

Prudence Island Water District
Minutes of meeting: April 1, 2006

Meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m. Present were David Buffum, moderator; Patricia Richard, clerk; Robert Hanson, Richard Brooks and Phillip Brooks.

Approval of minutes for meeting held March 18, 2006. Phillip Brooks moved for approval, seconded by Mr. Hanson, approved unanimously.

Administrative: Ms. Richard reported completing the paperwork for D&O insurance, which included a 2007 operations budget.

Technical: Land use and development. Mr. Buffum reported that he had received an email from Harry Sterling (PIPC) indicating that no one from the town would be available for the next planning meeting, and the meeting might be scheduled to take place on Prudence between April 15-22.

Leak detection: Philip Brooks said that he would be bringing detection equipment within the next couple of weeks and that PIUC reported having difficulty with the equipment he had loaned them. He said that a lot of the noise he was hearing was probably turbulence because of the variations in pipe size. Mr. Buffum asked how long it takes to do a survey. Mr. Brooks said it takes between 2-3 hours.

Pre-development engineering and environmental reports:

Richard Brooks noted that the engineering survey was dated August 2006.

Ms. Richard noted that the PO Box number was incorrect.

Philip Brooks said that in his opinion the environmental report was inadequate. He said that if the treatment plant required the use of chemical agents as described in the engineering report, the proposed site would present a danger to Indian Spring. He said that no provisions had been made to address the issue of a potential chemical spill.

Richard Brooks agreed that the site posed potential environmental problems and suggested that perhaps a more suitable site could be found. Ms. Richard pointed out that on a small island, it would be very difficult to find a site that did not pose environmental concerns because of either the watershed area or the bay.

Richard Brooks said that when comparing the proposal for doing the reports with what the reports actually contained, they were not what he expected. He said that they were well written but did not have enough information. He said that the most worrisome aspect in his opinion was the handling of potentially damaging chemistries. He pointed out that although pH adjustment had been mentioned, nothing was said about the type of chemicals that might be used for that adjustment. He said that most likely they would be hydrochloric acid and some type of strong caustic. He said that they would need to be isolated from each other during transport and storage. Philip Brooks said that fire protection would be an issue as well.

Mr. Buffum asked if preliminary testing could be done to determine what type of chemicals would be used for pH adjustment. Philip Brooks said this type of testing should have been carried out.

Richard Brooks said that environmental issues should be addressed locally as well as by those agencies that are required by USDA. He said that environmental reporting would be a part of operations and that the potential for litigation existed if any environmental problems arose. He suggested that the draft reports be made available to Joe Bains, who has considerable experience with environmental compliance issues associated with these types of operations. Ms. Richard said that she would make information available to the Conservancy, the NBNERR and the PIPC as well as the required agencies. She pointed out that the engineering report stated that letters to required agencies had been sent out on March 10, but that she had not received those letters until March 27. Mr. Brooks said that the executive summaries did not provide sufficient information to the agencies to make an informed decision. Mr. Buffum questioned whether the letters should be sent before the district board had received answers to its questions. Ms. Richard said that responses to the letters were necessary to complete the environmental report, but that they did make it sound as though the board had already decided to proceed with the project pending their responses.

Mr. Hanson asked what sort of precautions must be taken for transporting the chemistries from the mainland. Richard Brooks said that the district would be required to reserve extra ferry runs and that certain types of chemicals should not be on the ferry with certain other chemistries. He said that site preparation at the proposed plant was crucial because most of the accidents involving chemical spills took place during transport and unloading. Mr. Hanson said that the condition of the roads on Prudence would be an issue.

Richard Brooks said that in his opinion not enough research had been done on the possibility of a slow sand filtration system. He said that he had found information stating that such systems were in use in Connecticut and New Hampshire as well as in Vermont. Richard Brooks said that system operations and maintenance for the proposed treatment plant was more complex than indicated in the engineering report. He pointed out that raw water pH would not be a constant and would need to be adjusted regularly to keep the system running properly.

Philip Brooks expressed the opinion that for the cost of the proposed systems, shallower wells could be sunk that would probably be less susceptible to iron and manganese contamination and have lower radon emissions. He agreed that slow sand filtration as a treatment option had not been adequately addressed. Ms. Richard said that Mr. Nicholson had outlined the project he intended to propose when he last met with the board and that no objection had been raised by the board at that time. Richard Brooks said that he did not feel the "alternatives" portion of the report was sufficient. Mr. Buffum said that he was surprised that slow sand filtration was not considered among the alternatives. Ms. Richard said that he responded to the question of slow sand filtration by email, which had been forwarded to the board.

Ms. Richard said that she had reservations about the cost breakdowns for the proposed projects. She said that she had questions about some of the line items in the costing process. She asked if anyone knew what "overhead and profit" referred to in the cost breakdown. No one was able to explain the line item. Philip Brooks pointed out that part of the payment for the treatment plant involved a 40-year loan, but that the plant itself would need major renovation after 20 years. Ms. Richard said that she had questions about the cost of pilot testing, (\$15k each or for both, and what that included). Philip

Brooks said he did not know how it would be possible to determine seasonal changes in raw water with a 4-week pilot test.

Ms. Richard said that cost of operations had not been addressed, nor had cost of waste management been addressed. Philip Brooks said that operation would probably involve a couple of hours daily in labor. Richard Brooks said that the bulk of labor would be devoted to system cleaning.

Richard Brooks asked if the complete engineering and environmental reports were being sent to the required agencies. Ms. Richard said no, only an executive summary was to be sent.

Richard Brooks pointed out that many statements made in the engineering report are not accurate. He referred to the statement that the PIUC piping was in existing roadways when in fact a great deal of piping is on private land.

Ms. Richard asked if the Indian Springs dug well could be used since the finish water needed to be disinfected anyway. She said the ability to access that well might cut down on the amount of waste the system would generate since iron and manganese was not problematic in that well. Richard Brooks said that the concern would be with the organic load in the water. He said that waste disposal costs could be an issue, especially if a suitable dewatering technique could not be worked out.

Mr. Buffum said that each board member should write down all the questions they had about the reports and then the board would consolidate the questions and forward them to Mr. Nicholson.

Funding: Ms. Richard said that CDBG priorities would be set at the town council meeting on April 10. She said that Church Community Trust had contacted her and she had filled out a more comprehensive CDBG application.

Ms. Richard said that Sen. Reed's office had contacted her and asked her to revise the appropriations request upward, to as much as \$200,000. She said that she had revised her request to include both acquisition and water treatment.

No correspondence. Mr. Buffum to write letter to PIUC about USGS water availability study on Prudence.

No other business.

Mr. Buffum moved for adjournment to executive session, seconded by Mr. Brooks, approved unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Patricia Richard, Clerk