



**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Monday, September 15, 2025 – 8:30 a.m.**  
Water District Office – 60 Sagamore Road

Commission Present: *Scott Marion, Rosalie Lopresto, and Tom Mack*

Others Present on behalf of the District: *District Administrator Brian Goetz*

Attendees: *Peter Pitsas and Lynette Carney, representing Underwood Engineers. Keriann Roman, District legal counsel. Steven Borne, RWD customer*

**I.** Call to Order

Chair Marion called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**II.** Work Session Central Treatment Plant: Preliminary Design Update – Underwood Engineers

Underwood provided an update of their progress with the Central Treatment Plant preliminary design. A copy of their presentation is attached to these meeting minutes. Highlights of the discussion with the commissioners were as follows:

Scope of Work:

- Review historic WQ and treatment evaluations
- Evaluate treatment of Bailey Brook water for iron & manganese removal
  - This task relies heavily on key information that is currently being collected
- Evaluate treatment of Bailey Brook and Garland wells for PFAS
  - The water quality is tricky and we want to make sure that RWD and UE are comfortable moving forward with final design based on these parameters
- Evaluate site options for treatment facilities
- Update Cost Opinion submitted with the SRF loan based on preliminary design findings
- Create a Summary Report
  - The preliminary design phase is critical as the basis for everything moving forward

Other items of note during the presentation and discussion:

Mr. Pitsas noted that the problem with the water quality is that we have different water quality for different wells. This has been something that has complicated past efforts to design a treatment system for the district. The Garland water has the PFAS over the new EPA limit of 4 parts-per-trillion and needs pH adjustment, while the bedrock wells need additional treatment for iron and manganese removal. His slides and discussion highlighted all the past work, dating back to 2009, that has already been done to investigate, bench test and pilot treatment technologies. To date, none have been successful enough to warrant final design and construction of a full scale system. As mentioned many times during their presentation, he again said that UE wanted to make sure that what they design for is the right technology so that the district won't have to redesign or change treatment technologies in the future. Underwood wants to make sure that they are moving ahead right and don't want to waste money and come back and rework the design. Mr. Pitsas stated that they would like to have been further along with the design, but there are still questions about the water quality of the well water sources that are yet to be answered.

Ms. Carney noted that they have been learning lessons from other treatment systems that have been constructed recently throughout New England that they can apply to this project. She added that once final design is underway there are plans to have site visits to these other facilities to learn more about their operations.

Commissioner Lopresto questioned how effective the Cedar Run well seal will be. Administrator Goetz noted that the seal should be installed sometime in October. We are still waiting on the parts to arrive. Once that is installed then additional water quality sampling can be performed to determine the viability of reactivating that source of supply. Otherwise, Ms. Carney noted, the well is really not that usable other than an emergency source due to the high levels of iron and manganese. She added that the district's approach is the best option at the moment adding that maybe you get a little less quantity of water but perhaps be able to improve the water quality. There is also the potential to replace some of that water with water from the other test wells. The intention is to also collect water quality data from test well 3 as part of the work. Mr. Pitsas mentioned if the district has multiple wells and you're doing a well-field approach type of thing, then you're stressing each well less and get the volume that you are permitted for, then that would be a good solution.

There was discussion about the PFAS piloting and data to date. Underwood complimented Superintendent Jones for all the work he and his staff have done to set up and run this pilot in-house rather than expending time and money on an outside firm to do the work. So far, based on all the water quality sampling and data collected from the pilot system to date, each of the four filter medias being tested are proving to work effectively. Ms. Carney went over some of the charts and then went on to discuss the observations and photos that Superintendent Jones and staff have seen in the field. The Bailey water source is showing manganese deposition in the pre-filter installed on the well sample line. The Garland Well is showing iron staining in its pre-filter. This can be easily removed. The blended water is also showing staining that is harder to remove. This sample is after the chlorination, so it may be attributed to the chlorination. Superintendent

Jones also provided a water sample showing iron deposits taken from the bottom of the Washington Road tank that was recently collected as part of the tank cleaning prior to the tank painting project that recently started. Ms. Carney noted that this is likely the iron coming out of solution due to the chlorination. Since the tank is so close to the Garland water sources and chlorination this is likely why the iron doesn't get out into the rest of the system and cause water quality complaints.

The next effort that Underwood is going to pursue is to have Blueleaf be subcontracted to perform additional bench testing of treatment methods at the end of October or early November. They are going to try aeration on the Garland well water to see how effective that is. If the Cedar Run well is back on-line then they will be able to bench test that water too. Underwood added that they are also talking to various treatment vendors to get their opinion on possible options for effective treatment technologies. Ms. Carney noted that they have sent the vendors the first round of water quality data from recent well sampling and will do so with the next round to get their insight.

Underwood finished their presentation by providing an updated timeline for the preliminary and final design. Currently, they anticipate finishing the preliminary design by February/March of 2026. They will then work on final design and permitting, which will take about 12 months. However, they anticipate having updated cost estimates for the system by the end of 2026.

Chair Marion noted the timing for town meeting and budgeting to provide an update regarding the breakdown of the estimated treatment costs and potential rate impacts. He added that based on the Underwood presentation it appears that the district will not have a more detailed estimate by the time of the 2026 meetings and that we should look toward having everything in place by the 2027 meeting. Administrator Goetz added that this timing should also line up favorably with the ongoing work on the West Road test well as that work and pump testing should occur sometime in 2026 too.

Regarding rates, Administrator Goetz said that they could be updated for the start of 2026, together with a change to quarterly billing, and that the district will have additional time to assess the breakdown of the final treatment costs when design is complete and construction is set to begin. Fortunately, with the SRF loan structure, the district has until one year after final completion of the facility to start paying off the loan. That provides ample time to adjust rates and revenue needs to cover the payments when they start to become due in 2030. He added that the adjusted timeline for design provides the district with time to prepare outreach materials that can be presented at upcoming meetings and distributed to customers along with website posting. These materials will describe what the project is and how it will improve water quality and meet the new regulatory guidelines for PFAS.

### **III. Non-Public Session per RSA 91-A:3 II (l) Legal**

At 9:55 a.m., Tom Mack moved to enter Non-Public Session per RSA 91-A:3 II (l) Legal. Seconded by Rosalie. Roll Call: Scott Marion – Aye; Rosalie Lopresto – Aye; Tom Mack – Aye

The Commission came out of non-public session at 10:20 a.m.

### **IV. Other Business**

None

Motion by Scott Marion to seal the non-public meeting minutes of this meeting. Seconded by Tom Mack. All in favor.

### **Adjournment**

Motion by Tom Mack to adjourn at 10:30 a.m. Seconded by Rosalie Lopresto. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dyana F. Ledger