



TOWN OF NEW LONDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE

375 MAIN STREET • NEW LONDON, NH 03257 • WWW.NL-NH.COM

**APPROVED
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MEETING MINUTES
February 6, 2012**

PRESENT:

Tina Helm, Selectman
Peter Bianchi, Selectman
Kimberly Hallquist, Town Administrator
Wendy Johnson, Finance Officer

ALSO PRESENT:

Patricia McIlvaine, Wright-Pierce
Joseph McLean, Wright-Pierce
Jon Edgerton, Wright-Pierce
Richard Lee, Public Works Director
Peter Stanley, Planning & Zoning Administrator
Doug MacMichael, New London Resident
Rick Anderson, New London Resident
Will Kidder, New London Resident
Jud Donaghy, New London Resident
Fran Kaning, New London Resident
Bruce Hudson & Renate Kannler, New London Residents
David Dunning, New London Resident
Dan & Ellie Snyder, New London Resident
Jim Wheeler, New London Resident
Don & Liz Klingler, New London Residents
John Wilson, New London Resident
Merry Armentrout, Reporter for the *Intertown Record*

Ms. Helm called the meeting to order at 6pm. She thanked everyone for coming and welcomed Patricia McIlvaine, Joseph McLean and John Edgerton from Wright-Pierce to talk about the engineering that has been done on the Pleasant Lake Dam to date. She noted that a new assessment was brought to their attention the previous week and they didn't expect that any decisions would be made that evening regarding future plans for the dam. She hoped it to be a healthy opportunity to collect data and eventually they would figure out how to deal with the dam.

Mr. McLean, lead engineer, said they would be discussing the work they have done trying to re-classify the dam. Ms. Helm noted that going forward the dam should be referred to as the Pleasant Lake Dam, and not the Elkins Dam, to avoid any confusion. She noted that the dam has been called both names. All of the material provided by Wright- Pierce refers to is as the Pleasant Lake Dam. Turning to the issue at hand, Ms. McIlvaine explained that a letter to the Town from the State Dam Bureau in 2009 noted that the dam was reclassified as a "high-hazard" dam. Prior to that it was traditionally classified as a lower threat, or a "significant hazard" dam. The state reclassified the dam because of the building on the Mill Pond Dam which was further down the stream as well as two other structures. Should the Pleasant Lake dam breach, the downstream structures could be impacted, resulting in a loss of life. Communications went

back and forth between the Town of New London and the State regarding the deficiency letter. The town removed trees and did other things to try and get the dam reclassified, however, to this point changing the classification to “significant hazard” from “high hazard” has not been possible.

Mr. McLean explained that a previous dam study was completed in 1995 by another engineering firm. This study did not identify the three existing structures that would be impacted in a dam breach, instead there were a few things identified and several generalizations. At that time, there was a recommendation that another engineer should review the impacts of breach of the dam. Since that time, one of the three structures in danger was removed (the building on the Mill Pond Dam) and there was a request from the Town to have another review of the dam. The rule of thumb is that if a living portion of a structure is flooded with one foot of water, it was considered a high hazard. It is believed that a loss of life would be more probable with a flooding of this magnitude.

The engineers at Wright-Pierce conducted dam breach modeling from an older study with the hope of reclassifying the dam to show it was still a “high hazard” dam. Mr. McLean opined that the discharge capacity of the Pleasant Lake Dam works beautifully to fit within this category. They submitted a reclassification report to the State, who came back and said that some of the modeling assumptions were not conservative enough. The State wanted the engineers to remodel the breach modeling portion. Based on the modeling there are at least two structures in the Town of New London that would be inundated by this threshold, making it a “significant hazard” dam. Mr. McLean said the prior study, compared to the surface elevation they used, were almost the same. The level of detail investigated as far as the height and number of structures were also similar. He felt it very possible that there could be even more than just two structures in danger should a breach of the Pleasant Lake Dam occur.

Ms. McIlvaine explained that in the event of a breach of the Pleasant Lake Dam, the water going downstream would overtop the Chase Pond Dam. The regulations require that a “high hazard” dam must use two and a half 2.5 times (2.5 x) the 100-year flood to model this scenario. To be most thorough, they chose to model the scenario all the way to the town of Salisbury, NH.

Ms. McIlvaine noted that part of their charge was to complete new Emergency Action Plans (EAP), which they completed. The newly completed plans were distributed to the board.

Mr. Bianchi asked if the two structures were not there, would it have changed anything in how the State classified the dam. Mr. McLean said they considered this question in the modeling they completed. He noted that in addition to those identified structures, they also had to consider the properties that were downstream such as Chase Pond, Tannery Pond areas and further outside of New London. There would be a domino-effect caused by the incremental surges from dams breaching from a 100-year storm. Mr. McLean noted that even if all of the structures that were in danger were purchased and demolished it wouldn't solve the problem because if someone purchased land and built a home in Wilmot that was in an area that would be in danger if a breach occurred, the dam would then be kicked back into “high hazard” status.

Mr. Bianchi asked if the Chase Pond Dam owner has also been charged with making his dam withstand a 2.5 times the 100 year storm as the Town of New London is now being required to do. Mr. McLean said they are under the same regulations and stressed that Pleasant Lake Dam's classification is independent of the condition of the downstream dams. He also pointed out that the amount of water in Chase Pond is different than that in Pleasant Lake. The Wright-Pierce analysis shows that if Pleasant Lake Dam breached, there would be a lot of water flowing through and around the Elkins area for several days. Mr. Bianchi considered that Pleasant Lake was the top of the water shed and that New London may have to take partial responsibility for any breaching that would happen in the lower dams downstream.

Mr. McLean explained that if the Pleasant Lake Dam could cause a loss of life, the State requires the town to stabilize it to the “n-th” degree. If they look at Chase Pond alone, assuming it fails alone, it may not cause a loss of life because it is not as large as the Pleasant Lake Dam. Mr. Bianchi agreed that should the dam breach, water from Pleasant Lake would amount to more water than Chase Pond was designed to withstand. Mr. McLean said that Chase Pond would be required to withstand a 100 year storm, regardless of where the water comes from.

Mr. McLean said the State looks at all the towns impacted by a breach happening in New London. They are looking at the chances of a probable loss of life. Ms. McIlvaine said that their only responsibility is the dam in New London. It is not New London’s responsibility to be concerned with the dam at Chase Pond and whether or not it is sufficient, even though the owners of that dam are subject to the same regulations.

Mr. McLean said absent any dam failures, a 2.5x 100 year storm will cause problems all over the place. If they wanted to seek a reduction to the flow, there are means to do it. It would require even more extensive modeling than they have already done. They could figure out at what point a reasonable threshold remains. Unless they can prove what this storm is, the State assumes a maximum of a 2.5x100 year storm.

Ms. McIlvaine said that the implications of a high hazard dam are to be able to pass 250% of water of a 100-year storm. Currently, 250% of a 100 year storm tops the Pleasant Lake Dam by approximately 1.5 feet of water. She said the annual fee to the State will go up from \$750 to \$1,500 if the dam remains as is. The EAP test will go from being conducted every four years to every two years. NHDES will also come to inspect the dam every two years instead of every four.

Ms. McIlvaine felt that their hands were tied because any structures built within the flood zone would make the dam classified as high hazard. Mr. McLean gave some suggestions, which were stated in the regulations handed down from the State:

1. The spillway could be modified to pass flows with 1’ freeboard.
2. They could request a waiver from having to pass the amount of flow specified.
3. They could propose/implement a modification of the dam, which would lower the hazard classification.
4. They could conduct a stability analysis, or stabilize the dam to be safe.

Mr. Anderson asked what a 2.5x 100-year storm meant as far as rainfall. Also, he wondered what could happen upstream around Pleasant Lake should the water rise on the lake. Mr. McLean explained that a 100-years storm is a storm that could happen once every 100 years OR there was a 1% chance of it happening in any given year. For scale, envision the lake full with the water being 1.5’ higher than the dam. They should try to picture 2.5x the volume. Mr. McLean said that a 100-year rainfall event was 6.5 inches over a 24 hour period. This rainfall is distributed unevenly as storms dump rain in different amounts throughout the storm event. At first, a light rain saturates the land, then a large percentage falls immediately, and then a light rain falls for another few hours. Mr. Anderson asked if it was taken into consideration the steep sides or flat edges of the lake as it fills. Mr. McLean said that these nuances of the lake were taken into consideration.

Mr. McLean said if they raise the dam, to keep more water back, there could be worse flooding danger for residents who reside on the lake. This option could impact many and he felt may not be a popular choice.

Mr. Bianchi asked if the State had ever given any example of there being 6.5” of rain fall within 24 hours, or an even larger storm. Mr. McLean offered that statistically, the chances of that amount of rainfall is extremely low but they are asked to analyze out to a 500-year storm. 2.5 x 100-year storm is the probable maximum precipitation (PMP). Meteorologically speaking, taking into account weather patterns and storm sizes, dew-points and the ability for water to be retained in the air, the scenario they are being asked to plan for is the PMP. Some large dams are designed to that level (such as the Hoover Dam) for safety.

Ms. McIlvaine said that other states are more flexible on these regulations. Towns can work out appropriate discharge capacities of the dams with the State agency. This gives some flexibility on the possible redesigns of the dam. The State of New Hampshire’s Dam Safety Program is rated one of the most successful programs in the nation. They are the most aggressive at making sure the dams are in good shape and that people are safe. This may be an economic hardship and may very well change the look of the dam, but it is designed to make people safe. In other states, their programs are not as good and dams are failing.

Mr. McLean said making the spillway lower and longer in length could help with downstream flooding prevention. Ms. McIlvaine said that if they heighten the dam, the normal lake level would become higher. Mr. McLean said the normal level would remain the same but the peak level would be increased.

Mr. Klingler asked if the state required a boat launch. Mr. McLean said the Dam Safety Bureau does not require a boat launch. He noted that there are different state agencies responsible for these things (i.e.: access to lakes for recreational activities vs. dam issues) but the safety issues generally trump non-safety issues.

Mr. McLean said if they increase the height of the dam, the boat ramp would have to be made even steeper, which could cause some problems with getting boats in and out of the water. He wondered if the current location of the ramp was actually the best place for it. Mr. Snyder felt that it was. Mr. Wilson said it is the lowest part of the lake; it has a gravel bottom, and is an ideal place to conduct the “Weed Watch” program. Mr. McLean said there are ways to maintain a boat access at its current location but it would be costly. In the three current suggested redesigns of the dam, the boat launch is eliminated. Ms. McIlvaine noted that what they were there offering were some very preliminary solutions to the problem. They can do more detailed studies to try and modify the elimination of the boat ramp.

Mr. Stanley asked if they would need to create an armored pathway that wouldn’t create subsequent failure elsewhere. Mr. McLean said that such a pathway would be necessary. They would need more than just a road. Some erosion could occur and the water would go down the road a bit but would find its way back into the spillway. Water coming over the dam doesn’t cause a problem unless erosion occurs and opens up the dam. Mr. McLean said that an alternative approach would be to stabilize the dam so it wouldn’t erode, would be stable, and wouldn’t fail.

Ms. Helm asked about the request for waiver. Ms. McIlvaine said that even if the town could demonstrate budgetary restrictions such that it could not afford to make the required modification, the town could not gain a waiver. The town will have to demonstrate that they are maintaining public safety. They have to somehow explain why it is OK for their dam not to meet the requirements of the discharge capacity. They need to show how they will protect the safety of the public. She observed that she did not think it would be possible without making modifications to the dam.

Mr. Bianchi noted that the letter from Wright-Pierce dated December 12, 2012 caught them off-guard, as it quoted Jeff Blaney from the Dam Bureau in Concord as saying that “...based on the modeling...he sees no problem granting the waiver...to allow the dam to only have to pass a 100-year storm.” Mr.

Bianchi wondered what changed to make Mr. Blaney retract this thought. If the purpose of dam classification is for public safety, why would they grant a waiver if it would compromise that?

Mr. McLean said that he and Mr. Blaney met when they were submitting their detailed analyses. Once he had determined it was high-hazard and would not allow for a reclassification. They started saying they have to design the dam to withstand 2.5x the 100-year storm as it could not withstand it now. Without looking at anything, Mr. Blaney said that the State would entertain a waiver and that it was a possibility. What changed was when the analysis was reviewed by Mr. Blaney who then decided that a waiver was not a possibility.

Mr. Snyder wondered what changed that the State has determined any dam to require the 2.5x the 100-year storm. Who decided to impose that regulation? Mr. McLean said that as a regulation from the State level, this regulation has been around for decades. Mr. Snyder asked why they would impose that level of unrealism on a dam. He recalled Mr. McLean's prior discussion when he claimed it was unlikely that this kind of rainfall would ever be present. Mr. McLean said that if there was probable loss of life, they want a protection of this level. The downstream possibility of loss of life is taken into account. Mr. McLean explained that sometimes it takes a long time for these studies to come together and to get to the point where the reclassifications are made.

Ms. McIlvaine pointed out that in 2006 & 2007 there were many flooding events in NH and in the country. The town of New London even participated in surveys regarding the impacts of storm events in those two years. These events heightened the interest in dam safety nation-wide. Dams are getting older and are flooding in greater frequency. The state regulators want to make sure that people are going to be safe. They have been training inspectors better and are enforcing more because of those events. It is because of heightened awareness.

Mr. McLean presented three concepts to consider regarding upgrading the dam, as it was determined that reclassification was highly unlikely.

Concept #1 – focuses on how to keep the dam from washing away.

Mr. McLean shared that this was the most cost-effective approach. Currently they have some gravel, stone on the top of the dam and there is an earthen backside. A foot and a half of water over the top of the dam could wash away and erode all of it. He suggested placing a layer of concrete across the top to replace the gravel path. On the back side, they could place large blasted stone, 2-3' in size. Some of the trees would probably have to come down to allow the stone to be placed. The overall look of the dam would be drastically changed. The boat ramp would be eliminated. It is approximated that this concept would cost about \$350,000.

Concept #2 – focuses on how to increase safety but keep the aesthetics of the dam.

Mr. McLean said that they could bury everything that was added to keep the dam stable. Instead of concrete they could get nicely quarried granite stones. Instead of grass and earthen material, they could bury revetment mattress with stone. In a breach event, the grass would wash away and the concrete would stay in place. The layer of concrete is flexible and they could work it around the trees so maybe only one or two would have to be removed. Stonework that is more aesthetically oriented could be done over the dam. This would be estimated at about \$400,000. The boat ramp would be eliminated. If the town wanted to continue the boat ramp, some further cost would be added to maintain the ramp where it is now and reconfigure its design.

Concept #3 – focuses on how to improve the core of the dam.

Mr. McLean said that they could create a structural core wall and leave the dam in place how it is. Steel sheet pilings could be driven into the center of the dam so it creates a wall of steel inside. If the earthen material is washed away, the steel will remain. There are other options with concrete which is a slurry-wall construction, where a concrete core would be used. The steel is probably the most cost effective solution. It would depend on the amount of ledge that was present in the ground. This concept also calls for the elimination of the boat ramp. This was estimated at about \$500,000.00.

Mr. Bianchi asked if they had thought about the implications that would arise if the water doesn't wash away the earthen material and blows out the bridge instead. Mr. McLean noted that the dam bureau people won't be concerned with that possibility unless the bridge being destroyed makes the risk of flooding worse, which he does not think would be the case here. The hazard here is not necessarily a damage of structure, but the water in the lake floods out into town. They want to maintain the water in the lake.

Mr. Bianchi said another project happening in town is the Elkins Transportation and Enhancement Grant. They are talking about sidewalks and doing drainage on the bridge. He was wondering if they should bother with this if the dam is a bigger problem. Mr. McLean said when it comes to storm water and rainfall, they are taking a risk. Once every 10 years their catch basins will overflow. They always need to evaluate what risk they are willing to accept with new infrastructure being built. Mr. Bianchi wondered what the timeframe was and if they should wait on the Elkins project until after the dam is repaired.

Ms. McIlvaine said that the letters explained that the Town should do a series of studies and if in fact it is a high hazard dam and they have to make improvements, they have until August 2013 to do them. She said that they work with the NH DES Dam Bureau on a number of dams and her experience is that as long as the Dam Bureau sees progress, they are willing to talk about extensions. The Bureau has admitted that some private dam owners and commercially owned dams have received letters as well, and those letters are being ignored. The Dam Bureau is starting to issue fines to these dam owners. This can all be seen on the DES website. Ms. McIlvaine said that the emergency action plan should be updated before the construction is started to help with public safety.

Mr. Wheeler wondered about exploratory costs associated with these upgrades. Mr. McLean said there were some to consider such as exploratory drilling. The costs they have provided for these concepts do not include design. This would add approximately another 5-10% of the cost for design.

Mr. Bianchi said they could not go to Town Meeting this May to ask for money even if they wanted to as this is very premature. The best case scenario would be to raise money in 2013. They have some constraints due to the way the municipality has to work. Ms. McIlvaine said that the State is aware of these constraints; they put a date in the letter to exhibit the seriousness of the problem and to encourage action to take place. Ms. Helm thought if they came up with a strategic plan to deal with this issue, which may not include date deadlines, it is proof that they are working on it and they may be able to have the deadline of August, 2013 extended.

Mr. Anderson asked about the steel sheet drilling and wondered if a partial breach of the dam would be acceptable. Could they put the steel plates just 2' below the current dam level? Mr. McLean said when a dam breaches and erodes to that level, it is likely the same elevation as the 100-year storm breach scenario. For it to be stable, generally they need to go down two times the amount of steel that is showing, above the ground. If 10' of the steel is exposed, and should the earth around it wash away, they would need 20' to go into the ground to keep it stable.

Mr. Bianchi said if they hired a firm to design the dam, and noted that Wright-Pierce has not been hired for this job, could other alternatives be included in the design phase that were different than these three concepts. Mr. McLean said they could develop real-cost scenarios once more studying was done.

Mr. Edgerton said that they worked through things and around the first of the year it became evident through the modeling that getting a waiver wasn't going to accomplish much. They knew they had to sit down with the community to see where they wanted to go. To grasp what it looked like and where it would ultimately go, they determined that the logical way to proceed was to bracket the range of three possible scenarios and spend time to develop them and understand costs, pros and cons and have a discussion with them. There are other options out there but the focus was not to nail down a decision that evening. This was really a forum for having a discussion. The options discussed were not recommended at this point but were a basis for them to have a beginning discussion.

Mr. Edgerton reiterated that in the past they have seen flexibility by the State with project deadlines such as these. They may want some additional information after digesting what they have heard that night, and he recognized that one member of the Board of Selectmen was not present and they may want to share this information with him. Once they figure out their path and schedule, they will be in a better position to get a more detailed action plan for how they would like to proceed.

Mr. Wheeler asked why, if when armoring the dam, they keep talking about losing the boat ramp. Mr. McLean said the ramp is lower at the top of the road than the top of the dam. Water will go out of the ramp, potentially down the road uncontrolled, and the whole dam could breach at the boat ramp. Where water will start to flow first, the boat launch is part of a fill that would be considered the embankment of the dam. The ramp would need to be modified and raised in height. It could be complicated and costly and they thought perhaps there would be a better spot to place the ramp.

Mr. Wilson asked if they do this modeling with software. Mr. McLean said that it is, and it is based on textbook theory. Mr. Wilson asked if there was an artful aspect involved or if every engineer would come up with the same answers. Mr. McLean said that engineers would likely come up with different recommendations, depending how they interpreted the data. He added that they (Wright-Pierce) surveyed more than the previous study. He pointed out that while the homes were there, the homes hadn't been identified in the previous studies. Modeling has changed and has become more accurate over the last 10 years. They have to make a lot of assumptions to predict something very natural. There is appropriate use of assumptions and he found general conformance in what they have come up with.

Mr. Wilson asked if they start their modeling using a normal lake level and if so, he wondered what that level was. Mr. McLean said that there were two "normal" levels of the lake. One is lower in the winter, and the other is higher, which is the one they chose. The higher level would cause a worse scenario. DES assumed an even higher level than the highest level the lake would be at. Wright-Pierce was able to negotiate a more reasonable level with DES Engineers at the Dam Safety Bureau go over the models the engineering firms come up with to make sure the assumptions are appropriate.

Mr. Wilson asked if the mechanized dam gate had to be disregarded in the modeling. Mr. McLean assumed in their models that the gate was opened all the way. Mr. Bianchi wondered if the State would perhaps require that the bridge be redesigned. Mr. McLean said the water being held back by the bridge in the model was not a factor that would require the bridge to be redesigned. Ms. McIlvaine said that the Dam Bureau is more concerned with the dam, not the bridge.

Mr. Hudson asked if the Town has any other dams that have been issued a letter of deficiency. Mr. Stanley said the State owns the Little Sunapee Dam, so they won't be issued a letter of deficiency. Mr.

Bianchi said the Hayes Dam, below the Mill Pond Dam has been issued a letter. They will be repairing it in-house this summer to take care of the problems. They did give the owner of the Mill Pond Dam a letter of deficiency but he didn't know where that stood. He explained that the dam is privately owned.

Mr. Dunning wondered if, since the dam would/could impact other towns all the way to Salisbury, would New London be able to get any funding from other towns to make this repair. Ms. Helm said that she and Mr. Bianchi had both thought of this and would try and find out. She thanked everyone for coming and asked people to continue coming to these meetings to keep abreast of this issue and others that are important within the town. Mr. Bianchi felt that they should all come to the realization that at some point, the town may need to come up with half a million dollars to fix this problem.

Ms. Klingler asked if there was a deadline to use the Elkins grant money. Ms. Helm said there is no set deadline to spend the grant money, but the construction of the project is slated to be the same timeframe that has been assigned to the Dam's deficiency notice. Ms. Klingler wondered if the Elkins project would be put on hold. Mr. Bianchi said that this was his concern as they didn't know which project would/should come first. They have the money for the Elkins project and are already into it, and they are worried that what they do may become un-done when having to go in to repair the dam. Ms. Helm said to stay tuned as they clarify the whole picture of what will be going on in the Elkins area. Ms. Hallquist said they would talk to the State about the Elkins grant money and whether provisions for delay in light of this new issue are possible.

Mr. Edgerton recommended looking at the two projects together, along the same path.

Mr. McLean said there is likely an economy of scale here; having one person looking at the whole picture could contribute to some savings. Mr. Bianchi said that they would need to analyze a larger scope of the project to get more requests for qualifications.

Meetings

Ms. Helm said the meeting they have scheduled for February 21st is at 8AM. The list of meeting incorrectly lists it as 6PM. Ms. Hallquist agreed and said she would have the time corrected on the website.

Minutes Approval

January 23, 2012

IT WAS MOVED (Peter Bianchi) AND SECONDED (Tina Helm) to approve the minutes of Jan 23, 2012, as amended. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Bianchi said that on top of page four, it should specify that "he was billed for 40,000 gallons." Ms. Helm said it should note that she had said she would attend the sewer meeting, which she did.

Low Temperature Alarm System for Offices

Mr. Bianchi said there were two bids that came in for the installation and maintenance of these alarms. Capital Alarm came in at \$1,095 for installation, and monitoring at \$24/month for six month intervals. Ms. Hallquist asked Tasco and ADT to come in with proposals as well. Tasco came in at \$1,050 for installation but would install for free if the town signed a contract for five years at \$10/month.

Mr. Bianchi didn't think they had money to do this in the current year and thought they should appropriate money for next year within the budget they had recently given the Budget Committee. They could appropriate \$600 in the next budget for the five years of service. He wondered if they could do that.

Ms. Hallquist said she could talk to Tasco about it and believed they would have an escape clause in the contract in case it didn't work out on either end.

Mr. Lee asked if Capital Alarm would charge an additional \$24/month if they were already monitoring the fire alarms in the buildings. Mr. Bianchi said he wondered the same thing but was told that they can't tie in a low temperature or burglar alarm with a fire alarm. They were told it was a separate system and couldn't combine them.

Ms. Helm asked how important it was to have these monitors installed. Ms. Hallquist said she felt it was very important. The town has insurance to repair damage caused by water breaks but the time and information lost due to heating failure could be costly. Ms. Hallquist would see if they could install the equipment and see if they could just pay for one year at a time instead of coming up with \$600 for the five years all at once. Mr. Bianchi said they should save as much as they can on this year's budget and if they would go along with being paid \$120 for this year, they should go ahead with it. He didn't think they should commit to it in full at this time.

Letter from the Diekmanns

Mr. Lee thought what happened was when the new sewer main was run down Pressey Court, the old line was abandoned and not used by the town. A lot of the lines had private foundation and basement drains hooked into them. The problems discussed in the letter, water backing up into the basement of the home, might be the result of an abandoned sewer line blocked up, there are trees there that could have roots that grew in the clay pipe and it could have caved in. There is no way of knowing whether the sewer or water project caused it or if it is a natural event causing the clog. Some old, non-functioning sewer lines in that area were left to allow for basements in the area to not be backed up.

Ms. Helm asked who told the property owner that they could not let the water down the toilet. Mr. Lee said the Town did, as it is against the law to put that kind of water down into the sewer. Ms. Helm said if a camera is placed in the pipe and the location of the clog is determined, would it be a small area to dig up. Mr. Lee said it could be clogged 100' from the main; they have no idea how big the clog is or how widespread the clogs could be in the pipe. He said all along Pressey Court they have similar problems because it is so flat there. Mr. Bianchi said digging in this area requires digging in other people's property and getting permission from the State. Mr. Lee didn't see an easy answer. Mr. Bianchi said that these are well-known people in the town and he felt it unfortunate, but if it is a footing drain, it isn't the Town's problem. There is no sure or quick solution. Ms. Hallquist was asked to send an acknowledgement letter to the Diekmanns explaining the Town's position on the matter.

Fairway Lane Letter – Cyanrose Jensen

Mr. Lee said the area in question is such that it is difficult to maintain parts of the road in the winter. Over the last 4-5 years Ms. Jensen has contacted the Town, State DOT, Attorney General Office, Comcast, PSNH etc. to move the pole and fix the intersection at Rte. 114 and Old Rowell Hill Road. PSNH has moved the pole and the highway department has taken steps to make the intersection safer and easier to maintain in a safe manner. Ms. Jensen has expressed her disagreement with the results of the work, Mr. Lee noted that during an ice storm in November, there was ice on the dirt because dirt roads ice up much more frequently than do paved roads. Ms. Jensen reported that Mr. Ellison slid off the icy road and took out a street sign as well. Mr. Bianchi thought perhaps if Mr. Ellison slid 1,500 feet down the road, as her letter specified, he was going too fast to begin with. Mr. Lee has responded to Ms. Jensen already, to which she responded again. At that time, Mr. Lee handed the matter over to Ms. Hallquist and the Board of Selectmen to deal with. Ms. Helm wondered what they should do next. She asked Ms. Hallquist to send Ms. Jensen an acknowledgement letter. Mr. Bianchi said that they should use caution and exercise due diligence in icy road conditions.

Water Precinct Meeting

Ms. Hallquist said she went to the meeting earlier that day and met the commissioners and heard about how the Precinct operates. Tom Galligan (President of Colby-Sawyer College) was also there to discuss the colleges' plans with regard to Kelsey Fields. The Commissioners informed Mr. Galligan that that the area was not currently within the Water Precinct District and they were told that it was very difficult to change the districts. There was discussion that in order to change the precinct boundaries it must be shown that the district would benefit as a whole, not just the college.

Discussion of Wright-Pierce Presentation

Ms. Hallquist said that the charge of Wright-Pierce was to update the EAP and breach analysis to comply with the high hazard classification and to address the letter of deficiency. Mr. Bianchi said he didn't know how much more Wright-Pierce would be doing. Mr. Lee said that their original contract was for \$27,700 which has been billed for. He had not approved payment of their final bill as he wanted to make sure he received the EAP, which he now has. Once they test the plan, find that it works, and it satisfies the State, Wright-Pierce will be done with their commitment to the Town. The breach analysis is pretty much approved by the State already. What they have done for the presentation that night was extra and they did it because they found out that the reclassification of the dam was actually not a possibility. That wasn't what they thought would be the case. They were led to believe that reclassification by the State was a possibility.

Mr. Lee said that Mr. Miller's (Mesa) classification went from "high" to "significant" once he took the building off of the dam. That is why the Town tried to get reclassified as well. Mr. Blaney led them to believe that a waiver was possible or that they could possibly drop the classification. After all the work the engineers did, the answer was "no."

Mr. Bianchi said that this year there was no way they could appropriate money for this project as they don't know what the costs would be. Ms. Hallquist said they could appropriate some funding and suggested perhaps between \$50,000 and \$100,000 and have it put into the Bridge Repair Fund that already exists. This would get a head start on the funding for the project.

Mr. Bianchi said after talking to the State they could request proposals for solutions to the problem. Mr. Lee noted that there was no figure given by Wright-Pierce that would take them from the place they were now until a plan was actually created. They would need to pay for a feasibility study which he anticipated to be an additional and costly study.

Mr. Lee felt that the lack of a boat ramp in the design was a concern to everyone. He suggested asking Mr. Blaney from the Dam Bureau to sit in at the Elkins meeting to see if they could align the projects or at least see how they could work together. They could perhaps help with an outline of work and dates. Mr. Bianchi thought they should ask Wright-Pierce what it would cost to do a feasibility study. Mr. Lee said if they hire another reengineering firm, they will not use Wright-Pierce's study. They will spend at least a day doing something that was already done to come up with their own figures. Mr. Bianchi thought it would be fine to do this and it could be considered a peer review.

Mr. Bianchi said they need to be aware how this dam project will affect the Elkins project. Mr. Lee said the projects could be bid on at the same time but they would need to stand alone as projects. They would need to keep the work on the two separate.

The next Board of Selectmen's meeting would be held on February 21, 2012 at 8AM. At this meeting they would discuss the RFQs with the Elkins committee. They hoped to pare the firms down to three at this meeting and rank them in order of preference in their own minds. They will then think about

interview dates/times and questions that will be asked of the firms. Ms. Hallquist said she would check on Mr. Rose's availability to meet with them. Mr. Lee said he would check with Ms. McIlvaine to see about what it would cost for a feasibility study.

Application for Building Permits:

- Todd & Ingrid Quillen, 295 Forest Acres Road (Map & Lot 118-015-000) remodel existing house – interior only – Permit #12-003 – DENIED (referred to ZBA)

Application for use of the Whipple Memorial Town Hall:

- New London Garden Club – March 5th, set up 6-8PM - March 6th, 2012 – 7:30 AM – 5:00 PM set up – approved.

Application for Sign Permits:

- Ausbon Sargent Land Trust – sign at information booth – June 11, 2011 – Approved.

Other Items to be signed:

- Disbursement voucher
- Warrant Yield Tax Levy - \$498.61
- Intent to cut application (Map & Lot 114-001-000)

**IT WAS MOVED (Peter Bianchi) AND SECONDED (Tina Helm) to adjourn the meeting.
THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristy Heath, Recording Secretary
Town of New London