

WINNIPESAUKEE RIVER BASIN PROGRAM

ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

April 15, 2021 – Conducted Electronically

Members Present: The meeting was called to order by Wes Anderson (Laconia), chair, at 10:01 am. Sharon McMillin (NHDES), Rene Pelletier (NHDES), Ron White (DAS), Johanna Ames (Tilton), Jeanne Beaudin (Belmont), Glen Brown (Northfield), Justin Hanscom (Franklin), Ray Korber (Bay District), Brian Sullivan (Franklin), and Meghan Theriault (Gilford) were present at that time.

Guests: Cole Melendy and Thaddeus Webb from Underwood Engineering (UE).

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: Brian moved, seconded by Jeanne, to approve the March 18, 2021, meeting minutes as written. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion carried.

Citizens Comments for Agenda Items: Wes asked if there were any guests from the member communities participating on the 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.

Monthly Summary Report: Sharon distributed the *Monthly Summary Report* for March 2021 by email prior to the meeting.

- Energy Efficiency Upgrades – Delivery of the custom pumps has been delayed until June due to scheduling at the foundry. Installation work by WRBP staff and contractors is ongoing.
- Solids Handling Process Upgrades – No updates at this time.
- Asset Management (AM)/Collection System Evaluations Incentive – No updates at this time.
- WRBP Infrastructure O&M Responsibilities – No updates at this time.
- Replacement Fund – No updates at this time.
- Governance Work Plan – No updates at this time.
- Rate Assessment Formula – See discussion below.

Sharon announced that Mark Corliss was recently promoted to Chief Operator. He has been at the WRBP for over 30 years. During this time, he has progressively advanced to be well-qualified for the Chief Operator position. She wished to recognize his achievement and encouraged members to congratulate him on the promotion.

Rate Assessment Formula Update: Wes asked everyone to refer to a PDF entitled *Talking Points – WRBP Rate Assessment Formula Engineering Technical Assistance WRBP Advisory Board Meeting 4/15/2021* that had been distributed by email prior to the meeting. Cole explained that UE has been assisting Belmont and Franklin with I/I studies and was asked by them to assist with recommendations from those studies for the new rate assessment formula.

The cover sheet contained talking points. The second page contained the draft hybrid flow model that the WRBP presented last summer; which has been serving as the basis for further discussions. UE focused on the downstream members because of their work with Belmont and Franklin; both located

in the southern area. The third and fourth pages contained UE's suggested modifications to the hybrid flow model; provided in red text.

The green column contains data for areas with sewer flow metering that was determined to be accurate enough for billing purposes; representing the six upstream member communities or approximately 90 percent of the total sewer system flow. UE's study focused on the 10 percent that lacked reliable sewer flow metering including all or portions of Northfield, Tilton, Franklin and Belmont. The 10 percent include areas where additional metering was not deemed practical or financially feasible. This remaining 10 percent includes estimated sanitary sewer flows based on metered water consumption or property records; plus, I/I from the local collectors and from the shared WRBP main interceptor south of the Belmont Beach flow meter location.

The blue column contains data where water meter records were provided from the members. The working theory is that water meter records could be used as the next step to estimate sewer contributions based on each property's water use. These properties are not in the areas already captured by the installed sewer meters. The four member communities provided their water meter records for areas outside of the sewer metered areas shown in the green column. Metered water use was considered a reliable metric to use over time to accommodate for changes in population and infrastructure use. Northfield had information on all properties on water meters so this metric is used to estimate their sanitary sewer contributions. Franklin had water meter data for 100% of the area not already sewer metered through the WRBP River Street Pump Station; so, this metric is used to estimate their remaining sanitary sewer contributions.

The peach column represents areas not included in either the sewer metered, or water metered columns; so, a different estimate of sewer flows is needed. Both the blue and peach columns represent the estimated sanitary sewer component only; not I/I in the sewer system.

Only Belmont and Tilton needed data in the peach column for non-sewer metered and non-water metered areas and, for that reason, estimates were made in the model for both member communities using property data they provided. In the case of Belmont, a metric called EDU (i.e. Equivalent-Dwelling Unit) is used for community billing purposes. The estimation average flow for each EDU is 125 gallons per day (gpd) based upon the downtown (village) area of Belmont where there are water meter records. UE indicated that either 100% of the 125 gpd water use/EDU could be used to estimate sanitary sewer flows as in the WRBP model or 80% of the EDU water flow ($125 * 80\% = 100 \text{ gpd/EDU}$) could be used as recommended in the most recent UE model. The range of 110-130 gpd/EDU water use is consistent with evaluations that UE has done throughout the state. The goal is to decide on a metric using water metered data or estimated water consumption per property (EDU) that would then be consistently applied across all communities to complete the information in the peach column.

The other issue is that I/I contributions need to be determined for the non-sewer metered areas (blue and peach columns) in the communities and the main WRBP interceptor between Belmont Beach flow meter and the WWTP. It is possible to estimate the remaining, combined I/I flow by subtracting out all the sanitary sewer flows (green, blue and peach columns) from the WWTP influent flow. Although the final values in the blue and peach columns need to be verified and the water use to sewer contribution metric agreed-upon as either 100% or 80%, the current UE model shows about 2-3% of the total sewer flows are attributable to I/I. UE's I/I preliminary method used to divide up this remaining I/I uses inch-diameter per mile (idm) of pipelines weighted by a condition factor (age and type of pipe) is provided

on page 4. The diameter and length of pipeline needs to be confirmed; but the draft provides a starting point for discussion on a possible method to divide up the remaining I/I among members. The suggested concept is that I/I for local sewers would be attributed to the four southern communities and I/I from the main WRBP interceptor between Belmont Beach and the WWTP would be shared by all 10 members.

UU analyzed preliminary data for the local sewers and the main trunk lines and assigned condition factors for each pipe so that they would have a weighted properly. For example, Franklin had a lot of older, clay pipes (considered leaky) and had a higher factor of 7 because they potentially contribute more I&I than other (newer) materials. The main WRBP interceptor has a large idm so, based on just the idm calculations, it could have a high I/I potential. It was assigned a condition factor of 1.

This is an evolving model and could be changed now or over time. UE hopes that it will provide a starting point for discussions. UE realized that no one had a chance to review the handout in depth before the meeting because it was issued within the past 24 hours. Brian thanked UE and Belmont for helping to move the model forward. He also thanked Wes for all of the organizing that he has been doing.

Wes asked if Ray has had a chance to look into strength, since Bay District had expressed an interest in revisiting that parameter at last month's meeting. Ray noted that Sharon has been sharing information with him and that he planned to put a proposal together before the next meeting. Wes noted that strength had not been considered in the current model.

Wes noted that, with regard to potential I/I contributions, most of Tilton's unmetered areas contained PVC pipelines. For the most recent model, Tilton's collection system piping is considered similar to Belmont's. This is a change from Tilton's system being considered similar to Franklin's collection system. Wes asked if Northfield and Tilton are comfortable with the I/I revisions that were just presented. Johanna said that Tilton is comfortable with the logic. Glen said that he relied on the other members and their experts, but Northfield trusted their logic.

Ray asked UE how the currently estimated 132.18 (4-year MG total sewer flow assigned as shared I/I) would be divided up among the 10 member communities. UE indicated that they had not proposed a final method to allocate this shared I/I so it would need to be addressed. Sharon asked if UE planned on providing recommendations. Wes noted that UE is working for Belmont and Franklin and that they would have to give UE permission to provide these types of recommendations. Brian and Jeanne affirmed that Belmont and Franklin were in favor of having UE continue to be involved in the process. Wes suggested that the four southernmost member communities meet with him and UE prior to May's meeting in order to determine options to divide up the shared I/I flow and update and verify the data used in the most recent model. Wes asked members for suggestions on how to divide the remaining I/I among all 10 members. He confirmed it would not be just divided evenly by 10 since that disadvantaged the lower flow communities. Ray suggested the number of rate payers (population served) by each member, Gilford suggested flows from each member. Sharon suggested number of direct connections into this main trunk line should also be considered. Sharon agreed to provide the information previously provided by members regarding sewer users per member community to UE and Wes.

Timeline for the CIP Update: Sharon plans to have the draft overview table prepared by the end of June for the CIP Subcommittee to review.

Governance Guidelines, MOA, and By-Laws Update: Wes announced that there were no updates.

Review of the Escrow Account: Wes announced that there have been no new expenditures, and the account would remain available for group use during future studies. He asked if there were any questions. As there were none, he moved on to the next agenda item.

1. **Replacement Fund:** As a reminder, Wes announced that per the decision at last month's Advisory Board meeting, the proposed legislation documents would need to be reviewed and prepared for the upcoming legislative session and sponsors would be needed.

Other Business: The meeting adjourned at 10:50 am. The next meeting will be held on Thursday, May 20, 2021 at 10:00 am via Laconia's Zoom Video Communications account. The minutes were prepared by Pro-Temp Staffing.