

Mountain Lakes District Water Committee Report for July 2013

This report covers the meeting of July 3rd the meeting with D&K and NHDES on July 9th, and some additional emails about the NHDES meeting.

Mountain Lakes District Water Committee Meeting of 7/3/2013

Status: Draft as of 7/31/13 – Reviewed as of 8/1/13– Approved as of 8/1/13

This was the July 2013 Water Committee Meeting. It was held from 7:30 AM to 8:30 on 7/3/13.

Attendees: Ed Rajsteter – Chair, Don Drew – Water Department, Bob Long – Commissioner, Peter Olander, Robert Roudebush, Ken King, Tony Salvucci 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 our meeting with NHDES

Water System Status

Don reported that the current usage is about 27,000 gallons per day. The system is operating well. We are currently using 10,000 gallons per day from WWL at a monthly cost of \$3500.

Discussion with D&K about meeting with NHDES

Chuck talked about the goal of the meeting with NHDES. D&K wants to get feedback on the infiltration well source versus a surface water source in terms of feasibility, cost, and approvals needed. He expects the state to provide information but not to have a preference for one or the other. D&K does not yet have any cost information.

We also want to know what is required for continued use of our infiltration well.

Chuck will talk to Cynthia Klevens and will prepare an agenda for the meeting.

Meeting with New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services

NHDES, MLD Water Com, Dubois&King
Meeting of July 9, 2013

Meeting Summary

This is a summary of the meeting on July 9, 2013 between the Mountain Lakes Water Committee, Dubois & King, and NH DES (Department of Environmental Security). The meeting was held at the NH DES headquarters (29 Hazen Drive) in Concord, NH. A more complete set of minutes will be produced at a later date,

Attendees

NH DES

Cynthia Klevens (Water Sources), Steve Roy (Water Permitting), Brian DesFosses (Dam Safety)

Dubois&King
Chuck Goodling, Nick Sceggell

Water Committee
Don Drew, Ed Rajsteter, Ken King

Dubois & King are currently working on two design projects for Mountain Lakes. One is the replacement for the lower dam outlet system and the second is to evaluate two options for water sources, our Infiltration Well or a new Surface Water Treatment Facility. These projects will require interaction with the NH DES and permits from them. Also, how we do the outflow project has an interaction with the how we do the water sources project.

This meeting was the start of a process to be sure all groups have the same basic understanding of the issues involved.

Prior to this meeting, we believed that one of the water source options would be to perform maintenance on our Infiltration Well to restore the capacity and use that as our primary source. This is not an option. This well is considered grandfathered at its current level. The expectation is that within a few years, there will be a bad test and they would then shut down the use of this source. The state went through a few years ago and shut down all of the infiltration wells but ours was not in use at that time.

We could restore the infiltration well to the original design but it would then be permitted as a surface water system and a complete water treatment component would have to be added. It may sound strange to use an infiltration well as a source for a surface water treatment system but that does happen as it simplifies the permitting process. It means that the NH DES water source group can handle the complete permit. Otherwise, if you use a pipe directly into the lake, you also have to deal with the Wetlands and Shoreline Protection groups as part of the permit. Now in our case, we will have to do this anyway as part of the lower lake outlet.

When talking about the outlet project, Brian wanted to know if we had considered a plain concrete sluice way. He said it was easier to keep track of it over time as everything is visible. Don and I will talk to Shawn about this.

If we go with a surface water system, we will have to ask for a waiver as we do not currently have 1000 people on our water system although we expect to have that many over a 20 year time frame. Part of the waiver will be to show that there are no other alternatives from either a practical or economic point of view.

We need to look at a 20 year cost of a surface water system and compare that to the WWL alternative. There is not only the initial cost but all of the repairs and replacements expected over the 20 year period. We also have to consider that it will probably require a full-time person at 1 or 2 levels above our current system. Don is going to check on the specific requirements.

Follow Up from Cynthia after the meeting:

Hello All -

I am sending this message to the folks that attended the NHDES meeting last week (7/9/13) and Bob Long, who I have been following up with. Please forward to the rest of the Water Committee and other individuals as appropriate. Thank you.

I did speak with Cynthia Klevins this Wednesday afternoon (7/17/13). Here is a brief summary of our discussions:

1. I left a message for Cynthia on Monday, she was out on Tuesday, and we did not get to speak to each other until Wednesday afternoon.
2. She confirmed that no formal waiver request submission from MLD has been made to DES. During our discussions at the meeting, Cynthia provided an initial indication that she felt if a waiver request associated with surface water treatment was submitted, it could be favorably reviewed by DES, especially as our population projection over the 20-year planning period exceeded 1,000 customers. However, when she discussed the context of our meeting with the Administrator, the Administrator felt that there was not enough justification to support a waiver.....yet. Cynthia felt it was appropriate to pass this back to MLD and D&K, and that was what she did in her email last Friday. She said DES is "not slamming the door" on a possible future waiver request, but they just do not feel we are at the point where that is necessary yet. She said "there is more work to do with the source that you already have" (i.e., WW&L).
3. She said that the WW&L option "cannot be a dead option". I clarified that no one has said that it is a dead option, but as Ed explained, this option does not appear to be economically favorable as a full time, permanent water source (at least, not at this time). She said that economic viability of any option is a factor to consider when assessing an alternative, but it is not the ultimate deciding factor. She said that WW&L has available reserve capacity, so this needs to remain on the table. We agreed that the economic viability of the WW&L alternative will become clearer when we have the costs of the surface water treatment alternatives to compare against.
4. She said that DES needs to continue working with WW&L to have them better document costs and to better justify water rates. She said that DES is stepping up their outreach on water rates throughout the state in general. A year ago, DES offered funding to WW&L to conduct a cost of service study, but WW&L declined to participate in the study. DES will continue to push WW&L for better justification for water rates.
5. She said that she did not view the feedback on the waiver as a change of course for the direction that MLD is headed, and she encouraged MLD to proceed with the assessment of the two surface water treatment alternatives that we discussed at the meeting. MLD still needs to understand what the costs will be for all alternatives. She suggested that a follow-up meeting with the Administrator would be in order, once the study was completed.
6. We talked a little more about the two options:
 - Continued use of the infiltration source with surface water treatment.

- Brand new intake into the lake with surface water treatment.

She said that given the two options for obtaining water from the lake, she felt the most favorable approach was to use the infiltration source as this would appear to avoid (or at least, reduce) the permitting requirements that would accompany a brand new intake. At our meeting, she and Steve Roy painted a pretty murky picture of the permitting requirements that would be associated with a new intake into the lake. We agreed that we need to develop a better understanding of what the permitting requirements will be for both alternatives. I said that we will want to be speaking with the folks from the Watershed Group in the near future, to explore these requirements. She and/or Steve would want to participate in those discussions. I also mentioned that Nick and I completed a brief file review following our meeting, and found a couple documents that spoke to "clogging" of the infiltration source and corresponding reduction in infiltration capacity. This factor also needs to be considered in the comparison of alternatives.

In the end, I believe our discussions were positive and she clearly encourages moving forward with the study, despite the Administrator's current view on the waiver.

I presume that D&K should proceed with the balance of our study. Please confirm. Also, please feel free to call to follow-up on any of the information above. Thank you.

Chuck

Charles K. Goodling, P.E., Vice President
Director, Public Works and Facilities Division
DuBois & King, Inc.
28 North Main Street
Randolph, Vermont 05060