

TABLE 1B
Source Development, Supply Capacity, and Other Projects Subgroup -
19 Projects Requesting 50% or Less Grant

(S) SOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPLY CAPACITY AND (O) OTHER PROJECTS SUBGROUP ^{1,2}									
Applicant	Project Name	Project Category	Grant Request	% Grant Request of Project Total	Loan Request	Contributing Funds	Project Total ²	SRF Eligibility	Notes
Saco Pines Condominium Association	Water System Replacement	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$0	0%	\$110,000	\$50,000	\$160,000	YES	DWSRF funding available.
North Conway Water Precinct	Well #2R Process Control & Chemical Addition Facility	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$300,000	24%	\$790,000	\$140,900	\$1,230,900	YES	
Chesterbrook Estates	CBE As-Built	(O) Other	\$10,000	25%	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$40,000	YES	
Epping Water & Sewer Commission	New Water Treatment Plant Design	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$68,750	25%	\$206,250	\$0	\$275,000	YES	
Newmarket Water Works	Macintosh and Tucker Well Treatment	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$975,000	25%	\$2,825,000	\$100,000	\$3,900,000	YES	DWSRF funding contingency availability.
Crotched Mountain Rehabilitation Center	Water Supply and Distribution Improvements	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$450,000	30%	\$1,050,000	\$0	\$1,500,000	YES	DWSRF funding available.
Old Coach Village Condominium Association	OCVA Well Replacement	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$75,000	33%	\$0	\$150,000	\$225,000	YES	High DWSRF ranking but only DWGTF grant requested.
Pine Grove MHP Coop	New Well Hookup & Replacement of Failing Distribution Lines	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$534,038	42%	\$500,000	\$244,000	\$1,278,038	YES	DWSRF funding available.
Mountain Lakes Water Department	Well Source Development and Conservation	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$200,000	47%	\$200,000	\$30,000	\$430,000	YES	
Canaan Water Department	Canaan Well Field and Trunk Line Replacement	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$265,000	48%	\$265,000	\$25,000	\$555,000	YES	DWSRF funding available.
Belmont Water Department	Fe/Mn Water Treatment Plant for Wells #1 & #3	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$1,500,000	48%	\$1,600,000	\$0	\$3,100,000	YES	
Exeter Department of Public Works	Groundwater Source Development & Surface Water Treatment Facility Review	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$2,025,000	50%	\$2,025,000	\$0	\$4,050,000	YES	
Jaffrey Water Department	New Water Source- Preliminary Engineering	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$200,000	50%	\$200,000	\$0	\$400,000	YES	
Keene Water Department	Drinking Water Masterplan	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$50,000	50%	\$50,000	\$0	\$100,000	NO	
Merrimack Village District	Artificial Recharge Study for the MVD Wells #4 & #5	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$225,000	50%	\$0	\$225,000	\$450,000	YES	
Milford Water Utilities Department	Groundwater Exploration & Development Program to R	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$250,000	50%	\$0	\$250,000	\$500,000	YES	
Pennichuck East Utility Londonderry Core	Londonderry Core Water Storage Tank	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$1,600,000	50%	\$0	\$1,600,000	\$3,200,000	YES	
Plymouth Village Water Sewer District	Holderness Well Supply and Development	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$1,650,000	50%	\$1,650,000	\$0	\$3,300,000	YES	DWSRF funding available.
Southeast Watershed Alliance	Regional Water Master Plan	(O) Other	\$50,000	50%	\$0	\$50,000	\$100,000	NO	
Wilton Water Works	Water Source Resilience	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$1,200,000	71%	\$0	\$500,000	\$1,700,000	YES	
NH Department of Education	NH's K-12 Schools- Removal of Lead in Drinking Water	(O) Other	\$3,200,000	80%	\$0	\$800,000	\$4,000,000	NO	
Montrose Condominium Association	Fracking of Well #1 and Well #2	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$49,000	100%	\$0	\$0	\$49,000	YES	
Pennichuck Water Works Inc.	Merrimack River Raw Water Intake	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$5,500,000	100%	\$0	\$0	\$5,500,000	YES	
Peterborough Water Works	Delineation of Source Water Protection Areas-Northern Municipal Field	(S) Source Development and Supply Capacity	\$300,000	100%	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	NO	
DWGTF Requests (\$M)			\$20.7		\$11.5				
Total Request (\$M)			\$32.2						

DWSRF = Drinking Water State Revolving Fund

DWGTF = Drinking Water and Groundwater Trust Fund

Notes:

1. The Source Devel. and Supply Capacity category (S) represents construction projects that include development of a new water supply source (groundwater well or surface water intake), including pre-development investigations; rehabilitation of an existing source; or construction of additional storage to meet demand.
2. The Other category (O) represents non-construction/non-source water protection projects including planning, sampling, etc. These projects are not eligible for the Drinking Water SRF.
3. Project total is the cost of full project scope and may include grant and loan requests and/or other funding sources.

New Hampshire Drinking Water and Groundwater Advisory Commission

RSA 485-F:4 – SB380 – Chapter 11:2 – Laws of 2016

Subcommittee Group B Meeting Minutes

MEETING DATE: 2:00 p.m., Wednesday, July 25th, 2018, SH 100

Members of the Committee Present: Senator Dan Feltes
DES Commissioner Robert Scott
Bernie Rousseau

Audience Members Present: Josh Elliott – Senate Majority Policy Director
Griffin Roberge – Senate Legislative Aide
Sarah Pillsbury – Department of Environmental Services
Randy Suozzo – Department of Environmental Services

Meeting Discussion:

1) Welcome – DES Commissioner Robert Scott, Chairman

The subcommittee reviewed the 2018 NH Drinking Water and Groundwater Advisory Commission pre-applications pertaining to source development and supply capacity. The members would discuss the specifics of each application with DES staff and make possible recommendations to the wider Commission. The members agreed to divide the applications into three categories: YES (projects that should be funded), NO (projects that should not be funded), and MAYBE (projects to be further discussed at future dates).

2) NH Department of Education – NH’s K-12 Schools (Removal of Lead in Drinking Water)

The applicant requested a \$3,200,000 grant. The applicant had \$800,000 in contributing funds. The members agreed that any award would help schools meet lead contamination standards and protect students. There was a discussion about the applicant working through the regular budget process for funding to address the problem. Having schools pick up the remediation costs would be difficult. The subcommittee decided to award the applicant funding. **Recommendation: YES.**

3) Saco Pines Condominium Association – Water System Replacement

The applicant requested an \$110,000 loan. The applicant had \$50,000 in contributing funds. DES staff noted that the applicant was ranked high on SRF and is eligible for an SRF loan. **Recommendation: NO.**

4) North Conway Water Precinct – Well #2R Process Control & Chemical Addition Facility

The applicant requested a \$790,000 loan and a \$300,000 grant. The applicant had \$140,900 in contributing funds. The project does not rank high on SRF because the applicant can secure many water sources. The applicant has been proactive in addressing past water infrastructure projects and is offering contributing funds. The size of the request was notable to subcommittee members. While the members believed the project was worthwhile, the subcommittee believed the project was a redundant request and the applicant’s water rates could increase to cover the project’s cost. **Recommendation: MAYBE.**

5) Chesterbrook Estates – CBE As-Builts

The applicant requested a \$10,000 grant and a \$20,000 loan. The applicant offered \$10,000 in contributing funds. The applicant offered an incomplete application that did not adequately outline contributing funds and the project’s costs. The application did not have any description of its annual residential water rates. The applicant also listed an MHI of \$117,824. After consulting DES staff, the subcommittee believed the grant and loan request was too high for the applicant’s proposed project. **Recommendation: NO.**

DRAFT

6) Epping Water & Sewer Commissioner – New Water Treatment Plant Design

The applicant requested a \$68,750 grant and a \$206,250 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The members felt that the proposed project was inconsistent with the vision and goals of the Advisory Commission. The subcommittee believed the trust fund should not be used for design projects at this time. **Recommendation: NO.**

7) Newmarket Water Works – Macintosh and Tucker Well Treatment

The applicant requested a \$975,000 grant and a \$2,825,000 loan. The applicant offered \$100,000 in contributing funds. The applicant also requested a \$3,800,000 loan to cover the whole cost of the project. The applicant placed just outside of SRF funding availability. The subcommittee was inclined to award the applicant, but would wait to see if other applicants decline SRF loans. If so, an SRF loan would be award along with a trust fund grant. **Recommendation: YES.**

8) Crotched Mountain Rehabilitation Center – Water Supply and Distribution Improvements

The applicant requested a \$450,000 grant and a \$1,050,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The applicant placed on SRF's ranking for funding availability. The SRF loan would cover the loan portion of the applicant's request. The subcommittee decided to award the applicant's grant request. **Recommendation: YES.**

9) Old Coach Village Condominium Association – OCVA Well Replacement

The applicant requested a \$75,000 grant. The applicant offered \$150,000 in contributing funds. The members believed the applicant offered an incomplete application. The outline of the project's costs were speculative. **Recommendation: NO.**

10) Pine Grove MHP Co-Op – New Well Hookup & Replacement of Failing Distribution Lines

The applicant requested a \$534,038 grant and a \$500,000 loan. The applicant offered \$244,000 in contributing funds, mainly from the MtBE fund. The applicant has invested in water infrastructure in the past using its capital reserves and the MtBE fund. The project ranks within the SRF's funding availability, but the applicant has expressed a strong desire to get a grant. The applicant cannot sustain a loan. The subcommittee decided to offer the grant on the condition that the applicant accept the SRF loan. If the applicant does not accept the SRF loan, they are not awarded a grant. **Recommendation: YES.**

11) Mountain Lakes Water Department – Well Source Development and Conservation

The applicant requested a \$200,000 grant and a \$200,000 loan. The applicant offered \$30,000 in contributing funds. The applicant sought to test and permit a new well to connect to an existing water system. The new well would reduce dependency on Woodsville Water and Light and reduce their annual water rates. While the water rates are high, they are less than the state average. The members found there was no pressing need to award the applicant. **Recommendation: NO.**

12) Canaan Water Department – Canaan Well Field and Trunk Line Replacement

The applicant requested a \$265,000 grant and a \$265,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The applicant wants to drill three new wells and replace water lines. The applicant ranked within the SRF's funding availability. If the applicant accepts the SRF loan, the subcommittee would offer them the trust fund grant. The project is not affected by an MtBE contamination that rises to a level of urgency. **Recommendation: MAYBE.**

13) Belmont Water Department – Fe/Mn Water Treatment Plant for Wells #1 and #3

The applicant requested a \$1,500,000 grant and a \$1,600,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The applicant manages three wells, but two are contaminated with Fe and Mn. The applicant is using sequestration water treatment that does not completely solve the problem. The project would aim to install a treatment system or find new well sites, with the possibility of finding more contamination. The applicant demonstrated a good ability to fund projects and acquire loans. The applicant goes through 350,000-400,000 gallons a day for 1,612 people. The project ranks in the middle of the SRF because they have other sources of supply. **Recommendation: YES.**

14) Exeter Department of Public Works – Groundwater Source Development & Surface Water Treatment Facility Review

DRAFT

The applicant requested a \$2,025,000 grant and a \$2,025,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The members found the applicant should address existing problems with currently acquired loans. They can return to the trust fund in the future to address their proposed project. **Recommendation: NO.**

15) Jaffrey Water Department – New Water Source (Preliminary Engineering)

The applicant requested a \$200,000 grant and a \$200,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. While important, the members felt the trust fund should not be used to fund design and engineering projects at this time. **Recommendation: NO.**

16) Keene Water Department – Drinking Water Master Plan

The applicant requested a \$50,000 grant and a \$50,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. While important, the members felt the trust fund should not be used to fund design and engineering projects at this time. **Recommendation: NO.**

17) Merrimack Village District – Artificial Recharge Study for the MVD Wells #4 and #5

The applicant requested a \$225,000 grant. The applicant offered \$225,000 in contributing funds. The study would seek to dilute chemicals in MVD wells and to increase capacity. While important, the members felt the trust fund should not be used to fund design and engineering projects at this time. Though there is a contamination issue that requires study, the members noted the low water rates that could be increased to fund the study. **Recommendation: NO.**

18) Milford Water Utilities Department – Groundwater Exploration & Development Program to Replace the Contaminated Savage and Keyes Production Wells

The applicant requested a \$250,000 grant. The applicant offered \$250,000 in contributing funds from their capital funds. The applicant ranked low on the SRF. The applicant lost a well some time ago and the applicant is looking to address it. The subcommittee did not feel the trust fund should not be used for exploratory programs at this time. While they appreciate the applicant looking for their own water source and their contributing funds, the subcommittee felt strongly that the applicant could fund the project through increased water rates. **Recommendation: NO.**

19) Pennichuck East Utility – Londonderry Core Water Storage Tank

The applicant requested a \$1,600,000 grant or \$1,600,000 loan. The applicant offered \$1,600,000 in contributing funds. The applicant noted that the installation of a water tank will help further economic development. The contributing funds came from a developer (Demoulas Family). There is not a pressing contamination issue, but is part of an economic development project. DES recommended an expansion of water capacity and storage for the site. The project ranked high on SRF due to the need for fire supply, but did not factor in economic considerations. The members noted that the project was scheduled to move forward, regardless of funding from the trust fund. If the project was awarded, it should be given a loan. **Recommendation: MAYBE.**

20) Plymouth Village Water & Sewer District – Holderness Well Supply and Development

The applicant requested a \$1,650,000 grant and a \$1,650,000 loan. The applicant offered no contributing funds. Many of the applicant's sources are in one area adjacent to I-93. That source has elevated salt levels. DES compelled the applicant to find another source and they found one. The applicant ranked within the SRF's funding availability, but noted that if a grant if not awarded, they will seek out other local options. The subcommittee argued that grants should be given to SRF funded projects to keep the SRF attractive and to prevent applicants from "gaming" the system to get trust fund funding. **Recommendation: MAYBE.**

21) Southeast Watershed Alliance – Regional Water Master Plan

The applicant requested a \$50,000 grant. The applicant offered \$50,000 in contributing funds. The members felt the trust fund should not be used to fund design and engineering projects at this time. **Recommendation: NO.**

22) Wilton Water Works – Water Source Resilience

The applicant requested a \$1,200,000 grant. The applicant offered \$500,000 in contributing funds. The members felt the trust fund should not be used to fund design and engineering projects at this time. **Recommendation: NO.**



23) *Montrose Condominium Association – Fracking of Wells #1 and #2*

The applicant requested a \$49,000 grant. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The members felt the applicant should look at alternative funding sources for the project. The members were unwilling to award a 100% grant. **Recommendation: NO.**

24) *Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. – Merrimack River Raw Water Intake*

The applicant requested a \$5,500,000 grant. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The members felt the applicant should look at alternative funding sources for the project. The members were unwilling to award a 100% grant. **Recommendation: NO.**

25) *Peterborough Water Works – Delineation of Source Water Protection Areas*

The applicant requested a \$300,000 grant. The applicant offered no contributing funds. The members felt the applicant should look at alternative funding sources for the project. The members were unwilling to award a 100% grant. **Recommendation: NO.**

26) *Subcommittee B Pre-Application Ranking*

Project	Town	Rank	Grant	Loan	Total TF	Outside Funds	Total Project	TF Share	Grant Share	
NH DOE Lead Remediation	N/A	1	\$3,200,000	\$0	\$3,200,000	\$800,000	\$4,000,000	80%	100%	
Macintosh and Tucker Well Treatment	Newmarket	2	\$975,000	\$2,825,000	\$3,800,000	\$100,000	\$3,900,000	97%	26%	
Pine Grove MHP	Swanzy	3	\$534,038	\$0	\$534,038	\$744,000	\$1,278,038	42%	100%	DWSRF Funding Available
Crotched Mountain	Greenfield	4	\$450,000	\$0	\$450,000	\$1,050,000	\$1,500,000	30%	100%	DWSRF Funding Available
FE/ME Treatment for Wells #1 and #3	Belmont	5	\$1,500,000	\$1,600,000	\$3,100,000	\$0	\$3,100,000	100%	48%	
YES Subtotal			\$6,659,038	\$4,425,000	\$11,084,038	\$2,694,000	\$13,778,038	80%	60%	
Holderness Supply Well	Plymouth	1	\$1,650,000	\$0	\$1,650,000	\$1,650,000	\$3,300,000	50%	100%	DWSRF Funding Available
Canaan Water Dept.	Canaan	2	\$265,000	\$0	\$265,000	\$265,000	\$530,000	50%	100%	DWSRF Funding Available
Well 2R	N. Conway	3	\$300,000	\$790,000	\$1,090,000	\$140,900	\$1,230,900	89%	28%	
PWW Tank (Woodmont)	Londonderry	4	\$0	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000	\$3,200,000	50%	0%	
MAYBE Subtotal			\$2,215,000	\$2,390,000	\$4,605,000	\$3,655,900	\$8,260,900	56%	48%	
YES and MAYBE TOTAL			\$8,874,038	\$6,815,000	\$15,689,038	\$6,349,900	\$22,038,938	71%		