

## Approved Hudson Sewer Utility Committee Meeting Minutes

Date of meeting: 6/12/2008

### Attendees:

William Abbott, Chairman

Catherine Valley, Vice Chairman

Don Gowdy,

Bernie Manor,

Craig T. Bailey, Secretary

Don Gowdy Absent

Roger Coutu - Selectman's Liaison

Tom Sommers, PE - Contracted advisor to the SUC.

The regular monthly meeting of the Town of Hudson Sewer Utility Committee was held Thursday, June 12, 2008 at 5:30 pm, in the main meeting room of the Town of Hudson Town Hall. The Chairman William Abbott being in the chair. Secretarial duties were provided by Craig T. Bailey. The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved as corrected, after all public presentations were made.

The agenda was taken out of order, as a matter of courtesy to the members of the public who wished to present to the SUC.

### 2. Presentation by members of the public

A. 68 Pelham road, proposed mobile home park. Engineers from Keach Nordstrom and Associates presented a preliminary design for a proposed mobile home park to be located on Tax Map 192 Lot 17. The proposed "Ridgewood Estates" is calls for a 31-unit manufactured home park, with an expected sewer load of 120 gpd/unit, for a total of 3,720 gpd. The parcel of land is located outside the sewer district boundaries, but is adjacent to the district boundary.

Discussion was had by all members of the SUC and the Engineers, and was agreed the proposed Mobile Home Park will add to the limited amount of work force housing currently in Hudson, and the SUC agreed additional work force housing would be a benefit to the town. Some discussion was had regarding why the proposed "Ridgewood Estates" could not be constructed with on-site septic facilities, and the engineers indicated the leachfields that would be necessary would be so large, and with the jurisdictional wetlands on site, the envelope to place mobile home units would become so small that the project would no longer be feasible from a cost-benefit standpoint. The SUC agreed that a mobile home park of this proposed size should be connected to a municipal system for many environmental reasons, as well as the fact that Hudson has a perceived lack of work force housing. The fact that the parcel of land is outside the limits of the sewer district place the project outside of the jurisdiction of the Hudson SUC. If the developer were to approach the Hudson Select Board and petition the Select Board to re-district the Sewer Utility District to include Tax Map 192 Lot 17, and the re-districting occurred, then the SUC could continue with the proposal. The developer will approach the Select Board and attempt to be placed on the agenda.

B. 20 Executive Drive. Corporate Environmental Manager Michael J. Bolko of Entegris, a company that manufactures filtration products, presented to the SUC. Entegris is considering purchasing the currently empty industrial building located at 20 Executive Drive, and moving a 125+ person, 3-shift operation to this facility.

The company initially proposed a 125,000 gpd expected flow. The current balance of capacity for Hudson is currently 62,403 gpd. Discussion ensued regarding the companies' expected flow rates. Entegris is roughly estimating their peak flow. Discussion ensued, asking the company if they could provide a closer estimate of the actual flow values, since the original estimated flow is much higher than the current available capacity. Tom Sommers, PE suggested that Entegris perform some research into

their previous operations, and if they could find one years' worth of flow values, the Town engineer might accept the metered-values over the estimated.

Mr. Bolko asked how the peak flow values are calculated, and Mr. Sommers indicated the average daily flow was multiplied by a 1.5 peaking factor. Craig Bailey indicated that the 1.5 peaking factor was typically for sanitary flows, and where this facility is producing flows from both process water and sanitary flows, their estimated peak flow may become reduced if the peaking factor were applied to only the sanitary portion.

#### **4. Abatements and Waivers**

No new abatements were submitted for June.

#### **5. Reports**

The Treasurers' and cash flow report dated 05/21/2008 was reviewed by the committee. Discussion was had since the cash flow appears to show about half what it showed this time last year. There were (2) \$300K payments during 2008, the sewer rate should be looked at to possibly compensate for this drop.

The Expenditure Report dated 6/03/2008 was reviewed by the committee. This report shows that only 102% of the budgeted for-expenses occurred, which means only a 2% over budget for the entire Fiscal Year 2008.

The Revenue report dated 6/03/2008 was reviewed by the committee. The revenue report shows 101% of the expected revenue was collected for Fiscal Year 2008.

#### **6. "Old Business"**

The SUC reviewed the meeting minutes from the Board of Selectmen meeting of April 22, 2008. The BOS meeting minutes indicate that all the abatement requests for "Sparkling River" were not recommended for approval by the SUC because it was against the policy, so Selectman Jasper indicated it may be time to revisit the policy. The BOS voted to defer for clarification [by the SUC.] Sparkling River abatements were presented to the SUC for reconsideration, since during the April SUC meeting abatements numbered S-UTL-08-14, 15, 16, 17 & 18 were not recommended for approval. The sewer policy was read by the SUC, and Tom Sommers provided his interpretation of the intent of the policy that governs the **access only fee**: "Structures" meant concrete foundations that are installed. When the concrete foundation is in place, the sewer becomes "accessible." Before further actions are taken, the SUC recommends that the actual status of the units in question be confirmed: whether the concrete foundations are in or not. Once the actual status of the units in question has been confirmed, the SUC will reconsider the abatement requests.

After the Sparkling River topic, the SUC discussed whether the "Sewer Access Only" fee should remain. After lengthy discussion, but with no motions made, the consensus was that the fee should remain. Although the SUC believed the "Access Only Fee" remain in the policy, it was discussed that the definition of "Structures" be clarified.

**Sewer Rate Discussion:** The SUC had previously recommended that the Finances department prepare a sewer fund rate analysis for FY 2009. The Finance Department furnished a report dated June 6, 2008 to the SUC, which broke down the proposed sewer rate schedule. The report was reviewed by the SUC. The Finance Department has suggested a sewer rate increase for most of the different rate codes. The largest user group is the 5/8-inch flat rate accounts. The finance director has suggested the 5/8-inch group be increased 24%. The SUC discussed the rate increase, and the consensus was that an immediate rate jump of 24% for the 5/8" sewer users would be a difficult transition. The SUC discussed that a three year rate increase, of 8% per year would be an easier transition for the citizens. A motion was made by Bernie Manor, and seconded by Catherine Valley, that the Finance Director revise the proposed sewer rate increase for all users to reflect an 8% increase beginning with the October 2008 bill

cycle, and to increase the sewer rate an additional 8% for the next two fiscal year cycles: FY 2010 & FY 2011. The motion passed unanimously.

**Ottarnic Pond Update:** A letter dated June 6, 2008 by Donna-Staffier Sommers was read by the SUC, regarding the Ottarnic Pond Co-Op sewer project. The letter shows that DBU Construction was the low bidder for the project, with a bid price of \$693,168. The letter breaks down the anticipated revenue that will pay for the project, but the anticipated revenue incorrectly shows that the Hudson Water Utility will provide \$190,000 of the project. Some discussion was had, regarding the fact that the Hudson WUC approved only \$90,000 allotment for this project. After checking the math, it was determined that the memo had a math error. A motion was made by Catherine Valley, and seconded by Bernie Manner, to recommend that the Board of Selectman accept the corrected memorandum on the Ottarnic Pond Co-Op construction project, and to award the Bid to the Low Bidder. The motion passed unanimously with no discussion.

Balance of capacity – reduced to 62,403 GPD by a Board of Selectman action.

#### **7. New Business**

Informational memo was given to the SUC that there are a number of vacancies in several of the town volunteer boards.

After closing comments by committee members, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 pm.

---

Craig T. Bailey, Secretary