felt that Wes' table required a lot of work, with the logic as well as the numbers, although he was in agreement overall with the structure. Ron was in agreement with the structure but had questions on the numbers. Phil concurred with Ray regarding the structure being acceptable. Scott was in general agreement.

**Authority Workgroup Update:** Wes asked everybody to refer to the handouts that were distributed by email prior to the meeting, specifically to handout Item 6, which included a table reviewing status of the escrow account and Commissioner Scott's letter to the Advisory Board, dated June 9, 2020,

regarding the WRBP governance roadmap and DES' response to the proposed next steps. He asked if there were any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the two items.

Brian acknowledged that the letter addressed the expectations that the DES had moving forward. For example, the Advisory Board would be required to arrive at a unanimous consensus. Others required the involvement of the Governance Workgroup. He further acknowledged that the Governance Subcommittee (corrected to Workgroup since not a subcommittee) would play a bigger role than the Advisory Board moving forward, as it also include administrators and managers from the member communities.

Brian asked when the Governance Workgroup would be gathering, given the DES' required expectations. He asked if the Governance Workgroup had a chair and when the Advisory Board planned to reach out to the member communities. Wes needed to research the by-laws and previous meeting minutes first. Brian acknowledged that there was some confusion regarding a meeting last week, as it was unclear whether last week's meeting was the Governance Workgroup or the CIP Subcommittee. Wes acknowledged that it had met as the Governance Study Group. The Group has a standing meeting every Thursday.

Brian asked if the vote had been to have CIP Subcommittee members sit on both. Wes affirmed that in his recollection it was. Brian suggested the Governance Study Group set up a meeting with the administrators and managers, and asked when such a meeting might take place and whether Wes or Scott would be sending out the invitations. Wes reiterated that he needed to review the by-laws and previous meeting minutes, in order to determine the membership and which of them would do so. Wes indicated that it was unclear and he would have to research.

**Voting Criteria Discussion:** Wes asked everybody to refer to the handouts that were distributed by email prior to the meeting, specifically to handout Item 7, which outlined his view regarding three possible voting options; majority, super-majority, or unanimous. He described super-majority as either 2/3 or 3/4 of the members. In summary, it appeared as though all votes have been a simple majority outside of those involving capital expenses over \$50K. He asked whether members wished to continue doing what they have been doing, especially on critical decisions. Brian asked whether the vote would affect the Governance workgroup and if other options could be done for different votes. Wes reiterated that he needed to review the by-laws and previous meeting minutes in order to answer the question.

Scott moved, seconded by Phil, for all Advisory Board decisions be made by a simple majority. Jeanne, Johanna, Brian, and Glen opposed the motion. Wes, Ray, Phil, and Scott supported the motion. Ron, who rejoined the meeting after being absent for much of the prior discussion, supported the motion. The motion carried.

**Other Business:** Sharon announced that, for the past 25 years, the Franklin WWTP has been sending biosolids to be beneficially land applied on farm fields. The contract for transportation and land application is no longer an option due to concerns regarding PFAS and legal liability issues relating to that practice. A new contract has been awarded to send the biosolids to another WWTP that will compost the biosolids so that they can be sold retail as a Class A biosolid. This contract will cost three

and a half times more than the current contract. A couple of new revenue streams may help offset some of the increase in the contract change cost; although, they will not fully offset the increase.

Brian asked who were the members of the Governance workgroup. Jeanne thought they were the signatories of the original 2011 MOU. Brian asked if the workgroup would be setting up public meetings. Belmont reiterated their stance that they were not prepared to expend any more money without further information. No public meetings are currently planned.

Brian asked if the July meeting could be cancelled to give members a breather and that they could re-group in August. Wes wanted to hold the July Advisory Board meeting but, after discussion, indicated that it might just have the rate formula as the only agenda item.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 16, 2020 at 10:00 am. The venue is to be determined; however, hosting it via Laconia's Zoom Video Communications account is an option given that many members were not comfortable meeting in person yet.

The minutes were prepared by Pro-Temp Staffing.