

**Enfield Board of Selectmen
Enfield, New Hampshire**

MINUTES of March 5, 2007

Board of Selectmen: Nancy Scovner, Chairman; Curtis Payne

Excused: Dominic Albanese

Administrative Staff: Steven Schneider, Town Manager; Alisa D. Bonnette, Recording Secretary; Richard A. Crate, Jr., Chief of Police; Ken Daniels, Director of Public Works

Others: Steve Goldsmith, Dan Kiley, Kurt Gotthardt, Joe Mandell, Nancy Smith

BUSINESS MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mrs. Scovner called the meeting to order at 5:14 pm.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Payne moved to approve the minutes of February 20, 2007 as printed; Mrs. Scovner seconded, vote unanimous.

Mr. Payne moved to approve the public hearing minutes of February 21, 2007 as printed; Mrs. Scovner seconded, vote unanimous.

III. COMMUNICATIONS

Planning Board Notice of Public Hearing ~ March 14, 2007

Comcast Correspondence dated January 12, 2007 & February 21, 2007

Plodzik & Sanderson Correspondence ~ Auditing Standards Change:

Upon Mrs. Scovner's inquiry, Mr. Schneider informed the Board that the audit would not cost more, however, if the Town needs to hire someone to prepare the financial statements there will be an added cost for the preparation of those statements.

NBH Community Development Finance Authority 18-month Report

DPW Letter to NHDES, Wetlands Bureau ~ McConnell Well Site & DPW Facility:

It was explained to the Board that when the McConnell site was developed the wetland wasn't disturbed to the extent provided in the plans. The Town would like to transfer the area that was not disturbed to the mitigation area at the Lockhaven Public Works site for relocation of the stump dump, so the same number of acres is maintained.

DPW Letter to NHDES, Dam Bureau~ Harris Brook Reservoir Dam, LOD Response:

The letter to NHDES was Mr. Daniels' response to a letter from the NH Dam Bureau. There is some discrepancy on what's considered the toe of the slope. Mr. Daniels invited the Dam Bureau to visit the site to identify what their agency considers the toe of the slope.

Upton & Hatfield Correspondence ~ On-going Legal Issues**IV. BOARD REPORTS****Planning Board:**

The Planning Board had conceptualls and a final hearing for Shaker Granite. Bill Warren presented one of the conceptualls for a parcel of approximately 284 acres. About 200 acres of the parcel will be maintained as forestland. The Planning Board also heard a conceptual on the road for the townhouse development.

V. TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT**Police Department Report:**

Police Chief Crate provided copies of the monthly department report to the Board of Selectmen, which included monthly activity, an overtime breakdown and budget sheet for January and February 2007.

Jeff Hunold is doing the scheduling for the department. Three of the five officers are working 5 8-hour shifts; the others are working 4 10-hour shifts. This schedule allows overlapping shifts for busier times and provides more complete coverage over a 24-hour period.

Chief Crate provided an update on the progress of hiring full and part-time officers. A couple of candidates are in the final stages. Chief Crate hopes to have the positions filled within the next 30 days.

Chief Crate discussed field training of officers and the benefits to the department.

Through negotiations the Department was able to retain the prosecutor what is shared with some of Enfield's neighboring communities. The cost for the prosecutor will rise slightly overall. Billing is based on the number of hours to prosecute each case. Due to the excellent work by Enfield officers in preparation of cases, the prosecutor can spend less time on these cases and Enfield's costs may be reduced. This savings shows a direct correlation between well-trained officers and savings to the taxpayers.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**Joe Mandell ~ Whitney Hall Auditorium:**

Joe Mandell pointed out that in each of the scenarios for the Town Offices and/or Library, nothing is being done to improve the Whitney Hall Auditorium.

Mr. Mandell proposed that he create a non-profit organization and the Town allow this organization to rent the Auditorium for a 10-year period for \$1/year. He asked that if approved at Town Meeting that the slated improvements – wiring, new windows, etc. – be completed. The non-profit group would then make efforts to improve the space for community use.

Mr. Mandell discussed his connections with an individual that has turned a similar space into a theater space for the people. Thirty-five years later this theater is still runs.

Mr. Mandell wants to work with the Library. He also wants children involved, perhaps through an apprentice program.

Mr. Mandell believes that if a non-profit organization rented the auditorium space for \$1/year., then funds raised can be immediately spent on the space.

Mr. Schneider stated that might be the case. The Town can hold a public hearing and accept gifts and theoretically install them, but he is unsure about accepting cash donations.

Mr. Mandell hear from someone that Whitney Hall had been used 15 times in 2006. He used it 5 of those times. The space was filled to capacity on one occasion, had 100 people attend at another, and 160 people attend a third.

Mr. Mandell has waited and the auditorium plan has no changes, except for maybe new windows. Mr. Schneider pointed out that the balcony would be reclaimed. Mr. Mandell was unsure that was a good idea since people were shorter when the balcony was built. The way the balcony is set up is not ideal.

Mrs. Scovner expressed approval of the proposal, but asked Mr. Schneider to contact the Town's attorney to determine if it is something the Town can do.

Mr. Schneider agreed that a thriving arts program would benefit the community as a whole. Research would need to be done to determine what kind of rental would work for both the Town and the non-profit organization.

Steve Goldsmith noted that Mr. Mandell is going to put a lot of time and expertise into this project and if the Town can vote it down it could be a lot of wasted time; he's looking for some kind of certainty.

Mr. Mandell noted that at the public hearing regarding the bond issue it would have been nice if a) the audience were facing the stage, b) there was a microphone and c) there was additional light so everyone could see.

Nancy Smith stated that for several years a group of people has been trying to get the Board of Selectmen to move their meeting back to Whitney Hall.

Mr. Schneider pointed out that the plans include updating lighting and wiring. This does not include stage lighting or wiring, though conduit will be in place.

Mr. Payne pointed out that people just don't want to pay for the improvements. In his mind this is something that is not happening yet, but will some day. Perhaps Mr. Mandell can change that.

Mr. Schneider suggested that if the article passes for the Whitney Hall renovations that he and Mr. Mandell could talk about the proposal.

Dan Kiley ~ Shaker Granite:

Mr. Kiley mentioned that at last week's Planning Board meeting with Shaker Granite there was discussion about the Town taking over the road as a Town road. They also spoke about a sidewalk. Would the Town have to maintain the sidewalk?

Mrs. Scovner replied that the sidewalks are going to be gravel.

Mr. Daniels stated that the plans as presented don't constitute a Town road.

Mrs. Scovner responded that once the bottom lot is filled they want the Town to take it over. They will be building it to Town specifications, but are not installing a T turnaround. Mr. Daniels has discussed this issue with Jim Taylor, Community Development Director. This road is really no more than a drive.

Kurt Gotthardt stated that the Board of Selectmen would have to accept it. It's a driveway, not a road. One issue Mr. Gotthardt was going to bring to a future Board of Selectmen is short dead end roads; should we be maintaining them?

Mr. Daniels replied that short dead end roads typically get plowed and occasionally raked, but by reducing the Town's road inventory we would also be reducing the Town's Highway Block Grant funding.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

Whitney Hall Project:

One final meeting of the Town Facility Committee will be held on March 12th at 6:30 PM at Whitney Hall to go over the game plan for Town Meeting.

Town Reports:

Town Reports are due to arrive tomorrow and will be mailed this week.

Solid Waste Ordinance:

There have been no changes to the ordinance since the Board last saw it. The crux of it is that solid waste can't be out in front of your house more than 24 hours before pick up. If it's in a bag or container and is strewn on the ground (by animals or other causes) the homeowner is liable for the cleanup. If the Town must clean it up, the homeowner will be liable for the cost incurred.

This project was brought about as a village area ordinance, but is applicable to the whole Town.

Mrs. Scovner moved to pass the Solid Waste Ordinance as written.

The enforcement of the ordinance would fall primarily to the Building Inspector.

Mr. Gotthardt asked if the ordinance addressed burning. He was informed that State law covers burning.

Mr. Mandell feels it would be more aesthetically pleasing to require that it be placed curbside after sunset. He was informed that some individuals, such as the elderly, would want to do it during daylight hours.

Mr. Payne requested clarification of the application of fines. The ordinance states that violators are subject to a \$500 fine the first time they do it. He was informed that the Town would first provide written notification of violation. If the violation is not taken care of within 3 days they are subject to the fine. Mr. Payne wished to be sure the fine is not to be incurred until after they have been provided notice.

Mr. Payne seconded Mrs. Scovner's motion to pass the Solid Waste Ordinance, vote unanimous.

Stump Dump Closure Agreement

The Board reviewed and approved the Stump Dump Closure Agreement between the Town of Enfield and State of New Hampshire. The existing Stump Dump will be closed on June 30, 2007 and remediation shall be completed by July 31, 2007.

Greening of Enfield:

Mrs. Scovner spoke with Becky Powell and she is hoping that Curtis Payne and the other Selectmen will appoint a committee and do some good toward the greening of Enfield. The following individuals have expressed interest or might otherwise make suitable members for this committee: Becky Powell, Nancy Smith, Steve Goldsmith, Anita Warren, Kelly Wescott as Planning Board representative, Tim Lenihan as Conservation Commission representative, and Curtis Payne as Selectmen's representative. Kurt Gotthardt would be happy to act as a consultant to the Committee.

Mr. Schneider stated that this would be a two-prong committee, one is to green the Town's organization and the other is to green the Town. Mr. Schneider suggested an employee also be included on this committee. Mrs. Smith agreed.

Water/Sewer Rates:

Mr. Daniels made a PowerPoint presentation (attached). He began with a review of progress to date. He explained that State regulations identify how rates should be set up, the current structure, the original proposal for restructuring and the new proposal for restructuring. The new proposal charges for each tier of use at increasingly greater rates. Even those with a higher consumption will pay the lower rate for the first tier of consumption, then the next higher rate for the next tier of consumption, and so on. This proposal is fair and equitable to all users.

Mr. Daniels explained that they arrived at the breakdowns by taking a handful of users to find rate that was fair to all. The goal was not to benefit only low end users, but to treat everyone the same.

Discussion ensued regarding funding for the water and sewer systems. Major sewer extensions are usually a bond paid by the whole town because it benefits the entire community. The expense for repairs or replacement system should be borne by users that contributed to the decay of the system.

Kurt Gotthardt suggested creating some glossy brochures about ways to reduce consumption, such as low flow toilets, water saving showerheads, etc. Mr. Daniels replied that educational materials are on the way.

Mrs. Scovner moved to accept the water and sewer rates as presented March 5, 2007, effective April 1; Mr. Payne seconded, vote unanimous. Rates effective April 1 will appear on the July bill.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

Administrative Items:

The Board reviewed and approved the following documents: Property tax refund, property tax abatements, veterans tax credit, 2007 Town Warrant certificate of posting, land use change tax.

IX. OTHER ITEMS

There were no other items.

CONFERENCE

I. NON-PUBLIC SESSION

Mrs. Scovner moved to enter non-public session at 6:52 PM, RSA 91-A-3 II (a); Mr. Payne seconded. Roll call vote: Mrs. Scovner – aye, Mr. Payne – aye, motion carried.

Mrs. Scovner moved to come out of non-public session at 7:02 PM; Mr. Payne seconded, vote unanimous.

Mrs. Scovner moved to grant Steven Schneider a 4.5% increase in his bi-weekly salary, effective April 1, 2007, but to be implemented upon completion of town-wide employee reviews of full-time staff; Mr. Payne seconded, vote unanimous.

II. ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Scovner moved to adjourn at 7:05 PM; Mr. Payne seconded, vote unanimous.





Town of Enfield Department of Public Works

**Water & Sewer Department
2007 User Rates & Proposed Rate
Restructuring**



Requirements of a Rate Structure

- Some of these requirements are a result of original EPA 1984 grant.
 - CFR 35.929-1 "(a) User charge system based on actual use. ..each user pays its proportionate share of Operations & Maintenance".. (including replacement)
 - CFR 35.929-2 "(2) generate sufficient revenue to pay the operation and maintenance cost..(including replacement).."
-



Existing Components Used to Meet Rate Structure Requirements

- ❑ Base account charge
 - ❑ Fixed cost share (allocated water units)
 - ❑ Fixed cost share (allocated sewer units)
 - ❑ Meter/Backflow Replacement charge
 - ❑ Water consumption charge (flat rate per 1000 gallons)
 - ❑ Sewer consumption charge (Flat Rate per 1000 gallons)
-



Problems With Existing Rate Structure

□ Flat Rate Consumption Charges

- Repair and replacement component of charge not proportional to users
- No mechanism for consumption goal setting

□ Fixed Cost Share

- Allocated units are theoretically determined
 - No charge mechanism for over consumption
 - Yearly auditing required to manage
-



System Users

- Water Users: Total 466 Service Connections
 - Sewer Users: Total 438 Service Connections
 - Of these listed 314 are combined users
-



New Class Rate Structure

- ❑ Base Account Charge
 - ❑ Water classes based on consumption
 - ❑ Sewer classes based on consumption
 - ❑ Water consumption classes for use
 - ❑ Sewer consumption classes for use
 - ❑ Consumption Class Charge
 - ❑ Meter/Backflow Replacement Charge
 - ❑ Sprinkler Charge if applicable
-



Status Quo and Proposed Changes

□ Status Quo

- Base Account Charge
- MRF Charge
- Sprinkler Charge

□ Proposed Changes

- Fixed Cost Share Charges
- Consumption Charges
- Deletion of flow allocations
- Incorporation of consumption classes
- Consumption Class Charge - explain
- Consumption Classification



Consumption Classes Breakdown

Class	Flow Category Limits (gal/qrtr)	Number Water Users	Number Sewer Users	Percent Water Users	Percent Sewer Users
1	0-1,999	11	8	0.18%	0.15%
2	2,000-5,999	79	74	6.04%	7.20%
3	6,000-14,999	187	200	35.37%	36.93%
4	15,000-23,999	99	70	30.91%	23.58%
5	24,000-44,999	38	36	20.52%	21.46%
6	45,000-59,999	47	9	8.67%	12.50%
7	60,000+	5	6	2.48%	5.50%



Charge Structure Comparisons

Account #	GPQ/Ave	Class	User Type	Current Charges	Proposed Flat	Proposed Tiered
11325	1500	1	W	\$34.67	\$79.64	\$12.00
181	2700	2	W/S	\$67.55	\$154.59	\$64.08
949	7000	3	W/S	\$121.77	\$204.86	\$152.56
498	8000	3	W	\$68.73	\$93.48	\$71.98
3136	8700	3	S	\$92.38	\$130.51	\$91.23
244	11000	3	W	\$84.45	\$99.87	\$77.57
11570	12000	3	W	\$89.69	\$102.00	\$78.40
12282	16000	4	Apt W/S	\$247.19	\$322.00	\$296.58
1940	12000	3	W/S	\$184.82	\$263.31	\$193.29
11291	10700	3	W/S	\$168.43	\$248.11	\$181.12
11299	11000	3	S	\$109.33	\$152.50	\$107.02
2014	23000	4	W/S	\$323.53	\$391.90	\$363.60
9013	18500	4	W/S	\$266.79	\$339.30	\$319.64
8701	21000	4	S	\$183.03	\$248.10	\$219.71
1587	12900	3	W	\$101.10	\$110.61	\$79.72
11682	10300	3	W	\$80.78	\$98.38	\$75.83
10335	29000	5	Apt W/S	\$411.12	\$473.97	\$539.87
3473	102500	7	Apt W/S	\$1,361.82	\$1,357.05	\$2,405.78
9332	268700	7	Indust.W/S	\$3,421.81	\$3,264.13	\$4,575.65



Layout of Proposed Charges

Class	Flow Category Limits (gal/qtr)	Water Fixed Cost Share (A)	Sewer Fixed Cost Share	Water Consumption Charge per 1000	Sewer Consumption Charge per 1000	Water Threshold Charge	Sewer Threshold Charge
1	0-1,999	10.00	10.00	1.25	5.00	0.00	0.00
2	2,000-5,999	30.00	25.00	1.45	5.75	2.50	10.00
3	6,000-14,999	60.00	40.00	1.65	6.75	8.30	33.00
4	15,000-23,999	90.00	65.00	1.90	8.00	25.65	103.75
5	24,000-44,999	120.00	90.00	2.15	9.25	53.55	218.75
6	45,000-59,999	170.00	140.00	2.40	10.75	135.15	559.75
7	60,000+	220.00	190.00	2.75	12.50	261.15	1086.50



How Bills are Calculated

□ Class 1 User Example

- Base Account Charge + Class 1 Fixed Cost Charges + Consumption Charges + MRF = Bill

□ Class 3 User Example

- Base Account Charge + Class 3 Fixed Cost Charges + Class 3 Consumption Charges + Class 3 Threshold Charge + MRF = Bill

□ Class 5 User Example

- Base Account Charge + Class 5 Fixed Cost Charges + Class 5 Consumption Charges + Class 5 Threshold Charge + MRF = Bill

□ Class 6 User Example

- Base Account Charge + Class 6 Fixed Cost Charges + Class 6 Consumption Charges + Class 6 Threshold Charge + MRF = Bill

□ Class 7 User Example

- Base Account Charge + Class 7 Fixed Cost Charges + Class 7 Consumption Charges + Class 7 Threshold Charge + MRF = Bill
-



Conclusion

- ❑ This structure has been approved by the NHDES, WSEB
 - ❑ It meets the requirements of the Federal Grants for the original system construction
 - ❑ Should provide a more stable fund balance
 - ❑ But most of all is fair to all users of the system by being a consumption based tiered structure
-



Water & Sewer Rates ~ Adopted March 5, 2007

Class	Flow Category Limits (gal/qtr)	Water Fixed Cost Share (A)	Sewer Fixed Cost Share	Water Consumption Charge per 1000	Sewer Consumption Charge per 1000	Water Threshold Charge	Sewer Threshold Charge
1	0-1,999	10.00	10.00	1.25	5.00	0.00	0.00
2	2,000-5,999	30.00	25.00	1.45	5.75	2.50	10.00
3	6,000-14,999	60.00	40.00	1.65	6.75	8.30	33.00
4	15,000-23,999	90.00	65.00	1.90	8.00	25.65	103.75
5	24,000-44,999	120.00	90.00	2.15	9.25	53.55	218.75
6	45,000-59,999	170.00	140.00	2.40	10.75	135.15	559.75
7	60,000+	220.00	190.00	2.75	12.50	261.15	1086.50