

**Board of Commissioners  
Minutes  
May 21, 2018  
Public Session  
(approved June 18, 2018)**

Present: J. Comer, T. Pellegrino, G. Keller, W. von Schoen, D. Provencher,  
Superintendent R. Miner, Water Quality Support/Business Manager J. Lavoie

**Financial and Human Resources Review – April – Michele Holton**

M. Holton noted that the District is 10 months into the year or 83.33% complete. The revenues are at 78.9% and the expenditures are at 79.2%. There was a \$37,000 refund and \$35,000 for the cell tower rental was deducted from the year's revenues and put into last year's revenues per the auditors. \$26,000 was deducted from this year's expenses and put to last year's budget expense per the encumbrance previously approved by the BOC. She noted that large expenditures coming up include chemicals, tools, and additional tank work. M. Holton noted that expenditures are being closely monitored against budget through the end of the year, as well as where projected revenues stand.

**1. Board of Commissioners to elect Chairman, Vice Chairman and Personnel Liaison for 2018-2019.**

**Chairman** – A nomination was made by D. Provencher to elect J. Comer Chairman. The nomination was seconded by T. Pellegrino. J. Comer was elected Chairman on a vote of 5-0-0.

**Vice Chairman** – A nomination was made by J. Comer to elect T. Pellegrino Vice Chairman. The nomination was seconded by W. von Schoen. T. Pellegrino was elected Vice Chairman on a vote of 5-0-0.

**Personnel Liaison** – A nomination was made by J. Comer to elect G. Keller Personnel Liaison. The nomination was seconded by D. Provencher. G. Keller was elected Personnel Liaison on a vote of 5-0-0.

**Non-Public Session**

A motion was made by J. Comer and seconded by T. Pellegrino to go into non-public session per RSA 91-A:3 II(d) "...Acquisition, sale or lease of property" and RSA 91-A:3 II(e) "...pending claims or litigation..." The motion passed 5-0-0 on a roll call vote.

District Treasurer K. Stack noted before leaving the meeting room that she is opposed to being forced to leave during the non-public portion of the meeting.

### **After the Non-Public Session**

A motion was made by T. Pellegrino and seconded by D. Provencher to seal the minutes of the non-public session. The motion passed 5-0-0.

**2. Board of Commissioners to review minutes from the March 19, 2018 Public and Non-Public Sessions, March 27, 2018 Annual Meeting and April 16, 2018 Public and Non-Public Sessions,**

**March 19, 2018 Public and Non-Public minutes** – A motion was made by W. von Schoen and seconded by G Keller to approve the minutes of the public and non-public meeting of March 19, 2018. The motion passed 4-0-1 with D. Provencher abstaining.

**March 27, 2018 Annual Meeting** – A motion was made by W. von Schoen and seconded by T. Pellegrino to approve the minutes of the Annual Meeting of March 27, 2018 with the following change: page 4 next to the last paragraph, the second sentence should read “G. Keller noted that with the approval of Article 7 the account would exceed \$500,000 in this fund.” The motion passed 5-0-0.

**April 16, 2018 Public and Non-Public minutes** – A motion was made by D. Provencher and seconded by T. Pellegrino to approve the minutes of the public and non-public meeting of April 16, 2018 with the following changes: page 1, first paragraph the word “revenue” should be changed to “revenues”; page 1, second paragraph the word “timin” should be changed to “timing”; page 3, first paragraph the words “of iron and manganese” should be added to the first line after the words “for the treatment”. The motion passed 3-0-2 with T. Pellegrino and G. Keller abstaining.

**3. Board of Commissioners to hear updates of current projects from Underwood Engineers, Inc. Topics/questions posed by Commissioners D. Provencher and W. von Schoen:**

**a. Future expansion of Wells 4 & 5 Treatment Plant for additional PFC treatment if they become regulated in the future.**

M. Metcalf noted that provisions will be made for additional treatment of short chain PFCs should this become necessary. A question to be answered is how far you go in treating these chemicals, i.e. add treatment units?, provide space and blind flanges?, just provide a knock out wall?. The initial estimated cost for the treatment of wells 4 & 5 was \$4.43M. The cost was reduced to \$4.16M by moving the generator outside and reducing the building size. This cost was

further reduced by \$0.81M by the removal of items not directly related to PFAS treatment. The final number agreed to by St. Gobain Performance

Plastics (SGPP) for PFSA treatment was \$3.35M. He noted that MVD needs to determine whether the plant is being designed for \$4.16 M or \$3.35 M and if the former, where the additional \$0.81M will come from.

**b. Has anyone followed up with Pease or Hoosick Falls for recommendations for any design changes.**

M. Metcalf noted he is in contact with the consultants working at Pease. He has had contact with the design consultant for the Hoosick Falls facility during the process leading to the settlement agreement but has not spoken with them yet about specific design details, but he will do this.

**c. MVD unaccounted for water and NHDES threshold of 15%**

M. Metcalf noted that UEI tracks and does an annual water balance for the District. An initial Water loss study was done in 2007. This study indicated that the District had a 17.25% unaccounted for water loss. He noted that the typical water loss deemed acceptable is 15%. A portion of this loss was used in flushing and street sweeping. The recommendation at the time was to measure this water. This is known as non-revenue water since you can account for it by measuring it but you are not billing for it. He noted that the water balance work showed an average actual water loss of 6.3% from 2012 through 2017. He noted that a lot of the District's system is relatively new so leaks are not as big an issue as in older systems. J. Lavoie noted that leak detection grants were acquired and work was done to detect and repair leaks located in the system.

**d. Source capacity of wells, assuming 4 & 5 are back on line, versus peak and projected demands.**

M. Metcalf noted that this question and all the source capacity numbers are addressed in the Master Plan and referenced the appropriate tables to review. The District must deal with the average demand, the summer demand, and the maximum day demand.

**e. What effect does the Parker Road tank have on the system being off line?**

M. Metcalf noted that the Parker Road tank was offline in 2007 when UEI first started working for MVD and does not know why this tank was originally

recommended. His understanding is that with this tank, the District had more storage than it needed in the high pressure zone and the tank was not turning over. This led to loss of chlorine residual and coliform hits so the tank was taken offline.

R. Miner noted that this tank is used on a temporary basis when the Hutchinson Tank is being painted.

M. Metcalf noted it is nice to have the extra tank when you need to paint the Hutchinson tank as it avoids having to both run the Turkey Hill Booster Station 24/7 and provide a blow-off so you don't over-pressurize the system and cause breaks. This tank does not add fire protection to the main pressure system since it is in boosted zone. He noted that the Turkey Hill tank provides fire protection for the main pressure zone.

**f. Would deferring new source development for a couple of years, to advance PFC treatment be a safety concern?**

M. Metcalf noted that there are still issues with being able to meet future maximum day demand issues but that with the addition of the PWW booster station along with the Turkey Hill Tank, safety, in terms of fire protection should not be an issue.

He noted that a rate study update is done about every 3 years and one is due this summer. Given the new make up of the BOC, UEI suggested a worksession the week of June 4, 2018 to discuss a number of items including past and existing planning efforts, the Well 4/5 WTP, the rate study update, and any other issues that the Board may have.

**4. Board of Commissioners to hear updates of current projects from Emery and Garrett Groundwater, Inc. Topics/questions posed by Commissioners D. Provencher and W. von Schoen:**

- a. Mitchell Woods
- b. Would Artificial Recharge work at Well 3 by raising the level of Greens Pond?
- c. Is replacing Well 1 (with a collapsed screen) a potential option for a new source?

J. Emery noted that EGGI has been involved with the District since 1993 and was hired by the District due to the contamination at well #6. The District has to think about what will happen if the highest yielding well (#2) were to go down. Wells 4 & 5 are permitted to produce 870 GPM. There is an opportunity for the District to

use the existing Pumping House infrastructure and use Artificial Recharge to enhance the yield of Wells #4 and 5 in this area. The goal is to dilute the PFOS/PFOA insitu and increase the water output from these wells while increasing the life of the GAC.

EGGI is in the process of the preliminary AR investigation and is encouraged by the results of the investigation so far. It may be possible increase the capacity of well #1 and #3 by raising the level of Greens Pond. J. Emery noted that the water quality at Well #3 improves with the raising of the levels at Greens Pond (lowers iron and and manganese). R. Miner noted that the District has looked at the possibility of raising the level of Greens Pond in the past.

There is no PFOS found in the water from the well at Mitchell Woods, but Mitchell Woods has a limited capacity. (G. Keller left at this time.) This is an excellent source of water, but the capacity is low.

J. Emery noted that Artificial Recharge is a great way to use natural treatment of organic material to enhance weel yield.

The PFAS are being monitored at all MVD wells (except #4 and 5). It has been shown that the levels of PFAS are generally all declining over time. The ambient level of PFOA/PFOS in New Hampshire is considered to be 10 ppt according to NHDES.

D. Provencher questioned where the water would be taken out of the Merrimack River to create the Artificial Recharge at wells 4 & 5. J. Emery noted that a final location will need to be determined and that a withdrawal pump would be needed. The water pipes would need to go under the railroad right of way. The next step, will be to run a pilot study to determine how effective the soils/surficial deposits are in receiving and treating the AR water and how effectively the Artificial Recharge could be stored. D. Provencher stated artificial recharge at Well 3 would be by gravity not requiring a pump and recharge system.

D. Provencher questioned the potential for well #6. J. Emery noted this well might be able to be brought back on line at a lower capacity but would have to be closely monitored for 1,4 dioxane and other VOC's.

W. von Schoen questioned whether there is an understanding of the contamination of the ground at the proposed recharge site for wells 4 & 5. J. Emery noted that some soil samples have been taken and more are to be taken during this initial investigation.

**5. Board of Commissioners to discuss PFOA/PFOS Investigation.**

- a. MVD Customer Survey**
- b. Meeting with Horizons Engineering – private well hook ups**
- c. Commissioner von Schoen to discuss MVD's participation in joint meetings**

R. Miner noted that Horizons Engineering will be in town on May 22, 2018 to determine the points for the properties which currently have private wells. It looks like the cost to extend the MVD mains will be about \$6,500. SGPP is okay with this number. R. Miner noted that he does not think this project will get any less expensive.

This discussion was tabled until better numbers are determined for the possible cost of treatment of the MVD wells for PFOA/PFOS.

M. Meltcalf provided a draft engineering proposal for estimating the costs of GAC treatment at all wells excluding Wells 4 & 5.

**6. Old Business**

**Cell Tower Lease Agreements** – R. Miner noted that these lease agreements have been reviewed by Attorney G. Michael.

**7. New Business**

There was no new business at this time.

**8. Superintendent's Report**

**Artificial Recharge** – R. Miner met with J. Marts of EGGI on May 7, 2018 for the determination of test pit areas.

**Meeting with D. Provencher, W. von Schoen** – The system tour for the new commissioners was finished on May 4, 2018.

**Cleaning, Surging** – The cleaning and surging of well #7 is almost complete. A video of the well was taken. Kevin and Barry Miller will be at a future meeting to show this video.

**9. Questions from the Public**

N. Murphy noted congratulations to the new commissioners. She noted that the District complies with the current NHDES and USEPA regulations. There are health impacts to PFOA/PFOS chemicals. She noted that significant thought should be put towards thinking ahead. She noted it would be wise to look at the expectation that the advisories on chemical levels will change. She noted there are health impacts in Merrimack due to these chemicals. She noted she appreciates the efforts made to provide clean water.

G. Shaw noted she is looking to see the latest water test results and questioned whether these results are available. She questioned the date of the latest testing on the wells currently being used to provide water. J. Lavoie noted that results are submitted electronically to NHDES from the lab. NHDES posts the results on their website. There's a direct link to the NHDES PFAS website on the home page of the MVD website. The most recent testing was done April 19<sup>th</sup>. G. Shaw questioned whether these results could be put on the MVD website. J. Lavoie noted that maintaining such a database at the District would be cumbersome. W. von Schoen noted that a single source is fine, but this source needs to be acceptable.

G. Shaw noted that she wants to see the results for all chemicals tested. This information should be accessible to the public. She questioned the investigation of other wells and questioned how these wells were contaminated. R. Miner noted that NHDES identified potential users of these chemicals and their investigation is currently on-going. No responsible parties have been identified to date. G. Shaw questioned whether the landfills add to the contamination. R. Miner noted that the landfill is located far enough away from the wells. He noted that Mitchell Woods is the closest to the landfill and it is free of PFAS.

J. Emery noted that NHDES is looking at the fingerprint of the chemicals. He noted that New Hampshire is far ahead of other states with regard to these chemicals. New Hampshire is pursuing the responsible parties in the contamination of water by these chemicals.

L. Woods questioned whether the District is looking at the levels of sodium and chloride at well #3. He noted there are health issues involved with these chemicals. R. Miner noted that sodium was at 141 and chloride at 437 on April 5, 2018. J. Emery noted that 60 to 104 tons of salt were applied in the area of well #3 per mile. Sodium chloride is the biggest contaminant in New Hampshire. He noted there is salting going on at Fidelity. D. Provencher questioned whether Fidelity has been approached to change their de-icing practices. J. Emery noted that Fidelity has been approached and that it may be worth approaching them again.

**10. Questions from the Press**

There were no questions from the press at this time.

**Adjourn**

A motion was made by T. Pellegrino and seconded by D. Provencher to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 PM. The motion passed 4-0-0.

Respectfully submitted,  
Rita Pointon, Recording Secretary