

DRAFT 2

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont
Village Wastewater Committee
Meeting Minutes
Friday, March 3, 2023 – 9:00 AM
Neighborhood Connections, 5700 VT Rte. 100
Londonderry, VT**

Village Wastewater Committee (VWC) Members Present: Gail Mann (Committee Chair) Sharon Crossman, Larry Gubb, Gary Hedman (online),

Others in Attendance:

In Person: Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Sue Westa (Associate Director, Windham Regional Commission (WRC)), Chad Stoddard (Londonderry Resident)

Online: Shane O’Keefe (Town Administrator), , Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC), Paul Hendler (Londonderry Resident)

1. Call meeting to order -

Gail called called the meeting to order at 9:03 PM

2. Additions or deletions to the agenda:

Gail mentioned there is a a lot of material in the Dufresne Group 60% report or December 17, 2021 that she would like to discuss as part of public outreach. She also wished to communicate with Emily Hackett sometime regarding reclamation of disturbed areas following construction of systems and is there is any means to combine work with an allowable park construction over the wastewater system, as she would like to be able to present more information on this to the Parks Board.

3. Approval of Minutes:

Sharon Made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 21st 2023 meeting, as written, Gail seconded. All others on the Committee voted to approve.

4. WW Site Selection/Evaluation Plan Updates and Next Steps:

South Village: • Update on library property — Follow up and next steps based on recent hydrogeologist report

Shane reported that he was waiting to hear the hydrological engineering report for the second potential South Londonderry Free Library (SLFL) property site that was under investigation. He said the Library board was fine with the request for the extension of time to do the testing of the additional site. The requested and accepted extension date for a

commitment from the Town to respond with an offer to the SLFL as to purchase of the property or an easement, was March 31, 2023.

Gal mentioned outreach to homeowners in south village. Who will be contacted and what information will we have to present to them. Sharon is working to put together a list of people to contact. Gail said the Friends of the West River Trail Depot building might be a good place to gather people.

Chrissy reported in the hydrology findings of hydrology for the additional site investigated. The findings presented a system of 2,900 gal./day system, which may be increased slightly, depending on allowed modifications to the construction that might increase the capacity. In order to provide some perspective as to what a 2,900 gal. system may be able to service. Chrissy said she began looking at “priority” properties or those that appear to be in critical need of a viable system, should their current systems/arrangements fail. She cited properties that are in the floodway or the 100 year flood zone and properties that are underutilized. She identified two properties whose systems currently lie in the floodway, meaning if their current systems failed, they would not be able to replace them. Sharon asked a clarifying question about whether the two properties could still hook into a decentralized system (located out of the floodplain and floodway) if they lie in the floodway. Chrissy said they could hook into a decentralized system (out of the floodway), but they could not replace onsite any current individual or shared septic systems on those properties. These two properties would be among those identified as top priority, with regard to need. Two other properties may have a priority need for their current use or for potential additional capacity. The South Londonderry Free Library (SLFL) and the Town Office building were also included in a first look for priority need, although perhaps not as critical as some others.

For the sake of measuring the need against the potential capacity of any decentralized system, Chrissy added up the need for all the properties she mentioned inclusive of the SLFL and the Town Offices. She estimated their current capacity needs to be 1,100 to 1,200 gal./day. Chrissy said she spoke to Emily about a few additional houses on the same side of Main Street as the South Londonderry Post Office that fall into the 500 year floodplain. These properties would be able to replace their current septic systems, but they may wish to connect to a decentralized system. Other considerations were the 1st Baptist church and the Town Hall. Other properties in the center of the village were discussed and considered. A restaurant business in the south village has their own system with two levels of pretreatment.

Sharon asked what the capacity need would be, based on the properties discussed. Inclusive of the Town Hall and the 1st Baptist Church, the needed capacity would be 3,800 gal./day. Without reaching them (removing them) from a system at the Library property, the needed capacity would be 2,400 gal./day. Chrissy said that because at least two of the properties were likely to require some manner of future growth, a 2,900 gal./day system may not be able to cover all the properties mentioned. Gail wondered if a shared cluster

system at the south end of the village might work for some properties to that may not be critical currently, but may have a need in the future. Chrissy said that would be a good consideration. Gail thought it would be important to add the 1st Baptist Church and the Town Hall and Chrissy responded that another cluster system on that end of the village, in the Middletown Road/Crescent Street area would be a potential solution for those properties and others. Other properties were discussed, both in terms of need and potential system sites.

Next steps would be to set up a meeting between Dufresne Group (Chrissy) her system designer, Emily and Achouak Arfaoui who is the Indirect Discharge Technical Analyst and Regional Engineer for the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources, Department of Environmental Conservation, Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division, under the American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) Program, to review Londonderry for best potential system locations.

Gail suggested that this gets into public outreach and that the VWC should consider reaching out to private property owners now. Sharon asked if we would be talking to them about need and about what comes first with regard to property owners. Chrissy responded that it seemed like a good idea to begin to reach out to private property owners with educational materials about systems as it might indicate who would be interested in selling a piece of their property or an easement to locate a shared cluster system upon their property. She said some people will not be interested, but those who express an interest will help with planning. Gail suggested an outreach session at the Friends of the West River Trail Depot.

Gail asked if there was anymore discussion regarding the south village and the South Londonderry Free Library (SLFL) findings.

Shane reviewed the findings on the SLFL site and said the Town and the SLFL are looking for a decision based on the findings and the economics of cost per gal. of the potential system site on the property, with consideration to the cost of construction of the system versus its value in relation to the cost of the property. He mentioned the price put forth by the SLFL was in the \$190,000 range and that the Town will have to hire an appraiser to determine what above that appraisal the Town would have to pay for, that would not be covered by ARPA grant funds (ARPA funds could pay for approved appraisal price, anything above would have to be paid for by the Town). He said that Emily is still working to finalize the ARPA agreement and that once that is completed, discussion about acquisition can be made, but that moving forward with having an appraisal could be done now. Chrissy said that the per gallon cost of the system on the SLFL land is high. Shane suggested that at the same price, it may be better to purchase an easement on a property where a system with larger capacity could be constructed. Sharon asked if the SLFL might be flexible to adjusting the price for the property, based on what an appraisal comes up with. Shane said he did not know and no negotiation discussion had taken place and mentioned that any negotiation discussions would not be part of an open meeting. He further explained that

the SLFL needs funds for various projects they are undertaking. Sharon suggested the property remain an option for as long as we need to or are able to consider it. Shane said that if the Town cannot make a decision to purchase the property by the end of March, the SLFL will put the property on the market. After that time, if they do not sell it before the Town may come back to purchase it at a later date, the Town may have to pay the broker's fee for the sale.

Gail and Sharon asked about purchasing or asking for an option to purchase at a later date and that the only thing holding the property off the market to this point was "good faith". Shane responded that the SLFL board has been very patient and held the land from being put on the market, based on "good faith" and that the Town needs to decide whether to let them put on the market or some sort of option to keep it off the market beyond March 31, 2023. Shane said there was a Selectboard meeting on Monday night 2-6-23 and one on 3-20-23 and those two dates were the one's available before the already extended 3-31-23 deadline for the Selectboard to decide on what to do regarding the SLFL property, as they have ultimate authority on any decisions for acquisitions of property or easements.

Sue Westa asked if the VWC had looked at any other properties in the south village. Gail responded that other property owners were approached early on, but one in particular was not interested and others had not made any commitments to being interested or not.

Commented [1]:
removed "as"

Gail said it would be really helpful to be able to roughly describe what the physical size of a potential easement might be and possibly put some sort of price tag on it. Sue Westa suggested that it likely depends upon the site. Chrissy confirmed and added that determining price is site/property dependent, presenting the example that if someone had a four acre property and a system required one acre of the four acres, what would the value of ¼ of the total property be. Gail said that having some examples might help people determine whether they might be interested. Sharon added that incentivizing others to sign up for hooking into those systems might help increase interest, overall.

North Village: • Parks Board/Pingree Park — Selectboard recommendation regarding joint meeting • Custer-Sharp Property: Next Steps • Evaluation of alternative sites status report • Status of soils testing

Gail asked Shane to repeat the motion he suggested for the VWC regarding Pingree Park. Shane suggested that the VWC recommend a motion of recommendation that was already submitted to the Selectboard by the VWC on December 19, 2022, regarding the Custer-Sharp Town property, as model. Shane offered no position on the recommendation, but suggested that using the motion on the Custer-Sharp Town property as a model that the Selectboard (SB) had already approved, would help the SB decide a similar recommendation for Pingree Park.

Gail reiterated the directive to bring together the chairpersons of the Planning Commission, the Selectboard, the Parks Board and the VWC to pick a date for a joint discussion/meeting

of minds. Gail will send out invitations to chairpersons of all the above to meet briefly to choose and agreed to a date for the overall discussion of the various boards, committees and commissions. She hope all would agree to meet before the SB meeting on 3-6-23 to set a date for all boards, commissions, committees listed, to meet. She mentioned that she had met with Shane, Chris Campany and Sue Westa to discuss a request that the Selectboard make a decision to allow the testing (test pits) required to make final determinations as to the suitability of Pingree Park soils and potential system siting. This would also help determine more definitively, not only what the hydrology is and a more accurate definition of potential system designs.

Sharon read a motion; **"The VWC moves to request the Selectboard to authorize soil test pits at Pingree Park to determine the suitability of the soils for a wastewater disposal field at the Park. The cost of the tests shall not exceed \$4,000 to be paid from a source to be determined at a later date."** Gail seconded the motion, all VWC members approved.

Shane mentioned the importance of gathering the test pit information as quickly as possible to know definitively whether Pingree Park is even viable, based on what would then be a need to locate other potential sites (on private property, if it was not viable. He added that this is not only important to the ARPA grant property and easement acquisitions milestone timeline to be met to retain the grant, but to begin to get a fix on the cost of acquisitions of private properties or easements on private property that will reduce the amount of ARPA funds granted that could be used for system construction costs.

Gary reiterated Shane's comments regarding the interest of time, with tight milestones to reach. He thanked Chad for attending this and future meetings and commented that he thought the motion is related to time issues, not as an ultimatum regarding a decision on the Park.

Paul Hendler had a question about the test pit at Pingree Park. He asked would the test pit be done in what would be considered an active recreation part of the park, like centerfield in one of the ballfields, for example? Gail responded that they would not be. Chrissy added that the test pit locations could be coordinated to not impact the current uses. Paul Hendler mentioned that if a motion is made without stating that any disturbance of existing locations where recreation currently takes place, be repaired, it would be difficult for that motion to approved. Gail said that anything done with regard to any disturbance of the ground, needs to be repaired as part of the agreement with the State. Shane said that if the Town were paying for the test pits, the Town would have to agree to repair any disturbances to the ground made by the test pits. Larry mentioned that test pits are filled back in the same day they are dug, so they are not left open for any substantial length of time. Chrissy added that after being filled back in there is coordination by the Town with the excavator to rake out the test pit sites, add topsoil and seed or the Town would arrange to do the same in some other manner. Chrissy noted that it would not be a single test pit, but multiple test pits.

Gary asked if Chrissy had looked into systems that could utilize alternative methods that he believed were approved by the State to locate a disposal bed underneath a gravel parking area. Chrissy said she would have to investigate further and thought the State may only allow it in certain situations where there is no where else in a failed system situation. She will investigate further. Gail discussed the softball field at Pingree Park and how reclamation work on a system built under it, might help improve the field. Chrissy stated that for clarity, it should be understood that the State/ARPA funding can only be used to replace what exists and cannot be used for any additional improvements. Gail mentioned that additional funds might be found locally to help pay for improvements on top of what was replaced after a system was constructed.

Gary Hedman said he had just e-mailed the VWC the Vermont approved Drip Dispersal Design Guide.

<https://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/dwgwp/innovative/pdf/Vermont%20Percolation%20Drip%20Dispersal%20Design%20Guide%20July%202020-%20STAMPED.pdf>

Commented [2]:
add return

He explained how extremely flexible the system is with regard to a number of factors, one being its capacity for the disposal beds to be intertwined in a dynamic manner, Chrissy mentioned that Dufresne Group is already looking into these sorts of systems and that Pingree Park would be an excellent location for this type of system. She said the piping is flexible, as compared to rigid piping for more conventional systems and the area that needs to be excavated and filled with stone/sand with conventional systems. She said the drip dispersal systems piping, because it is flexible, can be installed into native soils with a “ditch witch”. Gary added that it was similar to the “soaker” irrigation systems that someone would lay down in their garden and are buried about 9 to 12 inches deep. Sharon asked if there were any installed close by. Emily Hackett said the Town of Westford is using this technology for their community wastewater disposal system. It is not constructed yet, but it will be the largest one in the state, once it is constructed and they are in the design phase, currently. Sharon asked if there were any others. She said the capacity of the Westford system is to be 24,900 gal./day. Westford purchased a property and made it a town forest. The soils were all sand, making Westford very lucky with regard to soils. Chrissy said each system has a pump station and a hydraulic unit and both are buried that control the flow to the system which automatically flushes itself every two weeks. One concern in New England is freezing because of the depth beneath grade, but the system does drain out entirely after each dose of septage, so freezing is less of a concern, if not eliminated. Chrissy showed examples of a system near Lake Champlain. There are systems being considered or designed for the Towns of Montgomery, West Burke, Wolcott and Bromley is considering this type of system for an 80,000 gal, expansion. Chrissy said there is a 160,000 gal/day system like this located in Maine, where the drip tubing was installed in 1 ½ days.

Gary asked if this type of system with its fewer costs for construction might allow the inclusion of properties further away where the cost for piping to the system would be prohibitive. Chrissy said the cost effectiveness of this type of system increased as with the

size of the system. She said they would likely not be cost effective for an individual system, but becomes a lot more effective as the system gets larger. Chrissy added that this technology is approved in the regional program, but approval is still pending for approval for indirect discharge, but slated to be approved this year, Emily concurred. Chrissy did say there was a 25,000 gal./day system of this type constructed in Vernon. Gary asked what the footprint of these systems are. Chrissy responded that they are generally the same size as a conventional system. Emily said that Westford’s system is taking up less space because its configuration did not require a replacement field and would have two fields running at the same time.

Commented [3]:
added “d”

Discussion then moved to the Custer-Sharp Town owned property. Gail asked for an update. Chrissy responded that it was on hold for the moment awaiting the archeologist review which would have to wait until there is no snow on the ground. Larry commented that the reason for waiting is that there is no pressure to purchase the property because it is Town owned. Shane added that waiting would also mean the cost of the test pits on that property would be born by the grand funds, by waiting for the archeological review to occur.

Gail asked about updates on what Gary, Sharon and Chrissy have been working on regarding reaching out to potential alternative site property owners. Gary said he is still working on the outreach letter and hopes to have that wrapped up soon. He said Chrissy had provided some conceptual footprints for properties that had been identified. He said the letters are essentially “cold call” first contacts and he wanted to be sure the language explains the process well.

5. Public Outreach and Prioritization of Deliverables

Gail presented flyers of information she thought would be good to hand out at Town Meeting setting up a table and possibly serving cider and donuts.

Sue said the website would not have the webpage up and running for the Town Meeting, 3-7-23, and the URL for the webpage would be shorter just using “Londonderry”. Sharon thought that because the webpage would not be ready, place a “coming soon” where the page address will eventually be on the WRC website. Gail asked if it might be a good idea to set up a Facebook page in the short term. Gary added that a Facebook page might be a good place to provide some information until the WRC webpage is up and running and to direct people to it, once it is up and running, but that a Facebook page should not be set up as a forum. He wondered how it would be monitored. All agreed that it was a good idea to provide information and public meeting announcements, but to not allow comments.

Commented [4]:
up

Commented [5]:
instead of “provide exchanges.”

Sharon mentioned a means for people to provide their feedback to be heard, without interaction, that was set up for the Main Street Master Plan Study. A link to the feedback form should still be available on the Planning Commission page on the Town website.

Commented [6]:
edit

Shane cautioned that as soon as comments and interaction are allowed on a public webpage, it legally becomes a “limited public forum” and any comments presented cannot be removed.

Sue Westa suggested items to be included on the on the webpage design. She mentioned that the information is very basic with key information about the project. Sue and Gail said that more can be added to it as more information comes in

Sharon asked about a reference to affordable housing in village centers. Sue pointed out references to these on the webpage design.

Chrissy wanted to note that the 10% match is up to a limit because Londonderry maxed out on the funds granted, saying the ARPA funds grant was 90% grant, up to the cap. The villages received approximately \$3.985 million per village. The grant application sought \$5 million per village. Emily recommended leaving out the dollar amount and possibly the percentage, if not say that “at least a 10% match”.

There was discussion about including the Main Street Master Plan as a basis for a need for wastewater. Sharon suggested that it is the same message as the that of the Commissioner of the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) that without attention to and addressing wastewater issues, many villages in Vermont will have trouble remaining viable and should remain included in the public outreach piece. She commented that what had been put together was well done and thanked those who worked on it. In order to have the piece ready for printing and Town Meeting Day, Sue would need any suggested changes by the end of today.

Gail presented a several page handout of information on wastewater systems that referred to work being done in Washington State and information that Dufresne Group had provided in the very first presentation and in the 60% report. She included photos of the Warren, VT school athletic fields during construction and after construction of their systems.

Maps would show potential service area. Gail discussed how to put out information based on the 60% report and put out small portions of the report at a time with reference to the full report. Sharon said she wanted to allow some means for people to comment on information they are reading. The recommendation in the discussion was to ask people to come to meetings to comment and discuss. Sharon thought knowing people’s comments and questions ahead of time, would allow us to respond better at the meetings.

The report will have to be edited as changes have occurred and more will have to be made as more information is gathered on proposed and existing sites. Sue and Gail will work on a means to handle people’s comments and questions. More work is need for a FAQ page.

Sue said Chris had put together some notes on a plan to reach out to other groups, boards, committees and commissions in Londonderry. Engage the Planning Commission, the

Commented [7]:
removed “return”

housing group, the Conservation Commission. Gary said he is glad to communicate with the Conservation Commission to attend VWC meetings for discussion. Shane said that members of “public bodies” can attend regular meetings of other “public bodies” without warning them as long as they make no decisions during those meetings. Sue discussed scheduling and how to present, inclusive of ZOOM or some similar manner. She will work with various groups to arrange.

Commented [8]:
deleted sentence —

The next step would be a larger community presentation and getting Julie Beth Hinds involved based her expertise and background. The proposal would be to try to get her to present sometime in April. School spring vacation was discussed to try to plan around. Chrissy said she had April 17 through the 21st shown as the scheduled vacation week.

Next was providing information on clarifying how the wastewater project advances the goals and objectives of the Town Plan. Sue thought this could be shared in a presentation and/or another flyer of information. Another item was the VWC hosting meetings with property owners around the villages with help from Julie Beth, Chrissy or Emily may be able to help to answer specific questions. These meetings could be done in May and June. Chrissy suggested May would be better than June because school is still in session. June 9th, is the end of school.

Next was discussion of how to relate this project to other concerns in town.

Larry mentioned outreach to churches and fire departments in town. He has reached out to both fire departments and heard from one. Still need to coordinate and where to hold meetings.

Sue mentioned getting organizations like the Windham and Windsor Housing Trust. Larry mentioned that his wife, Cindy is a member of the W&W Housing Trust board and will ask her about them addressing the issues and how wastewater is important. Chrissy cautioned that affordable housing would need a fair amount of capacity, that we may not find available, at least at first. For affordable housing projects to be cost effective, the need roughly 20 units which requires 4,900 gal./day. Larry mentioned the Eisenhower property potential. The potential system is estimated to be 5,500 gal./day with excess of what their own planned capacity needs might be, being available to the Town. Sharon suggested asking if Patty Eisenhaur would allow us to engage her to present what her plans are for their property as a potential incentive for other property owners to do something similar. Gail will contact Patty and see if she might present something in May.

Sue also mentioned having the Brattleboro Development Credit Corporation (BDCC) come to discuss how wastewater is important to any sort of redevelopment of towns and for simply keeping existing businesses running.

Sue said she will put the overall plan suggested into some sort of schedule for so it is easier for all to look at and said that it can be revised as needed, as well.

Sue said she was thinking a link on the WRC main page which was formerly used for broadband information could be replaced with the link to the Londonderry wastewater project and discussed what sorts of things would go on the webpage, She estimated that all could be up and running in the next couple of weeks and providing links to the page in as many places as possible. Larry mentioned a reverse link to WRC's website so not only would there be a link from the WRC website to Londonderry's Town website, but one on Londonderry's website to WRC's website.

Sharon asked if there might be any reason to also include the state discussion of compacting more housing into village centers? Sue said that it may be good to wait on any specifics, since it is not fully completed, but perhaps general discussion of the concept could be included.

Gail brought up discussion of comparison of annual costs for users from other towns and referred to an early presentation that either Lynnette Claudon or Emily had done. Sue said it is information that can be added and included. Gail said she thought it was important and brought up discussion of limitations based on household income. Emily and Chrissy said the limits were recommendations for project affordability criteria, not applied limitations. Chrissy said we are getting closer to knowing costs for certain systems, but without knowing where the systems go, what their designs are, costs are hard to provide. Chrissy said the known sites to have potential viability in the north village can begin to shape the costs as more information comes in about them. The south village will be more difficult. With properties such as the Eisenhour property, there are still steps that need to take place which include an archeological review on any potential site property, which cannot take place until snow is off the ground, if the ARPA grant is to pay for those reviews and the test pits. Shane said the Town has been very fortunate thus far to have donations of equipment and time to do test pits on other properties so that the gathering of information from test pits could move forward without waiting for the snow to melt for the archeological reviews. Without a continuation of that we have to wait for what can be funded by grant funds. Shane said no invoices have been received from the Dufresne Group for their work on test pits that were dug with donations of equipment and time. He hoped their costs were not large amounts, but there still is a cost to the town. The thought is that it may be best to wait for when the grant can pay for test pits still needed on the Eisenhour property and any other potential property sites.

6. New Business and Considerations

Gary asked if the Town Office parcel had been evaluated for a potential system site. Chrissy responded that the Town Office parcel has a wetland on. Shane added that the wetland was mapped at the time of drainage work for the Town Office building a number of years ago.

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

Gail asked if there were any guests who wished to speak. Paul Hendler asked about who would be paying for these systems suggesting there is a perception that only users would be paying for the system.

Chrissy responded with a need to establish how the systems would be paid for versus ongoing user fees. Is everyone in the town going to pay for the capital costs or just the users? These are questions that need to be answered by the Town.

Paul Hendler was concerned that if we did not have this information before public meetings, it would difficult to find support for it. Chrissy responded that this is a typical dilemma as everyone wants to know what it is going to cost, when in many cases, the system locations and designs are not fully known making the ability to determine costs with any accuracy, very difficult. It is understandable that we all want to know that, but before all the steps are take to know locations and designs and numbers of users who might be hooked in, costs cannot be fully known and there is a risk to trying to present them with any sort of accuracy. Emily added with some examples of how the costs vary based on variations of different factors and she reiterated Chrissy's comments regarding how difficult it is in the planning stage to know and provide the numbers that everyone wants to know.

Shane asked about the relationship between the MHI (Medium Household Income) and user rates. Emily reiterated that there is a desire to see project user fees fall into an affordability range or 1% to 2% of MHI affordability. Shane asked if there is a relationship that Londonderry needs to be mindful of. Emily did say that the grants like to see an affordable project. Shane asked what happens if the project does not fall into that affordability range. Is the project ended? Emily said that she did not know, but that it has to do with the ability of the community to pay back any loans, which is critical to the ongoing success of an projects. Gail said the 1%-2% range for Londonderry, based on MHI would be \$575 to \$1,150. Gail asked if there are any examples of towns we might be able to use as models or comparisons. Emily said each town was different in how they funded projects between the entire town and users, so those details would have to be looked at. She also said that most towns did not have ARPA funds to fund any part of their projects. Emily believed that the user fees in Warren, VT were about \$1,000/year. Gail said she had a figure of \$1,180 and said she could call Warren to ask.

Chrissy cited a proposed example of the West Burke project which cost \$10.5 million. The project includes a 25,000 gal./day system, two 6,500 gal./day systems, plus collection and a drinking water system, because of impacts of the largest system on nearby wells. They received \$3.9 million in ARPA grant funding; \$6.6 million is the remaining cost that West Burke will need to cover. The Town is looking at additional co-funding from different sources to reduce the user fees and evaluate whether capital costs could be charged through an assessment fee to further reduce the user fees. It's important to note that this project includes a drinking water system in addition to wastewater.

Commented [9]:
Correct amount

Discussion continued around the cost of pumping a system when needed (more in an emergency and off regular hours), plus the cost of replacement (broken down to an annual cost), assuming one could even do so, based on available land for a replacement system. Gail suggested that there is a whole town interest in contributing to the viability of the village centers where businesses and residences are located. Chrissy said an initial hookup fee could also support the costs. Shane commented that if the Town does not take advantage of the grant funds to help pay for this and finds in future years there is an emergency need to do something, there will be no ARPA funds to help cover the costs. Gail mentioned that there were people interested in doing some things on Main Street, but only if there is some community wastewater they could hook into. She pointed out how fewer businesses currently exist on Main Street.

8. Adjourn:

Gail adjourned the meeting at 11:05 AM

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

* * *