

WINNIPESAUKEE RIVER BASIN PROGRAM

ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

July 16, 2020 – Conducted Electronically

Members Present: The meeting was called to order by Wes Anderson (Laconia), chair, at 10:02 am. Ron White (DAS), Sharon McMillin (NHDES), Rene Pelletier (NHDES), Johanna Ames (Tilton), Jeanne Beaudin (Belmont), Glen Brown (Northfield), Scott Dunn (Gilford), Ray Korber (Bay District), Trish Stafford (Sanbornton), 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 Jeanne, to approve the June 18, 2020 meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried.

Monthly Summary Report: Sharon distributed the *Monthly Summary Report* for May 2020 by email prior to the meeting. A summary was not provided at the meeting. Wes asked if there were any questions for Sharon. As there were none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

Citizens Comments for Agenda Items: Wes asked if there were any guests from the members communities participating on the Zoom call and if they had any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the agenda items. As there were no guests participating, he moved on to the next agenda item.

Governance Guidelines, MOA, & By-laws: Wes asked everyone to refer to the handouts that were distributed by email prior to the meeting, specifically to handout Item 4. Item 4 included a draft schedule and references he used to put it together. The goal of the draft schedule for meeting agenda items so that deadlines and topics could be spread out. He asked if there were any questions.

Scott asked if the recommended 60-day budget review on page one of the draft schedule would work for Sharon because of the state's budget process. On the second page (Enclosure A) under February, the draft schedule recommended a review of performance measures for the first six months of the year, and Scott asked which six months that the Advisory Board would review. Wes explained that the Advisory Board would review July through December of the previous year. Scott asked Wes if he would clarify that in the final schedule.

Sharon asked Wes and Scott which performance measures they wished to see noting that the annual Balance Scorecard metrics were approved by the Advisory Board and covered many performance measures already. The Balanced Scorecard is posted on the WRBP website each year. Wes suggested for the three of them meet and review the annual CMOM reports, the Balance Scorecard, and any tangible CIP documentation in order to make the determination.

Scott asked, given that there would be performance measure reviews in February and August, if August was still an annual review, as it sounded as though August was now a semi-annual review instead of an annual one. He recommended changing the wording in the final schedule to reflect that fact. He also recommended inclusion of the election of the CIP committee members in the final schedule. Sharon noted that the schedule included an election of Advisory Board officers in September and if that covered CIP committee members. Wes affirmed that it would.

Sharon reminded everyone that the quarterly review of any year-end financials may need to be pushed out during the 1st FY quarter in which the state accounting folks were closing out the FY books. Wes affirmed that he understood.

Rate Assessment Formula Update: Wes thanked Rene for his and wastewater engineering bureau comments regarding the model. As a reminder, the model was a work in progress especially where I/I was concerned. He asked if the member communities had any I/I updates to share.

Jeanne announced that Belmont was in the process of updating its I&I study, as the last was conducted in 2011. Wes asked if Tilton had GIS or I&I data to share. Johanna indicated that it did not because what Tilton has available was speculative or outdated. Wes asked if Johanna knew the length and diameter of the pipes. Johanna affirmed that she did for some but not all. Sharon noted that she has been working with Johanna to do some interpolation in that regard. She has also determined estimated I/I for Northfield using inch and diameter pipeline data that Glen provided to her.

Wes hoped that once I/I was determined for Belmont and Franklin, the Advisory Board would have a better idea of what the rate assessment formula should look like. Wes asked Jeanne what the turnaround time was for Belmont's I/I study. Jeanne was not sure. She offered to ask Underwood, their consultant. Brian also offered to ask Underwood which is also assisting in Franklin. Wes asked what Belmont and Tilton wanted to do to accurately represent their areas without water metering. Sharon suggested that Underwood might be of assistance in this regard. Brian, Johanna, Jeanne, and Glen concurred.

Wes posited that once the I/I had been determined in the member communities, the Advisory Board would still need to look at the segment between the Winnepesaukee pump station and the WWTP and determine I/I in the main interceptor line. Brian concurred, noting that Underwood was looking into that. Sharon expected Underwood to make some recommendations. The number may ultimately be a small number to divvy up, although there were several different ways to divvy it up that would include age, condition, and/or additional factors.

Wes concurred that the number may be statistically insignificant although more fully determining I/I may help the member communities feel more comfortable with the hybrid model. Wes asked if October seemed like a reasonable target date for reaching conclusions for the ongoing I/I studies. Jeanne and Brian affirmed that October sounded reasonable.

Authority Workgroup Update: Wes announced that Item 6 in the handouts included updated escrow account information. Scott asked (with regard to the roadmap) if Wes anticipated any additional expenses between today's meeting and the next meeting. Wes affirmed that outside a small attorney bill was forthcoming; but he was not anticipating any other expenses.

Replacement Fund Update: Wes asked everyone to refer to the handouts that were distributed by email prior to the meeting related to the Replacement Fund because of the item was voted on at last month's meeting and both options failed to pass. Scott moved, seconded by Jeanne, to reconsider (for discussion) the item that was voted on at last month's meeting. The motion to open discussion carried unanimously. As a reminder, Wes noted that there were two options under consideration. Scott moved, seconded by Jeanne, to accept Laconia's proposed option. Jeanne asked Wes to provide a summary of Laconia's proposed option. Wes explained that 50 percent of the cost of projects would use the current formula. The other 50 percent would be distributed proportionally between the 10

member communities. He referred to Attachment 3 in the handouts as an example of how the model would work. The motion carried 6 for; Meredith not present; Franklin and Tilton against.

As a reminder, Sharon noted that the member communities would need to present the proposed legislation to the state legislature. Ray suggested providing the draft to DES and WRBP (and possibly by way of them, the AG's Office) with enough time to review the draft legislation prior to being submitted to the legislature.

Other Business: Sharon reminded members that there are state Rules (outside of WRBP rules) regarding testing and inspecting for connections. This became an issue lately because a connection was visually inspected but not tested, which is a violation of both state and WRBP rules. She asked the Advisory Board members to help get the word out in this regard, because the WRBP could require excavating the connection location so that the test could be conducted but does not wish to do so if doing so could be avoided. Proper testing of new connections is particularly important as it pertains to possible introduction of I/I if the connection is not done correctly.

Sharon also announced that a new contract for the disposal of the WWTP biosolids was now in place. The new contract will cost three and a half times more than the former contract. WWTPs across the nation have been affected; the WRBP included. A couple of new revenue streams may help to offset some of the increase in cost, but not fully. Wes asked if she had any preliminary numbers, as he was beginning to put his budget together. Scott asked what the former contract cost had been per annum. Sharon explained that it had been \$120K/year.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 am. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, August 20, 2020 at 10:00 am via Laconia's Zoom Video Communications account. The minutes were prepared by Pro-Temp Staffing.