



**CITY OF
DOVER**

DOVER UTILITIES COMMISSION ~ MINUTES

Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Meeting Location: Conference Room – 271 Mast Road, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Monday, June 15, 2009**
Meeting Time: **6:00 PM**

Members Present: Chairman Gary Green, Vice-Chair Michael Earley, Jay Stephens, Otis Perry, Mark Moeller, Alternate Ted Mortner

Members Absent: Marty Coyle, Ed Spuler,

Staff Present: Bill Boulanger, Utility Systems Supervisor, Dean Peschel, Environmental Projects Manager, Shari Bullen, DUC Secretary

Other Attendees: Linda Merullo

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

2. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Green indicated that the 2010 Investment Fees, item A under Old Business, should read Investment Fees.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On page 2 of the May 18, 2009 meeting minutes, Stephens said the reconciliation line should have a question mark as he was asking, not stating this. The term 'tax season' should not have been used and should be replaced with fiscal year. Under Old Business, it was not clear what Perry was trying to say about determining pressure from the previous meeting and should be re-worded. Stephens also indicated that he could not find the recommended 60-80psi in the code.

Motion: Perry made the motion to accept the May 18, 2009 minutes, as amended.

Second: Moeller seconded the motion.

Vote: U/A.

4. USER'S FORUM

User's Forum was opened and closed as there was no one present to speak.

5. ABATEMENT REQUESTS

A. Robert Goddard, 660 Central Avenue

Attorney James Schulte appeared on behalf of Robert Goddard to present a waiver request for investment fees billed due to change of use at 660 Central Avenue. Attorney Schulte presented a letter from Mr. Goddard authorizing him to represent him in this matter. A letter from Attorney Schulte to the DUC was included in the packet along with the building permit indicating change of use and the 10/17/08 billing of investment fees in the amount of \$6,200.00.

Bob Goddard owns the building at 660 Central Ave and is converting the 2 top floor commercial units into 1 apartment. The combined unit will have 1 ½ baths and a kitchenette. The only additional water use will be for a shower. The

building was converted in the 80's; it has one connection and 8 meters. He feels this is existing and the ordinance references new when assigning investment fees. Planning has done single family conversions where a credit is given for removal. This is not a new connection and a change of use should not be charged.

Linda Merullo joined at 6:15PM

Stephens asked if the Abatement Review Team had heard this request and Boulanger answered they did not as this is a waiver of investment fees request, not an abatement request. Stephens then stated that he supports the request where 2 offices were converted into 1 apartment and it is a current user. Perry didn't know we charged investment fees for change of use and doesn't feel it should require a fee be paid. Boulanger added that with Centrix Bank there were 6 apartments we did credit but also charged the bank and that it is standard procedure to charge for change of use. But, it can be determined in a case by case basis. Green supported the waiver although he stated it is a fine line.

Motion: Perry motioned to approve the requested waiver of investment fees.
Second: Stephens seconded the motion.
Vote: U/A.

6. REPORTS

A. Abatement Review Team Report

Bullen stated that the format of this report was updated for clarification. Stephens indicated that he was happy with the new layout and had nothing to add. Green added that the ART is doing a good job of handling abatements.

Motion: Stephens motioned to accept the ART minutes as submitted.
Second: Perry seconded the motion.

B. Utilities Report

In the water section, it was clarified that the nature trail is the tunnel previously filled in. Green indicated we're paying for this with a grant.

In the sewer section, it was mentioned that all sensors in the vault failed. Boulanger confirmed that they are corroded beyond repair and that Wright Pierce is looking into it. The parts are 20 years old and non-existent. The cavitation problem was discussed along with possible solutions.

Green handed out a list of non-utility work activities from last month's meeting where utility workers performed work for other departments. He stated that the Utilities Department is doing other work and it is being billed to Utilities. Stephens said this came up in 2006 and it was determined that there was sharing back and forth. This was okay as it was only small, he believes in the Billing Department. Stephens feels it should be separately billed. Perry feels it could come back where Public Works then needs to start billing Utilities for use of the conference room for meetings although it may not be equitable. Earley wants to know if it is measurable. Boulanger said it will be measurable with the new work order system but plowing has always been done this way as 6 highway workers can't handle it; we need an additional 17 from the Utilities Division. Green said not to take away the work but to bill it to Highway. He continued that Utilities workers did considerable work at the McConnell Center; weeks of work and this is being billed to the rate payer. Earley thinks snow removal is the big hitter but that we should get monies associated with each occurrence on Green's list.

Motion: Early motioned to amend the Utilities Report.
Second: Stephens seconded the motion.

Stephens clarified that we want to get an idea of the magnitude of the issue.

Vote: U/A.

C. Finance Report

Earley reviewed the report provided as of May 31st, backed out interest and depreciation and found a gain in water. YTD expenses are at 70% of budget and supplies appear to be over budget. \$2,700.00 abatements are over budget. We are operating at a profit but transfers may not be complete. The sewer loss is approximately \$900,000.00 but there is 1.7 Million in depreciation. Boulanger will get clarification on this.

Earley said he understood we would get a quarterly report. He thought we'd have it for this meeting but we do not. Perry said it's a balance sheet they are looking for and it should be in the budget presentation. The DUC wants to see investment fee income and that this income information should be available. Green will continue working with Steele on this.

Motion: Perry made the motion to accept the reports and adopt the motion for the Utilities Report.

Second: Stephens seconded the motion.

Vote: U/A.

7. NEW BUSINESS

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Investment Fees

Green spoke with Steele regarding the consultant report of investment fee methodology. Mayberry and Wright Pierce can do it in July at the earliest and would target presenting at the August meeting. Perry indicated that members wanted input before they start; he isn't sure of what they intend to do. Stephens said prior minutes showed the sub-committee was to meet with them. Green indicated he'd also like to join. Perry said it would be a quorum, therefore must be a public meeting. Green will work with Steele to set this up.

B. North End Water Pressure

Green said the DUC needs to determine an acceptable pressure. 35psi is the minimum but what do we want to provide? Perry said that 35 at the sill does not provide for 25 at every fixture within the structure. Stephens said 36 at the sill = 30 at the 2nd story. The plumbing code also has minimums. Green said the DES also has similar conflict and the DUC needs to have a target pressure. Stephens and Green have had some discussions. Stephens continued that he worked from the 2 maps of the region and that the looping is extensive. He said it's very complicated and that pressure over 75 can blow connections. If you add 30psi to a 40psi customer, that could result in issues. Boulanger said we'd have to use pressure reducer valves and that it's easier to reduce pressure than boost pressure. He continued that we have 125psi on Dover Point Road and we have the residents there supply and install the pressure reducer valve. Stephens is worried about whose burden the reducer valve would be. Discussion ensued about option and expenses.

Stephens asked if we need a 7 million dollar tower. Moeller asked Stephens if he had a recommendation and Stephens did not. If we are going to provide a pressure, how do we provide it to all? Elevations aren't taken into account. Boulanger said you would go to the lowest and increase it to the pressure you want. Green said we need a minimum pressure throughout the system. We increased water level in the tank and some individual services need to be updated. Repairing some mains was recommended. Earley said he didn't know what the pressures mean so went to the restroom to see the 67psi at the public works facility.

Green called a recess.

Earley returned and said 50-60psi would be good, Moeller thought 70 should be the goal. Earley said a 65 minimum then Green asked what the Commission wants to do. Perry asked what the next steps are. Boulanger said with a 65-70psi, staff has funds to purchase tower and provide this large scale fix. The plan would be to boost all pressure and add in pressure reducing valves. Stephens cautioned to be clear on the goal and who it's for. PSI can be proposed at

an elevation. Perry said Stephens brought up another good point; why would all users be paying for this upgrade. Moeller asked why open that door and Earley said the tower benefits all users for redundancy and system backup. Boulanger agreed the tower would backup and Green said it's a luxury we can't afford just for that reason. Boulanger said it's a secondary benefit. Stephens said he's in favor but these people did buy their homes this way and we have done a lot to improve the situation.

Green said that in 2005 or 2006 the Council went after this study and now staff is asking for a yes or no. He believes we can buy the land without being committed to the tower but the next phase with 5 million in the CIP is coming fast. Perry said it is desirable to set a standard pressure. How to get the pressure is the tower. The next step is how do we pay for it? Should we start with a desirable static pressure?

Motion: Stephens motioned to set a goal of 60psi in all general service areas.

Second: Perry seconded the motion.

Earley didn't think it was time to make this decision and felt it was too rushed. Peschel mentioned that it may only be necessary to set a goal for this trouble area.

Second: Perry withdrew his second.

Second: Moeller seconded the motion.

Perry said adding individual pumps may not be viable. Green says half the City doesn't meet this goal. Perry said he withdrew his second as it isn't fair to set a goal that's not possible. Boulanger said if the DUC approves the recommendations of the report, then staff can move forward.

Motion: Stephens withdrew his motion.

Second: Moeller withdrew his second.

Earley thinks this needs a special meeting; he wants to read the report and details again. Green said he will be in touch with Steele to schedule.

C. Willand Pond

Peschel presented the Request for Proposal to Provide Hydrogeological Services to Re-establish a Public Water Supply Well and Potentially Expand the Well Field. Stephens was concerned with paragraph 2 under the proposal section on page 2 where he thought we should emphasize that we need an economically viable solution. Perry asked if the rate payers would pay for this and Peschel answered yes. We also know we need a treatment plant and would like to sell enough water to get our money back. Perry asked if this would change the allowable uses and Boulanger answered it has always had restrictions because it is a water supply. Iron and Manganese are heavy in that area and there is a bacteria problem. The existing well is 35 years old and would need to be replaced. Water will be tested to determine if it is ground water or more like surface water. If it is surface water, this would stop the project. We have been searching for new water every year.

9. AREAS OF CONCERN

Green provided a Nitrogen article to the commission.

Peschel said that 1, 4 dioxane showed up in the Griffin well; it was found on the bottom but is being diluted below detection units. It appears, for now, that we are okay and the aquifer is improving. New monitoring wells are being installed to provide a better picture. MTBE seems to be coming from the same source and in moving in the same pattern and at the same rate.

Gary handed out a Foster's newspaper article on the water and sewer rates being raised in Rochester. Boulanger reminded the DUC that the investment fees here are higher and intended to keep our rates down.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Moeller made the motion to adjourn.
Second: Perry seconded the motion.
Vote: U/A.

Respectfully submitted, *Shari Bullen*, Dover Utilities Commission

Document Created by: Shari Bullen	2009.06.15_DoverUtilitiesCommission.Minutes
Document Created on: June 17, 2009	5 Pages