

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont
Village Wastewater Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, February 21, 2023 – 6:00 PM
Neighborhood Connections, 5700 VT Rte. 100
Londonderry, VT**

Village Wastewater Committee (VWC) Members Present: Sharon Crossman (Representing Committee Chair for this meeting), Larry Gubb, Gary Hedman,

Others in Attendance:

In Person: Melissa Brown (Londonderry Selectboard), Shane O’Keefe (Town Administrator), Chris Campany (Executive Director, Windham Regional Commission), Heather Stephenson (Londonderry Planning Commission), Stephen Bergleitner (Parks Board), Taylor Barton (Parks Board), Chad Stoddard (Londonderry Resident) Patricia Gagnon (Londonderry Resident), Mike Doane (Londonderry Resident), Jim Wilbur (Londonderry Resident), Bonnie Cobb (Assistant Town Clerk)

Online: Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC), Sue Westa (Associate Director, Windham Regional Commission (WRC)), Tom Cavanaugh (Chair, Londonderry Selectboard) Kelly Pajala (Town Clerk, Londonderry Parks Board) Hilary Batchelor (President Londonderry Arts & Historical Society), Patty Eisenhauer (Londonderry Resident) “Platypus” (unidentified).

1. Call meeting to order -

Sharon, meeting chair (standing in for Gail Mann) called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM

2. Additions or deletions to the agenda:

No additions or deletions

3. Approval of Minutes:

Sharon Made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 3rd 2023 meeting, as written, Larry seconded. All others on the Committee voted to approve.

4. Introductions and Overview of the WRC Facilitation Process

Discussion with Members of Parks Board, led by WRC.

Goal: Identify a process by which the Village Wastewater Committee and the Parks Board can reach a consensus position to be provided to the Selectboard on the potential use of Pingree Park as part of a public wastewater system for the North Village.

Sharon introduced the Windham Regional Commission facilitation team, Chris Campany and Sue Westa. Chris Campany added to the above stated goal with the caveat “if you want to”.

Chris Campany presented a short overview of the WRC, the towns included in the Windham region, that George Mora and Dennis Pinkernell are the two Londonderry representatives to the WRC. He spoke of his 13 years at the WRC, his being head of Village Trustees in Newfane as a resident there, prior to becoming a resident of Townshend.

He led off by discussing the what each of the Parks Board (PB) and the Village Wastewater Committee (VWC) is charged with by the Londonderry Selectboard with regard to stewardship. The PB is charged with stewardship of Pingree Park as part of this discussion and the VWC is charged with stewardship of finding suitable sites for potential decentralized wastewater systems in both the south and the north village. He mentioned that all PB and VWC members were all neighbors and all cared about the future of the town and that the question before both public bodies, was the very limited question of determining whether or not there is a process that is mutually agreeable to both the PB and VWC through which both can explore the development of a consensus position on the potential use of Pingree Park as part of a public wastewater system for the north village to be provided to the Selectboard (SB) that the PB and the VWC agree that they would like to go through the process to try to find consensus.

The next step would be to design that process with the two entities and schedule a joint meeting with the two bodies, but if the two bodies have already reached their decisions, then the Selectboard will have to consider each position and make a decision.

Chris reiterated that the grant received is conditioned on meeting various goals and timelines/milestones at fixed dates and dependent upon SB decisions and that if they are not met, the grant is ended and passed on to another town or other communities who have also applied for grant money to do wastewater projects in their towns. The funds being ARPA funds must be obligated by December, 2024. Knowing where the PB and the VWC stand will help the SB make their decisions.

In the interest of knowing all members of both the Londonderry Parks board and the Village Wastewater Committee Chris asked attendees to identify and introduce themselves. (Please see Attendees list above).

Chris asked Emily to speak to what the conditions are of the grant. Emily stated that the grant money can be used for final design, land acquisition, legal arrangement of easements, bond vote assistance, bidding, construction are just some of the items. All ARPA money must be spent by December 2026, Backing out from that, in order to spend every penny of the money, all milestones that need to be met were looked at. Based on that, all construction would need to be wrapped up by August, 2026 to allow paperwork to be finished. Design to be completed in September of 2024 and a positive bond vote by August of 2024, with all land acquisition by the end of this year (2023) or very early in 2024. Land

acquisition milestone may be somewhat negotiable as long as forward momentum on the acquisition is clearly seen. Shane O’Keefe asked for clarification on the acquisition deadline. Emily said she can provide more information on what is negotiable when she provides the grant to Shane. Chris was also interested in clarification, as to what the range of flexibility was. Emily stated that it was in the range of months, not a year. Shane reiterated the importance of the acquisition deadline relative to the issue of not being able to use a Town owned property and having to purchase property to locate a wastewater system.

Chris began with members of the Parks Board to see what their personal opinions were (because this was not a warned meeting for the PB they would not be speaking for the PB,) regarding going through a process to see if common ground between the PB and the VWC or if they have already arrived at a position and further process to find consensus is not necessary.

Stephen Bergleitner spoke first, saying he was only speaking for himself, but thought that everyone was for the grant money and that there was common ground in all caring about Londonderry. He spoke to all members of both the PB and the VWC all being volunteers and giving of their time for the betterment of the community. He said the biggest concern was the limited space in the Park, with the areas of the Park that are in the floodplain and future plans for the Park, including a pump track, a pickleball court or skate park. He said the PB didn’t have the funds to do any of the things they have planned, but that has been the vision of the PB since he joined the board 3 years ago.

Chris asked if he thought it would be worthwhile to get together with the VWC to discuss his and the PB concerns further. Stephen responded that there are further questions they have regarding capacity and more that they do not yet have answered, but thought based on what he knew, he did not see a spot for where a system could be place, but he was agreeable to meeting with the VWC to find out more and have his questions answered.

Chad Stoddard spoke next, saying he agreed with Stephen and said that the PB had planned to meet with the VWC and to also invite the SB and the Planning Commission for a warned public meeting. He also mentioned that the PB would like to send out a survey to the community to see if they want to see a wastewater system placed at the Park.

Chris reiterated that all meetings would have to be open to the public and would have to be designed to allow for public comment.

Taylor Barton spoke next, saying that while he has been speaking with members of the community or people he works with, that many people seem to be unaware of what is going on, in spite of open meetings and meeting minutes. His concern is that information is not getting out into the community enough. He thought that decisions made about Pingree Park might be beyond the PB to make, if the community is not very aware of what is going on. Chris C. reiterated that ultimately any decisions lie with the SB. He turned to Melissa

Brown for her personal thoughts as a member of the SB. She said that yes, ultimately the SB would have to make the final decision, but that the PB and the VWC were believed to be the best “fact finders” regarding information needed by the SB to make the decision. Taylor Barton was asked if he would agree to a meeting with the VWC and he said it could not hurt. Chad Stoddard said that the PB have all agreed that a wastewater system should not go anywhere at the Park and that questions have been asked about systems, but have only been partially answered and that the hope is many of the questions can be answered in a joint meeting.

Melissa said that she thought the most interesting information will be the thoughts from the community. She said she understood the pressure everyone feels to make decisions for the community when the community hasn’t had the opportunity to weigh in on it. She said as a SB member, she likes to have as much information as possible before making decisions that affect the entire town.

Chris Campany turned to the VWC to see if they thought it would be worthwhile to meet with the PB to come to some consensus and common ground on accommodation of the placement of a wastewater system at Pingree Park, should that be possible.

Sharon Crossman said, “absolutely” as it is something the VWC has been working toward for a long time, with the consulting engineer working hard to research and complete the information needed to know the viability of any location for a potential wastewater system and that without certain steps in the process, taking place, all the information needed cannot be complete. She posed the question the VWC has grappled with regarding putting out the information that is as yet incomplete or wait until processes are completed to give us the complete information needed. Chris asked again, if she would agree to a joint meeting and Sharon, saying she was speaking for herself said, yes.

Chris asked Larry Gubb next. Larry agreed, absolutely, that a meeting was important and reiterated the need to be able to gather complete information so everyone knew whether a wastewater system was viable at Pingree Park and if there could be accommodation for both a wastewater system and what the PB has planned for the Park.

Gary Hedman spoke next. He spoke to the enviable position of Londonderry being awarded a very sizable grant in consideration of the size and the total amount of ARPA money coming to the state specifically for water and wastewater projects. He also spoke to the unenviable position of having very tight timeframes associated with the grant. He spoke to the work that has already been done by the VWC and how there will be the need for more than one system and that will likely mean multiple properties to be involved, some of them currently privately owned properties. He spoke to some good examples of where wastewater systems have been collocated with recreation parks. He cited the Manchester Recreation Park and Warren, VT school playing fields and spoke to invitations and attempts to have the PB view the examples in Warren or Manchester and that another site visit to Manchester could be set up, as the first invitations and attempts failed to have any PB

members attend and as a means to add to and help the conversation regarding Pingree Park. Gary said he was hopeful a solution could be found and that Pingree Park is not the only site being looked at for viability and as many options are being looked at as possible, to fulfill the need. Gary said he is 100% open to meeting with the PB.

Chris Campany asked if the Conservation Commission (CC) might be invited to the planned discussion with the Planning Commission, the Parks Board and the Selectboard. The members present of the PB said they would consider inviting the Conservation Commission at the same meeting. Shane mentioned that the Conservation Commission would be included in any discussion of the “Custer-Sharp” Town property off of Middletown Road because they have “jurisdiction” or are custodians/overseers/managers of that property for the SB. Chris Campany said what still needs to be resolved is whether this would be a meeting about Pingree Park in particular or is it about the north village. The PB said Pingree Park is specific to their agenda.

Chris C. suggested the chairs of all boards, commissions and committees get together to decide what the joint meeting might look like and take back a proposed agenda to other members of their boards, committees, commissions and discuss what sorts of background information might be put together prior to the joint meeting. He said this would provide a means for members of various boards, committees, etc. to provide input, but have the leaders of each to put together the final agenda for the joint meeting. First step would be to determine how the meeting would be structured, when it would be held, what’s to be discussed and what information is to be provided. Chris said this is something the WRC could facilitate with direction from Shane O’Keefe, the Town Administrator. He asked if that sounded agreeable to all parties. Chad Stoddard speaking for the Parks Board said he wanted to wait until February 27th for the Parks Board meeting to discuss the joint meeting and make determinations, all in consideration of Pingree Park only. Chris C. asked if they would consider consulting heads of other boards, commissions, etc. during their February meeting about planning a joint meeting. Chris said he felt there felt to be a remaining interest in doing a joint meeting, but was uncertain a desire to reach consensus was resolved. Shane recommended the VWC and the PB in their upcoming meeting, make some recommendations to bring to the SB at their February 27th meeting. He also said that it would be useful to decide whether to have a joint meeting to resolve the Pingree Park decision, then bring the findings and additional information in a more general public meeting later on. Members of the Parks Board voiced concern about too many meetings.

Gary Hedman asked Emily Hackett if any connection could be made with regard to the grant being severable to help fund work that also helped Pingree Park funding. Emily responded that the funding can only be used for wastewater project. Gary and Shane discussed other scenario examples where a wastewater system might be built with the ARPA and Clean Water funding, then other funding from other sources could be used to build a pump track on top of that. Emily said any funding would have to be tied to construction work on the wastewater system. Taylor Barton voiced concern that while there are examples of where these sorts of things have worked there are examples of where they have not. He said

Manchester recreation park is very large compared to Pingree's and that the PB didn't know what sort of system would be involved. Chris C. said that is something that can be discussed in the joint meeting.

Shane asked if there had been any sort of master plan done for the park. Stephen said an engineer did some work several years ago. Taylor said plans had changed depending upon who is coming forth with ideas and across the years, so there is nothing that is really comprehensive. Stephen mentioned that a survey of a year or so ago found most interest was in a skate park and a pickleball court. Taylor voiced that there was a thriving youth baseball program now and where the test pits may be dug is where there is interest in adding T-Ball this year.

Chris Campany reviewed what of the agenda item had been accomplished. All had decided that meeting together was agreeable and that next steps would be to figure out how that would be arranged. The PB has their February 27th meeting planned to discuss the joint meeting. The SB will need to know more about when a meeting would be planned, the Planning Commission will have to know when a meeting or discuss when a meeting could be planned. He asked if it made sense to all board, commission members present. Sharon mentioned that the wastewater committee originated with the Planning Commission and then was separated from it and asked how PC comments would feed into the wider discussion. Chris said the PC is concerned with how wastewater fits into the overall planning for the town. Sharon asked if there was good reason to ask Chrissy Haskins if she has completed all the studies in Pingree Park to know if more information is needed. Chrissy said that test pits are still needed and that without the test pits we cannot know what the soils and the surface water conditions are. Once the information from those test pits is gotten, a lot of questions can be answered as to the viability and the type of system that would be best in consideration of that information. She said that there are a variety of types of systems to be used that include variable shapes that can be wound around other facilities and has been used in other recreation parks. She said once there is enough information gathered from the test pits to put a potential system design together, it may be of interest to the Parks Board and working around their plans for the Park.

Chris Campany asked about timing to do the test pits, if permission was given to go ahead to complete them (test pits are dug and filled back in the same day). Chrissy said test pits can be done any time of year, but there are archeological review considerations. On other sites the archeological review can be postponed under a later date if the cost for the test pits is born by the Town or funds that are not grant funds. Without funds from other sources to pay for the test pits, it could take several months before an archeological review can take place so that the test pits can be done and paid for by grant funds.

Melissa asked Chrissy to reiterate the process of how potential sites have been selected. Chrissy said it is typical to begin with town properties for the obvious reason of removing the cost of acquiring land for the siting of potential systems. Next thing that is looked at are USGS soils maps and there are type I, II, III and IV soils. Type I is well suited for septic, type II

is moderately suited, type III is marginally suited and type IV is not suited for septic. Pingree Park is mapped as Type I, the Custer-Sharp town property shows type II and type III soils and then topography, adjacent land uses, proximity to wells. Melissa asked if soils were not looking good on town properties other properties would then be looked at? Chrissy responded that ideally, sites with good soils would be looked at, but Londonderry does not generally have good soils for septic.

Sharon determined that the discussion of this agenda item appeared to be completed. Stephen B. had an additional question, regarding the next meeting of the VWC and if it were open to the public. Shane responded that all meetings with a quorum of the VWC were warned and open to the public and that the VWC had voted to hold 2 regular meetings a month, one on the first Friday of every month at 9:00 AM and one on the third Tuesday of every month at 6:00 PM. Gary and Sharon mentioned the meetings were held at Neighborhood Connections because of the capacity for facilitating remote participation via ZOOM. Bonnie Cobb had a question about the ARPA funds and if they were able to be used to purchase property if Town owned properties did not work out. Shane responded that it is not certain that there would be enough money to do everything, yet, but each property acquisition cost would reduce the overall total of the grant amount and mean less money for construction of the systems. The money for acquisition is only available to December 31st of 2023 and possibly slightly beyond. Emily Hackett added that land acquisition is only good for the “Yellow Book” appraisal value, so any property purchase that cost more than the “Yellow Book” appraisal value would have to be covered by the town or other funding. The “Yellow Book” is used by federal funding agencies as something similar to the “Kelly Blue Book” for automobile appraisals. Shane asked if a property cost \$220,000, but the “Yellow Book” and appraiser said it was only worth \$200,000, could the \$20,000 difference paid by the town, be used as part of the required grant match? Emily said possibly, but did not want to say yes or no without getting further information regarding whether it could.

Chris Campany asked if anyone joining the meeting via ZOOM (online) had any comments pertaining to this agenda item. Hilary Batchelor had a question about the amount of the grant. Sharon responded that it was \$7.9 million and likely not enough. Chris Campany responded that the total was for both villages, split evenly among them. Hilary asked what the South Londonderry area the VWC is considering is. Shane responded that is it the property adjacent to the Town Offices owned by the South Londonderry Free Library. Hilary asked about what might be negative about using the Custer-Sharp Town property. Shane responded that the soils are not as ideal as those at Pingree Park and there were deed restrictions requiring the property be used as a public forest reserve or a minor portion being used as a municipal park. He added that the Conservation Commission had weighed in on the use of a portion of the property as a municipal park with the collocation of a wastewater system, as a part of their custodial/managerial duties over that property, for the SB and will recommend to the SB that a portion of the property be used as a municipal park for that purpose. Hilary asked what the access would be for that property. Shane

said, off of Middletown Road and not through the driveway to the Londonderry Arts and Historical Society.

Sharon asked if there were any other questions from those attending remotely. No responses were heard. Shane mentioned that there would have to be agreement that no further comment on Pingree Park could be heard. Mike Doane wanted to comment, stating that his grandfather originally donated the land for much of the Park and sold additional land at a greatly reduced price, with the stipulation that it be used for recreation only. Another stipulation was that it be named Pingree Park after longtime resident Dr. Pingree. He said he does not know what the layout or the design of the system might be, but did not think a wastewater system in a recreation park was going to work. He said the system may be designed so that it can work and that he did not know, but he talked to his father (Rex's son) about it today and said that Rex was very adamant about wanting it used for recreation only. No trailers, no buildings, no inhabitants living there, nothing and that it would be a town park only and stated that he (Mike Doane) had a lot of reservations about it. Patricia Gagnon added her reiteration of her similar concerns. Mike Doane added that he does not know the designs, how it would be laid out or going to work and that he was really uninformed, but that he had a lot of reservations, as does his father and the rest of his family. He said it does not sound like the direction his grandfather donated the land for. Patricia Gagnon spoke again to her concerns about commercial versus recreational uses and the opinion of the Town attorney that a municipal use does not equate to a commercial use, was wrong and that the opinion also stated that the state or a judge may find differently. Shane mentioned that most legal opinions will say that the state or a judge may find differently. Patricia said if the state or a judge were to find differently in her opinion the property would revert to Doane family ownership. She also spoke to not knowing what the plan is with regard to piping etc. and costs asking if anything has been determined. Larry G. spoke to the need to gather the information needed to make the determinations on the locations and designs of the potential systems. Without that information an overall design and costs for the design cannot be determined, thus the information people desire to have cannot be offered until all the work is done to determine locations and designs is completed.

5. WW Site Selection Updates

South Village: - Update on library property

Chrissy Haskins reported on new test pit sites on the South Londonderry Free Library (SLFL) property. Test pits were done and coordinated with hydrogeologist. Results were better than before, not as good as we were hoping. Field would need to be built for a 6,500 gal./day system and footprint, but only take about 3,600 gal./day or 55%. Prior site on the SLFL land was at about 30%. Working with the system designer found ways that may be able to increase the capacity.

Rules may allow for additional sand underneath the mound raising the whole system higher giving more room for effluent mounding, underneath. Another option may be to add more stone in the trench. Instead of a typical 6 inch stone add 12 inch stone in the trench. Design using those modifications is being worked up to run back through hydrogeologist to

see what the change might be. She said the hydrogeologist will stay true to what the soils will take and that we wouldn't want him to do differently, so will have to wait to see what, if any increased capacity might come from the design. Chrissy will provide what he reports once she has the results.

North Village: - Evaluation of alternative sites - Custer-Sharp property update

Chrissy said that some very high level concept footprints had been developed for a few alternative sites and she, Gary and Sharon will be reaching out to the property owners individually soon to show what we are looking for. This would be low pressure discussion to see if the property owners are willing to talk to us. All would be under 6,500 gal./day systems. Gary is drafting a letter.

Custer-Sharp has no update as test pits have not been done. She spoke with Shane about the cost of an archeologist to be there for the test pits and that expense not being covered by the funding and the decision was to hold off until the cost could be covered by the funding, because there was no urgency to purchase the property. Test pits would be the next step. Gary said there may be some archeological finds there. Sharon asked if the SLFL board would be willing to wait for the archeological, before the test pits. Gary said the test pits on the SLFL property are already done. Jim Wilbur had some questions relating to the Library and Custer-Sharp property. He asked how the Custer-Sharp town property compared to the SLFL property. The response was that we do not know as much about the Custer-Sharp town property as we do about the SLFL property because test pits have not yet been done on the Custer-Sharp town property. Gary said the preliminary assessment of the Custer-Sharp town property was done based on soils maps that said the soils were not the best, but not the worst either. Shane explained the other difference is that the Custer-Sharp town property is already owned by the Town so there is no pressure for it under the property acquisition milestone timeline. Jim Wilbur introduced himself as the treasurer of the South Londonderry Free Library board and explained the situation he came into when joining the SLFL board with numerous problems with the library building. Many of the problems have been taken care of, but more is needed. Chris Campany mentioned that there was a lot of ARPA money available for libraries. Jim said he was aware and that the SLFL is working on applying for funds when the funds are open for the receipt of applications. Jim was curious about how many homes could be serviced with a 6,500 gal./day system. Chrissy put together an example of what a 6,500 gal./day system would service. She said 20 housing units would take up 4,900 gal./day of the system. The remaining 1,600 gal./day of capacity for commercial could service a café, a deli, 3 dry goods or retail stores, a 20 seat restaurant, a 10 child daycare, an 8-10 office space. Shane asked if that was all inclusive or optionally only some mix of those. Chrissy said all of those.

Melissa Brown said that was information that was something people needed to know. Jim said that it would help people determine whether even 2/3 of 6,500 gal./day would be worthwhile as it sounds like it would be. Shane added that it would be a more expensive system being further uphill from the first SLFL property site.

Meeting was officially adjourned at 7:25 PM due to a VWC member having another commitment (family birthday party). Unofficial discussion continues with the understanding no decisions can be made without a quorum.

6. New Business and Considerations

Sharon mentioned getting plan underway for public outreach to provide answers to many, many questions and working with Chrissy Haskins to answer them as the information becomes available, now that a contract with WRC is now in place.

Shane mentioned that Brattleboro Development Credit Corporation (BDCC) now has a draft contract from Londonderry, for BDCC to provide grant administration and draw downs and money flow. The contract is the same format as used with WRC.

Chris said that Sue Westa will facilitate March 3rd meeting. Chris will not be here the week of March 6th so Sue will be point of contact during that week. He reiterated that Committee contact with the WRC should come through Shane as the point of contact for Londonderry.

Emily had a question about meetings. She said our scheduled meeting would be March 3, then March 14, then March 31st? Chrissy corrected the dates to be March 3rd at 9:00 AM and March 21st at 6:00 PM. Chris asked if it would be helpful for the WRC to send out an outlook calendar to invite regular participants to regular meetings. Everyone agreed it would be very helpful. Chris also said he would talk to Shane about facilitating ZOOM meetings. Heather said she could help facilitate a ZOOM meetings with whatever account would be assigned to that.

7. Pubic Invitation to Speak (5 minute limit per person)

Melissa Brown asked how, in light of Londonderry not having the best soils, receive the ARPA grant funds? Sharon said her understanding was that although soils on specific properties may not have the best soils, but collectively capacity is doable across several decentralized systems. Shane believed a large part of it appeared to be based on need and our doing a study since 2019. Chris Campany suggested it was based on progress on a study. Sharon asked if Emily could clarify. Melissa said she was not trying to be negative, but was curious as to how the whole process worked. Emily responded that she only joined the Division 6 months ago, but could speak to what she understood and knew. She said every February towns across the state submit a “priority list application” (PLA) and all projects are ranked based on failed systems, things like swimming holes in the area, and other considerations on a huge list. A priority list was submitted for both villages, which was according to Emily a good idea, because money was awarded for both villages. The grant was based on the need for communities to among many reasons, but essentially to improve water quality as the top priority, but also to help some of the Governor’s initiatives on revitalization of villages. Based on the ranking (the Intended Use Plan can be found on the website) and there were things specific to the ARPA Village Wastewater money that was allotted, which went through a process which decided how the money would be allocated and decided 10 communities would be helped. One of those communities was a water

project and nine were wastewater projects. Much was based on need for the funds for the projects and points on the priority list. She said Londonderry is not unique in the sense of soils and quite a few projects are getting ARPA money that have soils issues. Grafton is one of them, South Hero is another. She added that Chrissy has been great at looking at different ways to find solutions and the result may end up being smaller cluster systems, where there may be two systems in each village that service different ends of the villages, unlike a typical wastewater plant. These are projects that take a long time to develop and ARPA timelines put pressure on speeding up the process. S

he went on to say Londonderry is in step one of the three step process, one being planning, two being design and three being construction. After the planning is done there is an environmental review and then the design step can begin and that is where many of the questions begin to be answered.

She reiterated how important it is for certain to be known before design can take place which can answer many questions. For instance, it is hard to know where to run pipes before you know for sure where the disposal fields are going to be located. It's a long process, but needs to be a quick process because of the ARPA funding milestones that need to be met. She added once again, that this sort of funding will likely not be seen again in our lifetimes. She said that the funds are highly valuable to advance the projects even if they never get to construction under this grant. Chris Campany mentioned that prior to this grant funding, towns that wanted to do wastewater projects were looking at loans to do the work and that ultimately the decision to keep Londonderry's projects on track will have to come from the Selectboard and that it is not an easy thing to do.

Melissa reiterated how important it was to get the information about how much a 6,500 gal/day system can handle out to the community.

Heather asked how typically at this point, what does outreach look like and what are other towns doing during this discovery stage. Emily said Westford has a town website where all the information about their wastewater project are posted. She said they are at 30% design because they had land that was already allocated, when they did their town forest and set aside a portion specifically for wastewater. They also do events like potlucks where they talk about their wastewater project. She said meeting smaller groups, going to churches or fire stations are other ways to be effective. She said it is hard to get to design before we get all the planning done and that means a lot of questions cannot be answered yet.

Chris Campany said some other towns were ahead of us in their determination to want to pursue wastewater for various reasons including economic sustainability . He said we are still chasing the grant in some instances, because we still haven't resolved a consensus on needing wastewater.

Sue Westa, added that all the community engagement ideas that Emily Hackett mentioned are on the list for the WRC. There was discussion of other community efforts brought

about from the Planning Commission and the SB approved engaging the Vermont Council on Rural Development and their Community Visit program, where close to or more than 200 Londonderry residents participated to identify three priorities, housing, a community center and the village main streets, specifically the north village at first.

Jim Wilbur mentioned a quote “people support what they help create” and that perhaps a goal should be to not just inform them, but to engage them.

Remaining discussion ended at 7:48 PM

8. Adjourn:

The next regular meetings of the VWC will be **the first Friday of every month at 9:00 AM** and **the third Tuesday of every month at 6:00 PM**

Respectfully Submitted,
Larry Gubb
Secretary, Village Wastewater Committee

Approved _____.

Village Wastewater Committee
Gail Mann, Chair

* * *