

## **Mountain Lakes District Water Committee Report for August, 2013**

This report covers the meeting of 8/1/13, and some additional emails since that meeting.

### ***Mountain Lakes District Water Committee Meeting of 8/1/2013***

Status: Draft as of 9/3/13 – Reviewed as of 9/5/13– Approved as of 9/5/13

This was the August 2013 Water Committee Meeting. It was held from 7:30 AM to 8:32 on 8/1/13.

Attendees: Ed Rajsteter – Chair, Don Drew – Water Department, Bob Long – Commissioner, Peter Olander, Robert Roudebush, and Ken King with Chuck Goodling and Nickolas Sceggell from Dubois & King on the phone.

The purpose of this meeting was to have a discussion with D&K about the follow up to our meeting with NHDES.

### **Water System Status**

Don reported that the current usage is about 29,000 gallons per day. The system is operating well. There were two incident reports of dirty water. These were investigated but no problems were found. There was a report of ground water on Stafford Drive but that was investigated and no problems were found.

The two new dry hydrants are in and have been tested. They are performing as planned.

Bob reported that Dennis Connolle wants to sell his lot in the spillway. Because of the restrictions on it, it is of little value to the District. However, if the price were reasonable, it might be worth it to avoid the years it takes to do anything to it even though we have the rights.

### **Call with Chuck and Nick from D&K**

At the NEDES meeting, Chuck and Nick had stayed to review the files that NHDES has on Mountain Lakes. The discussion centered on the infiltration well. The original 1973 plan talked about the infiltration well and the plan for expansion of it as needed. In the mid 80's, it was shut down due to contamination problems. In the mid 90's, there was a penciled entry in the files from Bernie Luce, a state employee, that the well was back in use but with no explanation. Since 1985, the state has maintained that there was insufficient out put from the infiltration well to justify any any maintenance of expansion.

We discussed with D&K that as our only non-WWL option is now a surface water option, it is important for their proposal to include the full 20 year cost of such a system including initial construction, full operating costs, and the estimated cost of the people needed to maintain and operate such a system.

Don had talked to Wade Pelam at the state. For a surface water system, the operator must be at Grade 3. There are education requirements in the specifications but Wade said that previous experience could replace the such requirements.

The state had suggested that we do some basic water quality tests. Don will check with Eastern Analytical on the cost. Bob suggested that we get the vendors of the water treatment plants to do the testing.

We talked about three ways to provide water for the surface treatment system. One would be to use the

existing infiltration well. However, this would require a redesign and complete implementation to provide the volume of water necessary. The second approach would be to install a pipe directly into the lake. This will require permits but we may be able to do this as part of our new outflow system project. Bob suggested a gravel packed well as a third alternative.

We told D&K to investigate all three options and to remember that the outflow project and the new source project must be integrated.

The final business was to approve the minutes of the Water Committee Report for July of 201

## **Other Email Messages**

Don and Bob,

I just wanted to update both of you on the conversation that Chuck and I had with NHDES this week. We had a conference call with Cynthia Klevens and Owen David (Watershed Bureau). The purpose of the call was to better understand the permitting process that is involved with a new surface water intake. We briefly discussed the two scenarios that we have previously discussed as options for the source on a new surface water treatment plant: 1. An expansion of the existing infiltration system; and 2. A direct piped intake into the lake.

Under scenario 1 (expansion of the existing infiltration gallery), there would be no additional permitting requirements through the NHDES Watershed Bureau. This is a benefit to this option. However, as previously discussed and to be outlined in our report. There are some maintenance concerns with the stream bank filter. And additional discussions are needed and planned with NHDES Wetlands Bureau about the permitting requirements for maintaining the infiltration gallery.

Under scenario 2 (direct intake into the lake), there is additional permitting needed through the Watershed Bureau. This permitting could be initiated either through the wetlands permitting process or a Water Quality Certification. The water quality certification can be fairly involved and requires additional information about the watershed and lake levels and the effects of a withdrawal on the lake levels and/or the low flow out of the dam and into the receiving stream. The permitting process also looks at impacts to endangered species and archaeological impacts of the project. The permitting process can take up to 1 year by statute but typically is about 6 months.

We're planning on using all this information and including it into our analysis for the report but just wanted to keep you folks up to date.

I am still trying to get a manufacturer to sign on to analyze a water sample but haven't gotten a firm yes. I hope to have an answer very soon. If we don't get a freebie, then I will let you know what we should have analyzed by a lab locally. I will let you know next week.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact Chuck or myself.

Nick

**Chuck,**

Thanks for taking the time to respond as I am sure it's a pretty hectic time with getting the girls back to college.

I believe Nick's approach to have the systems reps test the raw water quality is a good one. Since they are the ones who would design the system, it would provide us with some more accurate data on what would be required for the treatment system.

On another note, you had expressed some concerns with the infiltration option as it has had some problems in the past. We talked briefly about shallow gravel wells in place of the infiltration wells being fed by the lagoon. Is this a viable option and if yes, would it come under the same scrutiny as pulling directly from the lake.

Enjoy your trip and we will talk with you soon.

Regards,

Bob Long

On Sat, Aug 24, 2013 at 9:14 PM, Charles Goodling <[cgoodling@dubois-king.com](mailto:cgoodling@dubois-king.com)> wrote:

Hello Bob -

You probably received an auto-reply saying that I am out of the office for a few days.....on the "take you daughters back to college road trip". Nick sent out a brief status report later Friday afternoon, with a summary of our phone call with Cynthia and the Water Quality guy last week. A reasonably helpful call with some basic feedback about options and process. We can chat when I get back after Labor Day weekend. I know that Nick is pushing the treatment system representatives for some free raw water quality sampling like we discussed, but has not gotten any firm offers to do this, just yet. If he cannot get a commitment soon, we should probably have Don collect some samples. This testing is not absolutely necessary to complete our report, but it would likely make the results that much more "specific" to this project. We would clarify what tests should be performed and get an estimate of costs, before making the decision to proceed with this. Thanks Bob.

Charles K. Goodling, P.E., Vice President  
D