

**MERRIMACK VILLAGE DISTRICT
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
JANUARY 27, 2025
MEETING MINUTES
(approved February 24, 2025)**

A regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners was conducted on Monday, January 27, 2025, at 5:00 p.m. at 2 Greens Pond Road, Merrimack, NH.

Donald Provencher, Chairman, presided:

Members of the Commission present: Kenneth Ayers, Vice Chairman
Erin Clement
Scott Sabens

Members of the Commission Absent: Wolfram von Schoen, Personnel Liaison

Also in Attendance: Ron Miner, Superintendent
Jill Lavoie, Business Manager
Kristen Maher, HR/Finance Director
James Emery, Emery & Garrett Groundwater Investigations
Fran St. Peter, 8 Sherwood Drive

FINANCE/HUMAN RESOURCES REVIEW

A. Analysis of Revenue and Expenditures

Kristen Maher, HR/Finance Director, stated six months into the fiscal year, shown is revenue in the amount of \$4,002,033 (63.71% of budgeted amount) and expenditures of \$2,471,733 (39.35%). Net Ordinary Income is \$1,530,301. That will be reduced as loan payments occur mostly at year end.

Revenue is up over last year due in part to higher interest rates, which she believes will level out over time. Included in the revenue line are funds received for the new mains for Saint-Gobain (Line Item #40408) as well as new construction entrance fees (70040). Also included is the revenue received from the sale of scrap metal (40414).

Director Maher addressed the expense side of the ledger noting costs associated with new entrance/meters for new construction around town (70040), which is offset by the revenue received. Also noted was the cost of repair and maintenance (R&M) of meters; replacing old meters (70450), under Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Janitorial (70675.6) is the cost of chemical disposal, and under R&M WTP, the cost of additional pumps and Variable Frequency Drives (VFDs) (70677.4 & 70677.8) to have in-house and avoid delivery delays.

Chair Provencher questioned the negative amount shown for Line Item 40412 – Service Charge (Backflow) and was told that is simply a matter of timing of the receipt of funds.

Asked about Line Item 50108 - Administrative sick pay out, Director Maher stated that to be related to payouts for anything over the maximum carryover.

B. Capital Reserve Balance

As of December 31, 2024, the Unassigned Net Position is \$22,099,288, which includes \$3,992,801 of convertible cash. Net income is \$1,799,637.

Director Maher noted the operating manuals for 2, 9, 7 and 8 were completed and payment was received at the beginning of January.

With regard to trust fund activity, items identified under a new year (during budget discussion) were moved. As a full grant was received for the PFAS water main extensions for areas 3, 4, and 5, the item/cost was removed.

The estimates associated with the 2025 warrant articles; \$800,000 allocation for Equipment & Facilities and \$200,000 for Water Purchase & WTP operating & maintenance (O&M) were included.

Anticipated FY25 year-end totals are; Land Acquisition \$1,586,095.32, Equipment & Facilities \$3,349,670.09, System Development \$1,380,649.22, Extraordinary Legal \$112,221.36, and Water Purchase & WTP O&M \$270,243.10.

Chair Provencher questioned the location of the booster pumping station evaluation identified under Equipment & Facilities for FY26 and was told that is the Belmont pumping station. Asked if the \$100,000 is for the engineering evaluation alone, Ron Miner, Superintendent, stated that to be the case noting it is the only station not linked with SCADA. If it goes down, it does not result in the loss of water pressure as it is merely a boosting station. If it does go down, Belmont Hill has water pressure, it is just lower. If a call is received, they go out and reset it.

Listed under FY27 is portable pressure pump/high service at \$100,000 and a new pressure pump for high service at \$100,000. Chair Provencher questioned whether they are redundant or if both are desired. Superintendent Miner stated were the Turkey Hill booster to go down it would be hooked to a hydrant as a backup for high service. He will look into why it is listed as a portable and a new pressure pump; it may be redundant.

Listed under FY28 is the Parker Drive tank at an estimated cost of \$500,000. Asked what is planned for, Superintendent Miner spoke of the need to blast coat that tank at some point (inside and out). It has been 20± years since that has been done.

REGULAR SESSION

1. Board of Commissioners to discuss the Mitchell Woods project and Change Order #01 with Jamie Emery of Emery & Garrett/GZA

Jamie Emery, Emery & Garret Groundwater Investigations (EGGI), provided a presentation (can be viewed [here](#)).

Mitchell Woods is a conservation area that was thought to be pristine. A pretty detailed exploration program was conducted in terms of looking at alternative or additional sites throughout Merrimack, and very few opportunities exist. The Mitchell Woods Production Well (MWPW) site was identified. Noted on the diagram displayed were the monitoring wells around the facility, piezometer, and wetlands. The stream

that runs through is accessed through Mitchell Street. There is a subdivision that is on individual septic drain fields.

PFAS samples have been taken at the MWPW site since 2016. There has never been detection of any PFAS compounds.

No PFAS has been detected in Monitoring Well 5 (MW-5), which is near the existing MWPW.

PFAS was detected at MW-7 on two separate occasions (7/2/24 and 8/16/24) with lower concentrations measured in the second sample (about half). MW-7 is on the western side near the subdivision and is 450' from the MWPW. Natural groundwater flow gradient is southeast toward the stream. Asked which way the stream flows, he was uncertain.

The MWPW is permitted to pump as much as 432,000 gallons/day. Total volume of water that can be pumped in any calendar year is limited to 45 million gallons (based on the amount of recharge they were able to determine was available to this well). That is equivalent to about 104 days of pumping at 300 gallons/minute.

For the most part, the demand needed to be met for additional source capacity is during peak demand. This would be what is considered to be a peak shaving well, meaning it would shave off the peak demands from buying water elsewhere. That was the intent.

EGGI has proposed conducting additional sampling in this well field to include DLM-3, DLM-5, DLM-6, DLM-7 and shallow piezometer 4P9 to better characterize the spread of PFAS in this immediate area and to provide some recommendations on whether the well should be retained for future use. As part of the next sampling round, they propose to pump the well for 8 hours. Currently, samples have been based on a sampling where they have taken a certain number of well volume out to take a sample of the local water, but if they pump it at 8 hours they would be able to see if the PFAS increased. Because there is also interest in the aquifer, we want to know if there is PFAS distributed throughout. Because we know the area above is pretty pristine, it is surprising that PFAS was seen in MMW-7 to a certain extent.

Mr. Emery remarked we have been dealing with Sodium and Chloride as elevated levels in a lot of the sources that MVD has depended upon. Looking at water samples taken at the MWPW for a fairly long period of time in the monitoring program, Iron and Manganese are low, Sodium is very low, Arsenic is very low, and pH is low and would have to be adjusted. Chloride levels essentially in 2024 were non-detected. Hardness is great, Nitrate is non-detect as are VOCs and SOCs. Overall, the water quality of this well is extraordinary; very high quality water. From the standpoint of mineral content, the only thing that would have to be adjusted is pH.

If looking at the PFAs, the well that is the production well has no detections. The proxy well that has been sampled since 2016; three samples no detections of any kind and then the well next to it no detections. The MW-7 has had PFOS at 84.5 in July and almost half of that (47.3) in August. A different lab method was used, although that is not believed to be the reason behind the difference.

Displayed was a chart from a previous hydro study. It shows that the groundwater flow comes southeast towards the brook. When we are not pumping this well, this is what the groundwater flow looks like. When we pump this well we see drawdown contours start to form (after a 5-day pumping test). We begin to see an impact on MW-7. That does not mean that the groundwater quality of MW-7 will enter into this

well, you are getting recharge from 360° around this well so there is a lot of dilution there. If taking this as a 180-day pumping period non-stop, consecutively, with no recharge and we start capturing, we would definitely start seeing some groundwater flow migrating towards this well.

Under the short-term pumping, one of the things we would likely have to do is model this well to determine how much water could be pumped from this well without incurring any contamination from this particular area.

Mr. Emery remarked he does not want to think about doing that until he knows whether or not there is contamination or PFAS elsewhere in this aquifer. Then he could do a particle tracking analysis to determine how long it would take or what pumping rates could be done or how many days a year could be pumped without causing groundwater to actually migrate towards the well and be influenced by that. He suggests this knowing a lot of time has been spent in the previous decades looking at other sources for the MVD. This is one of those that remains a viable source. It's water quality, other than PFAS that has been seen in this one MW is very high/good. We already know this is a peak shaving well so we won't be pumping it 180 days consecutively. This would be pumped probably 30-40 days or perhaps only during certain peak days.

If the Commission still feels this is a viable option for peak shaving, he would not throw this well out completely because property is already negotiated in terms of availability to MVD. We have a permit that is valid until May of 2027 after which we would have to re-permit the well (a year or so before the deadline). Once this lapses you would have to go through the large groundwater withdrawal permit all over again, which in his view, does not make sense.

The proposal is a Change Order in the amount of \$9,300 to pump this well for an extended period (8 hours), take a PFAS sample and then pump all wells and get PFAS samples. The Commission would then be provided with the results and a recommendation as to whether this remains a viable well.

Mr. Emery remarked he does not have a clue as to the source of the PFAS and would not want to speculate.

Chair Provencher spoke of the project having been tabled over the past several years.

Commissioner Clement remarked for the \$9,300, if PFAS is the issue we will not re-permit in 2027. It is already not our favorite. Moving forward with this will provide an answer once and for all. If it comes back PFAS it is probably not worth the investment to put filters on it to then use it just to shave peak summer with the power issues that location also has.

Jill Lavoie, Business Manager, noted it is in the groundwater management zone. The cost would not all be that of the MVD. Chair Provencher added unless disputed, which would likely be the case. Member Clement commented we were not really excited about this because of the flow limitations.

Mr. Emery spoke of it being challenging to find alternative sources in Merrimack. This is probably one of the last ones the MVD would have independent control of in terms of rates, etc. It is a challenge. His view is this permit is coming up and if this PFAS goes through he would suggest asking legal counsel to submit this to Saint-Gobain as part of their possible responsibility. You may not get anywhere with it, but they and probably NHDES need to know.

Chair Provencher commented that would have a large impact on whether we want to move forward, e.g., if there is going to be a responsible party for treatment. This just isn't quite enough volume. It would be good to know, if it does need treatment, whose burden that would be.

Commissioner Sabens remarked, at that point, we would be able to make an informed decision about whether or not to proceed with the re-permitting. Asked what the return on investment is on the well, Commissioner Clement stated it to be a smaller volume and there are power issues of getting three-phase power or converting power at the site. It is not the best option, but one of the only options we have for a fresh well.

Asked what would be the direction were it to come back pristine, Commissioner Clement stated her belief it would remain tabled until we are ready to make a decision on it. Asked about the cost of permitting, Mr. Emery stated re-permitting to be about \$30,000 - \$40,000. If you let it lapse and have to go through the large groundwater withdrawal permitting process all over again, the cost would be in the hundreds of thousands. You already have an investment in it and a landowner that is willing, which is very hard, and you already have a supply that is meaningful (400,000 gallons/day is pretty significant). If this is able to pump without PFAS, which he believes could for 30-60 days/year, you have that peak shave.

Asked, Mr. Emery stated DES would prefer to see you pumping water before the permit expires. That is not happening between now and May 2027, but that is why when you do the re-permitting you give yourself another 5 years to make that decision. If you let it lapse and have to go through the large permitting process you are probably doing that at a cost of approximately \$300,000. If we come back and there is PFAS in all of these other monitoring wells you know what the answer is.

Chair Provencher remarked spending \$9,300 gives us more information to conclusively determine what we do next.

Vice Chair Ayers commented if nothing else, there is value there in terms of perhaps adding to the litigation, if nothing else. It is something we have invested in already.

Commissioner Sabens added the additional testing will tell us whether or not we need to bother renewing the permit as a potential option going forward.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER AYERS TO APPROVED EMERY & GARRETT'S CHANGE ORDER #1 IN THE AMOUNT OF NINE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$9,300) FOR MITCHELL WOODS GROUNDWATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT. SOURCE OF FUNDING IS THE OPERATING BUDGET
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER AYERS
MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

2. Board of Commissioners to discuss a billing dispute with Fran Cahill from 8 Sherwood Drive

Ms. Fran St. Peter stated her usual water bill is at most 205-225 cubic feet/monthly. Her October statement was for previous months (3 months back) at a cost of \$85.47. In November she received an invoice for October usage, which identified 1,370 cubic feet or 10,000 gallons of usage.

She resides in a mobile home. After receiving the invoice, she visited the office and was provided with tablets to place in the back of the toilet to identify if there was a leak. There were no results from that testing. She again visited the office to inquire about next steps.

It seems obvious to her that she could not be using 10,000 gallons of water in a one-month period. The following month the invoice corrected itself showing the usage at 206 cubic feet. She questioned if there may have been an issue with the meter or a typo in the invoice.

Because the area is a resident COOP, the water department does not come out to her location to assess problems. There is a contractor, Tom Howe Septic Systems, who came out to identify the problem. They found nothing wrong.

She is concerned as to where the water usage went and who is responsible for the bill. She lives on a limited monthly disability income and has never paid bill over \$25 for a single month. This bill was \$72.77

Asked where the meter is located, Superintendent Miner stated meter pits can be anywhere from 20' away from the home. For some of the mobile homes it can be 50-60' away. Ms. St. Peter stated for her home there are two spickets; one for two houses. She is in charge of the double spicket and with that she has a round circular cover that is approx. 20' from her kitchen.

Vice Chair Ayers asked if the information is gathered digitally, and was told it is. Superintendent Miner stated they took a reading and verified the top was reading the same as the hand-held. Water goes from the main into the meter. There is a length of pipe that does go from the meter to the home. It doesn't seem to be the case as it would be leaking if not repaired, but there is a section of pipe that could sit there and leak. It doesn't seem to be happening, but it could have gone through a hose, could have been a leaky toilet, etc. It is water that did go through the meter.

Chair Provencher spoke of notes that there was no leak observed by our technician. Superintendent Miner stated we looked at the dial on the meter. There was nothing spinning. We didn't observe anything else.

Asked, if a plumber was called, Ms. St. Peter reiterated the COOP's contractor came out and assessed the whole problem and was unable to identify anything. Asked if there are any external garden hoses that may have been left on, she stated she drains her garden hose with every use. Nothing is left turned on.

Chair Provencher remarked, in the past when there has been a known leak that the owner was simply unaware of, a credit has not been granted. However, in this instance, it is not known there is a leak. He asked if there is an average usage amount/cost Ms. St. Peter would feel is appropriate. She indicated she would be fine with the \$25 flat fee.

Commissioner Sabens questioned the frequency with which meters provide inaccurate readings, and was told if there is a discrepancy, it is usually that the meter slows down not that it speeds up.

Asked about past practice, Business Manager Lavoie spoke of the Town having applied for an abatement based on a water leak at Wasserman Park. It was not approved as they were aware of a leak in their infrastructure.

Chair Provencher reiterated the oddity of this is that the usage returned to typical without any intervention. Commissioner Sabens reiterated the meter shows the usage that went through it. Asked if the contractor went under the mobile home while assessing the situation, Ms. St. Peter stated they did, they checked everything out and were unable to find anything wrong. Superintendent Miner stated he had been told by the contractor that he didn't climb under as it was raining the day he was there, and he couldn't see anything. He wasn't going to go under the unit and shut the valve off, but he really couldn't see anything. He went down and talked to one of our guys later on that day. We went out the following day and that is when is when we looked at the meter. There was nothing leaking at that point.

Chair Provencher commented that this situation seems different than the other that came before the Commission last year. He asked what the policy is and was told requests have to come before the Board. In the past, to his knowledge, the Board has not forgiven any. Asked about the number of occurrences. Business Manager Lavoie responded typically when rates are high we can walk customers though the situation and have identified leaking toilets, the spray on a hose has popped off, etc. Superintendent Miner stated they work with customers on payment plans, etc.

Ms. St. Peter remarked she is aware the usage will go up this month given the need to drip faucets when getting into the single digits to avoid pipes freezing.

Vice Chair Ayers asked if any neighboring residents had reached out to the office and was told they have not.

Chair Provencher stated he would be willing to accept some kind of reduction in the bill. Commissioner Sabens remarked had he seen the November bill be high as well it would suggest they found a leak and fixed it. He is not seeing that.

Something to consider is the matter of precedent.

Vice Chair Ayers sated he would be fine with adjusting the bill based on historical amounts.

Commissioner Sabens commented on the weather pattern in November having been relatively warm suggesting it was not a situation where something had frozen stopping a leak. He asked if there is a mechanism for monitoring.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SABENS TO ADJUST THE BILL TO REFLECT A \$50 CREDIT BRINGING THE BILL TO A TOTAL OF \$22.77 FOR THE OCTOBER BILL REFLECTING MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER AYERS
MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

Superintendent Miner stated it can be monitored as they drive by the area frequently.

There being no objection, the Commission went out of the regular order of business to take up Item #4

4. Board of Commissioners to discuss and vote to move the Proposed Budget forward to the Public Hearing as amended at the Budget Work Session on January 22, 2025.

The recommended operating budget for FY26 is \$6,538,953, which represents a 4.1% increase over the FY25 approved budget. The total budget, if approved, will not result in a rate increase for FY26. The total budget includes \$68,000 in capital budget costs. Fifteen thousand (\$15,000) of that is required each year as part of the Town ordinance deductible. If no work is completed by the Town, this expense will not be incurred.

A chart was displayed depicting a breakdown of the proposed expenditures; Ops - debt services 12%, capital expenditures 1%, and operating expenses 87%.

Proposed appropriations include interest at 5%, offsetting revenue of 5%, services at 66% and other 24%. Anticipated revenue is projected to balance the proposed budget of \$6,538,953.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER CLEMENT TO MOVE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDED BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF SIX MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THIRTY-EIGHT THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED FIFTY-THREE DOLLARS (\$6,538,953) TO THE PUBLIC HEARING

MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SABENS

MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

FY26 Budget Detail Memorandum

Noted were typos in the first paragraph of page 4; replace “is” with “in” before “wetter years.” and “Chemical” should be plural.

Asked about the increase in the cost of chemicals, Director Maher stated the increase is based on pumpage and the delayed opening of wells 2 and 9.

Chair Provencher spoke of the revenue addressed at the start of the meeting and that chemicals were running under the budgeted amount. We underfunded the budget in FY25 and are requesting an increase in FY26. Business Manager Lavoie noted the need to purchase chemicals for the summer. You are likely to purchase more at the end of the fiscal year.

Director Maher provided the example of FY24 when it was believed all three wells would be online, which did not occur. It was the wettest summer ever. We have to budget for worst-case scenario, e.g., potential drought, etc., and the end result was that the need was less than half what was anticipated.

Commissioner Clement mentioned the long period of time in FY26 when there were a few wells down due to pump issues. Water was purchased during that time and chemicals that would have otherwise been used were not.

The Annual Meeting will be conducted on Tuesday, March 25, 2025, at the James Mastricola Upper Elementary School All Purchase Room beginning at 7:00 p.m.

MOTION BY MEMBER CLEMENT TO APPROVE THE FY26 BUDGET MEMO, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER AYERS

MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

The Commission returned to the regular order of business.

3. Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Miner addressed the following:

Water Quality

- Lead Service Line Inventory

We have had 65 requests for lead sample bottles. Forty-one have not been picked up as of this time and 6 that were picked up have not been returned. There were eighteen results; 3 hits, 2 of which have been remedied and 1 is pending re-sampling. We've had 61 non-lead service lines and 6,548 unknowns.

Chair Provencher questioned the timing of the letter that was sent, and was told it was at the start of December. It went out snail mail to every MVD customer (through the MVD system). Chair Provencher and Commissioners Clement and Sabens stated they did not recollect receiving a letter.

Chair Provencher remarked only one neighbor of his on the next street over whose property was built in the '80s received a letter. Vice Chair Ayers stated his belief he had received one.

Business Manager Lavoie stated the letter to be the notification letter the EPA required to be sent out by a certain date. We included the bottle order information as well. We have to offer bottles to anyone who wants them. Asked who is responsible for the cost to repair if testing positive, Business Manager Lavoie stated, to date, we don't have any lead service lines. We had three detections; one where a woman took the sample from an extra bedroom and jacuzzi tub in a bathroom. They discussed it and learned it was a new main line extension on Jason Drive and Bryant Circle. It was thought it could be interior plumbing where a deposit was left. Another one the gentleman took the sample right after the meter. There was a slight hit on that one. We went out and switched out the meter, retested, and it is fine. The meter was from 2002. If we are seeing any of these we are looking at the age of the meter and switching it out. We are waiting for one more and all three will be explained. These new results will be put in place of the ones that have hits to keep the database clean.

Chair Provencher commented the letter stated the customer has the option of requesting a test at no cost. He asked if there are instructions provided for where to take a sample, etc. Business Manager Lavoie responded individuals are provided with written instructions when they come in. Whoever is at the windows goes over them. Shelly puts the request onto the list, makes the bottle, sends the notification back to the customer informing the bottle is ready, and it is logged into the spreadsheet identifying the date requested, date picked up, dropped off, went to lab, results came back, customer notified, etc.

- Sampling

The Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule 5 (UCMR5) quarterly compliance was completed last week along with our normal PFAS media and quarterly distribution PFAS sampling; 144 sample bottles in total.

- PFAS Pilot (4 & 5)

The pilot components should be shipped this week.

Maintenance

- PFAS - nothing to report
- Treatment Facilities

Treatment staff will be working on re-generating the green sand filters at 7 & 8 treatment facility this week.

Leak Repair Mainline/Entrance

Distribution staff repaired an entrance leak on Turkey Hill Road on January 14th. A hydrant repair was done on Back River Road.

Administrative

- PFAS Watermain Extensions (MVD)

MVD comments have been submitted to Underwood Engineers for Gerard and Mullikin. Town to review by end of month. Plans have been submitted to NHDES. Expect receipt of plans for Mason and Farmer this week.

- PFAS Watermain/Entrance Extensions – Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics (SGPP)

Watermain work, Cardillo & Sons - all watermain work is done. There remains some inside plumbing to do. Waiting on a Change Order from SGPP.

Entrance work, SUR Construction - 5 more properties were added - planned for spring.

- Town of Merrimack Hazard Mitigation Plan

Adopted July 15, 2021. Due to be revised by July of 2026. All Town departments will be working with the Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC). Superintendent Miner stated his thought would be to have groundwater contamination; specifically, Sodium, Chloride, and PFAS added to the Mitigation Plan.

Training

Hosting a class on Emerging Contaminants, PFAS, through Granite State Rural Water Association (GSRWA) on 2/13/2025. Class will be at Distribution Warehouse with a tour to follow at wells 2 & 9 Treatment Facility.

Salt Letter

Included in agenda packet. Will be mailed to everyone within the Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA) this week.

Chair Provencher noted the notices of site plan violations. Business Manager Lavoie stated those to have been sent out by the Town.

Commissioner Clement spoke of Colleen Olsen, Assistant Planner, having mentioned the Community Development Department would be creating a list of properties that have the salt restriction and what the restriction is so that they are more aware of it. Business Manager Lavoie remarked we could just send them a spreadsheet. She had spent days in the department gathering that information.

Chair Provencher commented on the plan that is referenced in one of the letters as having the salt restriction, it appears as though it includes all the properties on Dobson Way. He is pleased to see this as there was a discrepancy in the WHPA area on two maps. One map suggested the WHPA went all the way up to Dobson Way and the other went out Continental Boulevard several hundred feet. It is good this is capturing that property as he believes it could be in the WHPA.

Superintendent Miner commented it is close enough. It still has the site restrictions so they should be abiding by it.

Commissioner Clement spoke of the letter indicating there are directions for completing the survey. It does not appear as though there are directions. Chair Provencher pointed out it references the website. Commissioner Clement suggested placing a QR code on the letter or the front page of the website. Business Manager Lavoie indicated that could be done.

Superintendent Miner noted the following day he and Director Maher would be attending the New Hampshire Regional Cyber Defense training in Concord. Business Manager Lavoie is on the waiting list to participate.

5. Board of Commissioners to discuss a *Local Source Water Protection* Grant to install security cameras at MVD properties

Business Manager Lavoie stated the quote for the 9 locations totals \$42,683. When applying for the grant you can seek \$20,000 of which \$10,000 has to be your matching funds. In the approval letter they offered \$6,508. For that we would need a Certificate of Authority signed by the Chair indicating Superintendent Miner has the authority to sign any and all documents required for the grant.

The grant funds are intended to address areas of wells. It cannot be offices, warehouses, etc. Superintendent Miner noted the cost identified in the CIP to address all areas.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER CLEMENT THAT THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE MERRIMACK VILLAGE DISTRICT ACCEPT THE SOURCE WATER PROTECTION GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF SIX THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED EIGHT DOLLARS (\$6,508) TO ASSIST WITH THE FUNDING OF SECURITY CAMERAS AT MVD WELLS. THIS GRANT IS CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF THE GOVERNOR AND COUNCIL
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER AYERS
MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

6. Board of Commissioners to decide where the Public Hearing for the Annual Meeting will be held

After a brief discussion, the consensus was to hold the Public Hearing at 2 Greens Pond Road.

7. Board of Commissioners to review the draft 2025 Warrant articles

Article 1 – Election

To choose two (1) Commissioners for a three (3) year term of office. (Written ballot vote required)

The word “(two)” should be replaced with “(one)”.

Article 2 - Election

To choose one (1) Commissioner to fill one (1) year of a three (3) year term of office. (Written ballot vote required)

Article 3 – Operating Budget

To see if the Merrimack Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of six million five hundred thirty-eight thousand nine hundred fifty three dollars (\$6,538,953) for general municipal operations for the 2025-2026 fiscal year with said sum to come from water related charges. This article does not include appropriations contained in special or individual articles addressed separately. (Majority vote required)

Article 4 – System Development Capital Reserve

Shall the Merrimack Village District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of sixty eight thousand four hundred ninety dollars (\$68,490) under provisions of RSA 35:1, I and II to add to the District’s “System Development Capital Reserve” fund for the future system expansion and improvement of the existing system. This sum to come from the System Development revenue fund; these are the system development charges collected during the 2023-2024 budget year. (Majority vote required.)

Article 5 – Equipment & Facilities Capital Reserve

Shall the Merrimack Village District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of eight hundred thousand dollars (\$800,000) under provisions of RSA 35:1, I and II to add to the District’s “Equipment and Facilities Capital Reserve” fund for associated costs with existing storage, transmission and production of water. This sum to come from unassigned fund balance. (Majority vote required.)

Article 6 – Non-Capital Reserve Fund

Shall the Merrimack Village District vote to raise and appropriate the sum of two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) under provisions of RSA 35:1, I and II to add to the District’s “Purchase of water and/or the operations and maintenance of GAC Treatment facilities” Non-Capital Reserve fund for associated costs with purchase of and/or treatment of water. This sum to come from unassigned fund balance.

Article 7

This article is to transact any other business and close the meeting.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER CLEMENT TO APPROVE MOVING THE WARRANT ARTICLES TO PUBLIC HEARING, AS AMENDED
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SABENS
MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

8. Board of Commissioners to review the minutes from the December 16, 2024, regular Board of Commissioners Meeting and Non-Public Session

Board of Commissioners – Non-Public. December 16, 2024

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SABENS TO UNSEAL THE NON-PUBLIC MINUTES DATED DECEMBER 16, 2024
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER AYERS**

A Viva Voce Roll Call was conducted, which resulted as follows:

Yea: Donald Provencher, Kenneth Ayers, Erin Clement, Scott Sabens
4
Nay : 0

MOTION CARRIED

Board of Commissioners Regular Meeting December 16, 2024

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER AYERS TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING AND NON-PUBLIC SESSION CONDUCTED ON DECEMBER 16, 2024, AS PRESENTED
MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SABENS
MOTION CARRIED
4-0-0**

9. Board of Commissioners to review Action Items from previous meetings and those to be added from this meeting.

The Commission reviewed the Action Items. New dates were added to several of the items.

10. Old Business

Chair Provencher spoke of having seen salt on roads in Town that are designated as no salt use. In those areas, he has also seen signage stating limited salt area. He is uncertain if the plow drivers are seeing those signs and thinking it is limited salt, which means salt can be spread.

Commissioner Clement spoke of the salt policy having been changed to be more in line with practice. When it says no salt it does not mean they are doing no salt. Chair Provencher added it means they should be adhering to no salt unless there is an emergency. The problem was that every storm seemed to be an emergency. The current policy identifies no salt roads, but the signage on some of those roads, e.g., Royal Court, indicate limited salt.

Superintendent Miner stated his understanding Naticook Road would receive the salt but Royal Court would be a no salt area unless absolutely necessary.

Chair Provencher reiterated there is no signage to indicate no salt. The only signs in place say limited salt. He questioned if the signage needs to be changed in the areas where the policy identifies the road as no salt.

Asked if the MVD has “no salt” signs, Chair Provencher stated it does not. Commissioner Sabens suggested the first step to be to acquire the signage. There was discussion of who identifies a particular situation as an emergency. Chair Provencher questioned the total number of signs that would be needed to address those roads identified as no salt. Superintendent Miner noted it was the Town that put up the low salt signage. Superintendent Miner will follow up and include an update in his report next month.

11. New Business

The next meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2025. The Public Hearing is also on this date and will be held at the MVD Office.

The March BOC meeting will be moved from March 17th to March 10th due to the risk of not having a quorum.

12. Questions from the Public/Press - None

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER AYERS TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SABENS

MOTION CARRIED

4-0-0

The January 27, 2025, regular meeting of the Board of Commissioners was adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Submitted by Dawn MacMillan, Recording Secretary