



**CITY OF DOVER, NH
STORMWATER UTILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY**

**Stakeholder Meeting 5
Dover Department of Public Works
December 13, 2010 at 6:30 PM**

Committee Members in Attendance:

Jan Nedelka, Committee Chair
Dot Hooper, Committee Vice Chair
Chad Kageleiry
Dana Lynch
Gary Green
Ray Bardwell
Chris Nash
Jay Stephens
Chris Nash

Other Participants:

Dean Peschel, City of Dover
Bill Boulanger, City of Dover
Dan Barufaldi, City of Dover
Alan Krans, City of Dover
Alyson Watson, GHD

1. Welcome and Introductions.
2. Citizens Forum
 - No citizen comments were received.
3. Approval of Minutes
 - Mr. Nedelka asked that the slide presented at Meeting 4 showing the penalties for noncompliance with new stormwater permit requirements be incorporated into the minutes.
 - Minutes were approved as amended.
4. Proposed changes to the draft report were discussed. Mr. Nedelka distributed a summary of proposed report amendments (attached).
 - a) Proposed technical changes were discussed.
 - Mr. Green and Mr. Stevens pointed out typographical errors in the draft report.
 - The proposed technical changes were approved as amended.
 - b) Proposed minor changes were discussed.
 - Ms. Hooper asked that her full name be used in the draft report.



- The proposed minor changes were approved as amended.
- c) Proposed major changes were discussed.
- Mr. Nedelka asked the committee whether the examples on pages 30, 31 and 33 should be updated with more recent rate examples. The committee agreed the examples should be updated.
 - Mr. Nedelka asked the committee whether it wanted to recommend the Public Outreach Plan outlined in the report. It was agreed that the plan should be used as a starting point for the parties responsible for implementation.
 - Major proposed changes were approved, as amended.
- d) Other proposed changes were discussed.
- The second bullet on page 24 states that ‘Because Dover is not currently required to treat stormwater, this [water quality improvement] credit does not currently apply.’ The committee decided this sentence should be modified to ‘Dover is not currently required to treat stormwater’ to leave the possibility of future water quality credits open.
 - Mr. Green stated that he had recently attended a Southeast Watershed Alliance where expected future water quality monitoring was discussed.
 - Ms. Hooper asked that discussion of water education curriculum credits be removed completely from the report.
 - Other proposed changes were approved as amended.
5. Ms. Watson presented the powerpoint slides attached.
6. The Committee discussed whether vacant and undeveloped lots should be charged a base stormwater utility fee. Mr. Green presented information obtained from the Assessor’s office about the quantity/makeup of the vacant/undeveloped lots in Dover. He suggested that a tiered structure might be adopted, with undeveloped lots being charged on a square footage basis. Mr. Kageleiry questioned how large undeveloped lots would be treated and cautioned that the tier structure should be sensitive to how each property contributes to stormwater issues versus how much benefit they derive from the stormwater system. There was concern that a gross area structure could disproportionately impact owners of large undeveloped lots. Mr. Bardwell pointed out that agricultural land could have a large impact on water quality, even though it had relatively little impervious area. Mr. Lynch and Mr. Kageleiry indicated that there has been a significant effort to encourage developers to offset development impacts by purchasing and conserving land, and charging them for that conserved land would send an inconsistent message.



7. Mr. Bardwell asked if the question of whether undeveloped lots should be charged a user fee could be reviewed by the Dover Utilities Commission (DUC). Mr. Nedelka suggested that the present committee should attempt to make a recommendation on the matter.
8. Mr. Nedelka pointed out that land can be undeveloped and still have a water quality impact. However, according to his calculations, the revenue collected from undeveloped properties would represent less than \$10,000 out of the \$1.2 million collected through the stormwater utility and might not be worth the overhead cost to administer a program for these parcels. Ms. Hooper also pointed out that the committee had elected to keep the utility structure as simple as possible.
9. Mr. Kageleiry indicated a need to state the definition of what an undeveloped parcel is. Mr. Nedelka suggested that this definition may be determined in the future by the DUC.
10. Ms. Hooper moved to not include undeveloped and vacant land in the current base fee structure. Mr. Green asked that the motion be amended so that the issue of undeveloped and vacant parcels would fall in the scope of the utility committee. Mr. Nedelka requested that Mr. Green participate in the implementation-phase Committee, and Mr. Green agreed. The motion, as amended was passed.
11. The Committee discussed what should be covered by the base fee charge. Three options were presented: a small base fee covering only a portion of the fixed program costs, a large base fee which would reflect the shared cost of City roads, and a medium base fee which would reflect a portion of Dover's roads.
12. Ms. Hooper asked if the small base fee would cover all expenses. Ms. Watson explained that all of the alternatives cover all expenses. In each case, a portion of the needed revenue is collected through the base fee, with the remainder collected through the impervious are fee. When the base fee is smaller, the impervious fee is larger to compensate. The question is what should the base fee incorporate, and what magnitude of "flat fee" is appropriate. In all cases, the revenue collected will be sufficient to cover program expenses, and the amount collected will be backed out of the general fund.
13. Mr. Nedelka mentioned that it might make sense to incorporate at least a portion of the roads in the base fee to emphasize that stormwater is a community issue that affects everyone.
14. Mr. Nash asked if other communities were incorporating road infrastructure into their base fees. Ms. Watson explained that base fees are commonly used, and the magnitude of the fee varies.
15. A motion was made to approve a medium base fee, reflecting the Committee's desire to cover a portion of the City's shared road infrastructure with the base fee. The motion was passed.
16. To achieve consistency with the State Statute, Mr. Krans (Dover City Attorney) recommended that residential properties be allowed to apply for credits. Mr. Green asked why residential



customers would need to be allowed to apply for credits. Mr. Krans indicated that allowing a credit is different from setting the standard for receiving a credit, and the standard for receiving a credit could be difficult to achieve. However, it is likely that in the future there may be a scenario in which a property owner implements a system substantially different from the average resident that truly reduces stormwater impacts from a residential property, and in this case, there should be a mechanism in place to allow a credit to be extended. Mr. Nedelka added that small improvements such as rain-barrels that are difficult to monitor and enforce should not qualify for a credit. Mr. Krans suggested that a system that returns a residential property to the impact level of an undeveloped property may be considered for a credit in the future.

17. The proposed Public Outreach Plan was discussed. Mr. Nedelka stated that the proposed plan seemed largely academic and not practical for Dover. He emphasized that there were some good ideas but that the plan should not be adopted as a whole. He pointed out that since Dover is not a very large community, focus groups may not be necessary.
18. Ms. Hooper discussed some ideas on how to disseminate information to the community including broadcasting on Local Channel 22, a city council broadcast, flyers and a writeup in *Fosters*.
19. Mr. Barufaldi suggested that this type of outreach requires dialogue, not just informational presentations. He suggested 'Dover Discussions' as a model for the type of forum that should be utilized; however, he suggested that dedicated meetings should be held on this topic. Ms. Hooper also suggested a special city wide meeting dedicated to the topic.
20. Mr. Boulanger indicated the importance of educating the City staff so they could handle residents' questions when they are out in the field.
21. Ms. Hooper suggested emphasizing that enhanced stormwater management is mandated and stressing the penalties for non-compliance.
22. Mr. Lynch asked that the Public Outreach Plan avoid being too 'cutesy' as it is dealing with a serious topic and should be perceived as such.
23. The Committee took a voice vote to approve the report as amended. The report was approved unanimously.
24. The meeting was adjourned.

These minutes are an overview of all pertinent discussions that took place at this meeting. Should anyone take exception to any portion herein, notify this office in writing within ten (10) days of receipt or these minutes shall stand as written.