



**CITY OF
DOVER**

DOVER UTILITIES COMMISSION ~ MINUTES

Meeting Type: Special Meeting
Meeting Location: Conference Room – 271 Mast Road, Dover, NH 03820
Meeting Date: **Monday, July 13, 2009**
Meeting Time: **6:00 PM**

Members Present: Chairman Gary Green, Vice-Chair Michael Earley, Jay Stephens, Otis Perry, Mark Moeller, Marty Coyle, Ed Spuler

Members Absent: Ted Mortner

Staff Present: Doug Steele, Community Services Director, Shari Bullen, DUC Secretary

Others Present: Kristen Berger, P.E., Project Manager for AECOM

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

1. USER'S FORUM

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

2. NORTH END WATER PRESSURE

Earley began by indicating he would like to know the number of homes in each elevation for the area studied in the 2006 report. Kristen Berger of AECOM said she did not know but stated that 30% of the total City water demand is located in this zone. Berger said she could get the additional data Earley was asking for. Earley asked how many users are at an elevation of over 232 ft. Berger explained that they looked at an elevation of over 265 ft and it's about 4 houses. The next level down is a big drop to Sixth Street and they have borderline pressure. These users would see a definite improvement.

Green asked Berger how they got the 265 ft area and if they could map the other elevations in the zone. AECOM looked at it for a 50psi minimum without increasing other pressures over 100psi. If the grade line was raised too high, they'd over-pressure the lower so their recommendation represents a balance. Older mains are currently used for low pressures and you also need to be sure not to over-stress the lines and the system.

Earley still thinks we need to determine a goal for pressure which users are happy with. He thinks there should be a sub-committee to look at pressures and maybe get petitions. He has 70-75psi at his house and feels this is good pressure. Earley also wants to know how many pressure reducing valves would be required and at what cost.

Berger said it's a good idea to get people involved. Stephens said it's hard to explain and that users who have small or restricted pipes may still not be happy. He also stated that the higher elevations are not on the system.

Moeller indicated he is opposed to more studies. In October of 2006 the study was completed and he doesn't feel we need additional committees or studies. He said the DUC needs to decide based on the information at hand. Moeller went on to explain that he had 39-42psi which was not acceptable. It has been studied and a decision needs to be made. He thinks we need to build the tower and shoot for 70psi. Everyone in the north end would benefit.

Earley disagreed as we could spend 7 million dollars and be, 'a miss'. Stephens said 70psi is higher than is needed. He felt the 60 range or 65 at the street which would provide greater than 50psi at the 2nd floor. Earley asked if any users would be missed. Berger stated the last house on Sixth Street gets 35-39psi. With this study bringing pressure to 50psi, 15psi extra and 25 extra at 60psi; no one is missed. This project would bring 50-60psi at the street to the 232 elevation.

Perry said this area is going to grow and he would like to see if the Planning Department could find out how many users there are over 232 and how many potential new users. Green agreed we need to decide on pressure but wants to know how many people we will help. Perry said plumbing inspection is requiring boosters where they don't have the pressure at the street. Green said we need to plan for future development but Chris Parker has identified 20 lots which couldn't be served with this system. He's not concerned with future development as much as the existing customers we can help. Berger recommended using a decision matrix to help clarify and come up with a decision.

Green said the DUC has discussed reducing the area and adding booster pumps for a smaller pressure zone. Steele stated he understands the cost concerns but that the DUC should not forget that if there's ever a problem with the existing tower (which is 50 or 60 years old) there is currently no backup in place. Steele continued that a second tower would benefit the entire system. Stephens said he is concerned about the size and that 7 million is a lot to spend to provide backup. He felt we could get away with a cheaper and smaller solution.

Berger indicated they sized the tower based on:

- Storage
- Fire storage
- Emergency Storage

They calculated size to cover water main breaks or lost pumps but there is a lot that went into sizing. It should be noted that the elevation of the tower is also important.

Stephens asked if we could rely on the old tank for fire and emergencies. Berger answered that booster pumps would need to be bigger and we would need more of them. Green gave the history of the 2006 Council getting this study without involving the DUC. Steele said we've identified land but there is a concern about being aggressive with moving forward when the Commission is unclear. Green said we should disregard the backup benefit.

Storage/Fire/emergency needs are already met. He continued that we're trying to increase the water pressure and 7 million doesn't hit the target. Perry said we need to decide on a target pressure and know how many users are affected. Maybe the tank should be sized for pressure only.

Steele asked if we could set a goal tonight that, by the August DUC meeting, we could have a decision. Green responded that it's a bad time to be spending and maybe the project should be put off a year. He felt the DUC has questions and needs data. Earley also felt he doesn't have enough information to make a decision and at this point would vote no. Perry said this is a Council decision and the DUC is only making a recommendation. He prefers the DUC pull it together and make a good recommendation. Perry continued that the DUC should determine a pressure target and also identify who is impacted. Earley said he recommends 60-80psi. Stephens would be happy with 60psi at the street. Perry thought maybe we didn't need anything so absolute and should instead give 90% of customers 60 or 50psi.

Coyle asked how questionnaires were done. Berger answered that a neighborhood meeting was held. Spuler wanted to know what percentages of customers get what pressure now. Green said we can conduct a public hearing and involve the community. Green then asked what's the goal now, 60 or 70? Perry said we should set the pressure goal then find out what it will do where. We should look at 50/60/70psi + costs + how many customers. Moeller asked why study if we've had no complaints? Steele answered that Council wanted it and Community Services was instructed to get a study. Perry added that there are all sorts of areas with low pressure and everyone knows it. It meets code/minimums but isn't desirable. Perry is not ready to set that pressure; he needs more detail on costs for hitting those pressure numbers and number of users.

Stephens wanted to know if we had the money for this additional study. Steele answered that we have the GIS data. He discussed requesting a change order to allow AECOM to review the data and get the answers the DUC is requesting.

Motion: Stephens made a motion that, based on available funding, AECOM with 3 pressure levels, determine how many current users at each elevation would benefit from the pressure increase.

Second: Perry seconded the motion.

Perry clarified that structures by elevation allows for adjusting pressures. Berger will map elevations, users and existing pressures and will also indicate any users who are adversely affected. Steele felt that he could arrive at a scope of work with Berger before the next meeting.

Vote: U/A.

Stephens said it would be great to get some stimulus money for this project but he knows it has to benefit existing customers to qualify. Berger added that Public Health and Welfare won't fund fire protection but that redundancy would be a good argument for qualifying. 'Shovel ready' could be an issue but the next round of funding is in October. If we are ready, we will apply but these issues need to be resolved. Berger will provide funding deadlines. This project is already in the CIP. Council could vote to move the money and get started.

Earley wants to see: 1. Homes at each elevation, 2. Updated table ES-3 (costs) for 2010/2011, and 3. If we are going to need a higher tower to get higher pressure.

The proposed site at an elevation of 300 would require a 50' tower. The tank quoted for the report was not a standpipe at a 300' elevation.

Green added that the EPA may still mandate inter-connection. This could cost between 1 and 2 million dollars, even if we do the tower. Earley also wants the cost for pressure reducing valve installation and if the DUC is satisfied with the project area. Stephens said it's about the customers and where they are. Berger says the boundaries are well defined. Green said Sixth Street wasn't so bad. Stephens said it's harder to separate.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Stephens 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	2009.07.13_DoverUtilitiesCommission.Minutes
Document Created on: July 14, 2009	3 Pages