



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

**Stakeholder Meeting 4  
Dover Department of Public Works  
November 8, 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

***Other Participants:***

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

1. Welcome and Introductions.
2. Citizens Forum
  - No citizen comments were received.
3. Approval of Minutes
  - Minutes from the October meeting were approved as revised.
4. Comments on Draft Report Sections 4-6 were discussed.
  - Mr. Bardwell recommended that the committee suggest that much of the stormwater program be implemented by contract so as to not overburden the current staff. Mr. Nedelka replied that staffing organization does not fall under the scope of the current project. Ms. Watson agreed to clarify the section to state that the current organization and staffing is anticipated to be sufficient.
  - Mr. Bardwell asked whether Churches will pay stormwater fees. Mr. Nedelka replied that all non-profits and tax-exempt properties would pay a stormwater utility bill.
  - Mr. Green asked which category condominiums fit into in Table 4.3. Typically, each owner is responsible for his own water and sewer bill. Ms. Watson replied that they are currently treated as multi-family structures in the study. Discussion ensued on whether it would make



more sense to bill each resident separately or issue one bill to the property owner. Ms. Hooper suggested that the bill could be issued to the Condo Board.

- Mr. Nash asked which category condominiums fit into in Table 4.3. Ms. Watson replied that they are currently being treated as multi-family structures. If condominiums were treated as single family residences, each property owner would receive a full bill. Condominiums are typically more densely developed than single family residential properties, with less impervious area per unit. As a result, treating each condominium as an individual single family residence would not be as equitable as treating them as multifamily residences, where the cost of the impervious area is divided among the owners.
- Mr. Nedelka commented that in the previous meeting the discussion indicated that each single residence would be charged one ERU to simplify the rate structure. The draft report contains a rate structure where different charges are assigned to each residence. Ms. Watson explained that three different rate structures are presented in the draft report, only one of which is based on a flat fee for residential properties. Mr. Nedelka asked if any committee members would like the other options to be explored. As Mr. Nedelka and Mr. Green were the only members to express interest, the other two rate structures were dropped from discussion.
- Mr. Kageleiry handed out a copy of the New Hampshire State Statute that outlines the legal criteria for setting up a system of fee units (149-I:6-d.) He emphasized that the system must be fair and equitable. Mr. Nedelka indicated that he would ask the City Attorney to sit in on the next meeting to provide a legal perspective.
- Mr. Bardwell asked if it would be helpful to sit through a quick presentation about the current Stormwater Utility in Burlington, Vermont. It was decided that since the population density, makeup, and authorizing legislation of the two cities were radically different it would probably be difficult to compare the two.

5. Presentation: Recommendations and Draft Report.

- Ms. Watson gave a presentation based on GHD's understanding of what the committee had indicated at the October meeting.
- Mr. Kageleiry asked about whether structures, such as porous pavement, would be considered for stormwater credits. Ms. Watson replied that the credit manual, detailing such information, would be developed during the implementation phase of the project.
- Mr. Green asked why reducing runoff rate was being considered for a credit when the actual amount of water leaving the site might not be affected. Mr. Kegeleiry indicated that a property was not allowed any more runoff post-development that they had pre-development.



Mr. Lynch clarified that the rate cannot increase, but the actual volume of stormwater will increase due to additional impervious area (and reduced infiltration) on site.

- Mr. Nash asked if water quality should be considered in this study in addition to water quantity. Mr. Peschel indicated that the utility will be a dynamic program that will evolve as new regulations and permits are issued.
- A slide with GHD's recommendations based on their compiled data was presented. Mr. Lynch asked if the recommendation for a phased implementation approach would meet EPA compliance requirements. Mr. Peschel indicated that the budget recommendation was based on a need to meet compliance regulations.
- Mr. Boulanger suggested that a minimum revenue amount should be established that accounts for potential credits to prevent having to supplement the utility with the General Fund. Mr. Nedelka pointed out that credit programs in other communities only took out approximately five percent of the revenue stream. Ms. Watson indicated that projected revenue needs have been increased to reflect projected delinquencies and credits such that sufficient revenue would be left over to fund the program. In addition, a cap on the fee reduction available through credits could be established to limit the impact of credits on revenue predictability.
- Mr. Green asked if every property in the City would be billed. Ms. Watson replied that each property with impervious area would be billed. Mr. Kageleiry pointed out that farmland has a meaningful impact on stormwater quality even though it has a small percentage of impervious area.
- Ms. Watson indicated that the proposed base fee only covers a portion of the current stormwater budget. The remainder of the budget is covered by impervious area fees.
- Mr. Kagaleiry asked if it would be possible to develop a figure detailing the extent of the City's current stormwater system. Mr. Boulanger indicated that this could be done.
- Mr. Nedelka suggested that since stormwater is a community issue, the base fee could be structured to reflect the contribution from public roads. Ms. Watson indicated that GHD could run calculations to determine what this figure would be.
- Mr. Bardwell asked that condominiums be broken out from multi-residential structures in the pie chart showing ERUs by customer class.
- Mr. Nedelka asked why the phased approach was spread out over six years. Ms. Watson responded that this was done to be consistent with the capital planning timeframe.



- Mr. Lynch indicated the importance of emphasizing the cost of doing nothing (permit non-compliance charges). The group requested that information on penalties be included in the presentation.
- Mr. Green asked Mr. Barufaldi what impact a stormwater utility charge would have on businesses looking to establish themselves in the area. Dan replied that the answer depends on what surrounding communities are doing but would most likely be minimal. He emphasized a preference to include the utility on the water / sewer bill instead of as a standalone stormwater bill, preferably as a line item on the sewer charge.
- Mr. Lynch asked what the charge equates to in terms of cents per thousand of assessed value, and what that means for a single family residence. Ms. Watson responded that the full program cost equates to approximately \$0.75/thousand, and for the average single family residence, that amounts to approximately \$15.75 per month. The utility will cost the average single family residence approximately \$11.20 per month. As a result, the utility would be expected to generate a minor reduction in costs for the average single family residence.
- Mr. Green suggested multi-family residential structures be eligible for credits if they implement stormwater controls. Mr. Nash added that properties should have to demonstrate stormwater control effectiveness and proper maintenance in order to receive credits. The group determined that credits should be limited to non-residential properties which are expected to have the greatest stormwater charges and therefore stand to gain the greatest benefit from credits. A process should be put in place which disallows credits for onsite management systems that are not maintained.
- It was agreed that the credit cap should be left at fifty percent, as reflected in the calculations. This number can be changed in the implementation phase of the project.
- Ms. Watson asked if the committee wanted to consider a credit for seniors and low income citizens. Mr. Kageleiry stated that the City does not currently provide such credits on water / sewer bills and the stormwater bill should have a similar structure. There was general consensus on the point.
- Mr. Lynch asked why reducing the quantity of water leaving the site was considered a credit opportunity, considering that this is required for new development anyway. He suggested that improving water quality through implementation of best management practices should be rewarded. It was decided to include improving water quality in place of reducing water quantity as a potential credit
- Ms. Watson asked if the committee wanted to consider offering a curriculum credit to schools. It was decided that placing additional curriculum requirements on schools would be excessively burdensome, and the option should not be pursued.



- The group discussed whether the Dover Utilities Commission (DUC) would be able to determine the details of what the credits should be. It was determined that it is appropriate to provide a structure and guidelines, but that the DUC will be capable of determining the details of the system.
- Ms. Watson reviewed implementation steps for establishing a utility. Mr. Nedelka clarified that the rates would be approved in the annual budgeting process, not through a separate ordinance.
- Mr. Nedelka discussed his thoughts on the composition of the implementation phase committee. He suggested that it would make sense to include the current committee members, along with additional representation from the Planning Department as well as members of the DUC. The group agreed.
- Mr. Peschel asked whether the future meetings would be facilitated. The group felt that while staff may be technically capable of completing the meetings without outside assistance, they have limited time to dedicate to the project and outside facilitation would help to keep the process on track. The group agreed that future meetings should be facilitated if possible.
- Mr. Nedelka reiterated his request that all comments on the draft report to be submitted to him by December 4 to allow time for categorization. This will help to keep the group on schedule to complete the project with one additional meeting.
- Mr. Bardwell asked if it was possible to teleconference into the next meeting. It was decided that this would be allowed.

6. Meeting was adjourned.

The next meeting will be held at the Dover Department of Public Works on Monday December 13th, at 6:30 pm.

*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.*