

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont
Village Wastewater Committee
Special Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, August 8, 2023 – 3:30 PM
Neighborhood Connections, 5700 VT Rte. 100
Londonderry, VT**

Village Wastewater Committee (VWC) Members Present: Sharon Crossman, Larry Gubb, Tom Metcalfe. **Online:** Gary Hedman

Others in Attendance:

In Person:, Susan Westa (Windham Regional Commission)

Online: Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC), Gail Mann (Londonderry Resident, former Chair, Village Wastewater Committee)

1. Call meeting to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 PM

2. Additions or deletions to the agenda:

Sue Westa requested discussion about the planned September 19th meeting/forum. It was agreed to add this at the end of the meeting.

3. ARPA Funding for Londonderry VWW project- Emily Hackett

- **Update and discussion re: implications of 7/10/ 2023 flood event and recovery.**
- **Status of Londonderry ARPA Grant milestones and schedule.**

Emily did not have a lot to report, saying the grant writer is working on the grant for Londonderry, but towns that are more advanced in their work are getting worked on before Londonderry. She mentioned some concern in her DEC group about towns like Londonderry that have more than one village and the difficulty in getting all the work done that needs to be done for more than one village. She said it is a conversation that needs to happen with more depth and hearing more about it. She mentioned that it is also important to know what impact the recent flooding had on both villages in Londonderry related to leach fields and septic systems and what might be potential delays as a result.

Sharon responded that there was no information she yet knew of that had compiled how the flooding impacted existing systems or potential sites for community wastewater. Larry mentioned that he thought many of those impacted were the same as those impacted by the flooding during Irene, in both the north and the south villages. Tom Metcalfe said he believed that any potential sites for community wastewater were not impacted or should

not be in locations that would be impacted. Repetition of the same places hit during Irene would be the biggest known impacts. Some businesses hit are still cleaning out the damage and preparing to rebuild. Gary said he was not aware of any existing septic systems that were impacted, saying he believed the shopping center was shut down for a period until its septic system could be inspected. Sharon said she has not yet heard of any impacts. Gary said that discovery of some impacts may not have yet occurred. Gary mentioned that the bridges were looked at for the impact of flooding upon them.

Emily said it is important to that Chrissy document all known impacts for the PER (Preliminary Engineering Reports) as there appear to be more and more storms similar to the one that caused the most recent major flooding. It is important to capture any information on failed systems as a result of these storms. Sharon said as of the day before this meeting, the Zoning Administrator was still asking about any reported damages and said they are still compiling information on the impacts. Emily mentioned that the fire station in the south village was impacted in previous storms and wondered if there was any damage there. Sharon mentioned the home next to the fire station and whether that was impacted. Tom mentioned the South Londonderry Post Office. Emily mentioned that any lost systems that are in the floodway, would not get a permit to rebuild. Chrissy said from what she could tell, from aerial photos, the flooding seemed very close to the 100 year flooding of the past. No aerial photos of the south village, but photos taken presented some idea of where the flooding came to.

Sharon said she thought some things are settling down a bit from the worst. Emily said she heard that Londonderry, Weston and Ludlow were among the hardest hit. Sharon said Londonderry and Weston have worked very closely together to begin putting some things back in order.

Sue Westa asked Emily about her mention of concern about getting the work done for two villages and asked if there was consideration to drop one of the villages. Emily said there was a lot of discussion about timelines and meeting timelines and how other villages dealing with more than one village are focusing more on one village than the other. The deadline for design, which is more important than easements is next September and wants to make sure that schedule is kept to. She wanted everyone to be aware that trying to get two villages done in that period of time may take away from being able to complete both projects saying that it is a year from now and we have not yet reached 60% PER. She said the Town may want to discuss this and wanted to be as transparent about the discussions going on in her group.

- 4. VWW Status Report - Chrissy Haskins, Dufresne Group**
 - Evaluation of all alternative VWW sites – North & South Villages
 - Next Steps

Chrissy said they did get to move forward with archeological for all the known potential sites, which was done last week. Chris Ponessi marked all the test pits and shovel testing was done on all of them. The results are not in yet. She explained that the results of the shovel testing is sent off to the Division of Historic Preservation (DHP) and they then provide a concurrence on plans to move forward. Once the DHP reports back, it is known which test pits can then be done (or not done). She said typically it was taking about 3 business days to hear back. She hoped to hear from them in the next few days and was going to check in with them to see where things stood. One property had standing water on it when Chris went to stake out where the test pits would go. There was some concern about that, but decided to proceed with test pits to the point there was further concern about completing all the test pits. If one or two were not looking good during that process, it was decided to not dig more. All other sites were checked out and looked good. That meant a total of four sites reviewed, one in the north village, three in the south village. Once there is an all clear from DPH for test pits, Hunter is ready to move in to do them.

Test pits would also include the Custer-Sharp Town property test pits, making a total of five properties total. Gary asked if the Conservation Commission could be given some advanced notice ahead of the test pit digging at the Custer-Sharp Town property. Chrissy said she should be able to give a few days up to a week's notice. Gary said he would let the CC know that it was up and coming. Chrissy said she believed the test pits would likely be down late in the next week or the following week. Emily asked Chrissy if she would make sure Achouak Arfaoui is available to look at test pits when they are being done. Chrissy said she has already been in contact.

Tom Metcalfe had a question for Chrissy regarding scheduling and getting designs done to meet the timeline schedules and what concern there is about meeting the timeline for designs needing to be done in the next year. Emily said the plans need to be done and have a final design letter and be ready to go out to bid. Emily would be the one to do the approval and final design letter. Steps still needed since we are still in Step One, still in the PER phase, would include a 60% report, 60% public meeting to discuss alternatives, alternatives need to be selected, then project engineers would need to finish out to 90% PER. Then there would be another meeting and comments from the DEC on both 60% & 90% and then up to the final PER. After the final PER comes environmental review, then Step Two which is design, still 30%-60%-90%-100%. That would still include permitting process with regard to Regional Program or Indirect Discharge Program. Chrissy asked Emily about the 100% for next September and if it ended up the project was in the Indirect Discharge Program would all have to be fully permitted by that date. Emily did not have a full answer, but thought it may not have to be fully permitted, but be able to be permitted. She thought that if all the steps were made to make a system approvable under the Indirect Discharge Group, it may not have to have a permit at that point.

Tom asked what the turnaround was at the state level after plans have been submitted. Is there a mandated 30 or 60 days to respond to a design? Emily responded that it 45 days depending upon what may be coming in for review at the same time, She said she has most

of the ARPA projects in various stages, but ARPA projects have priority for review when they come in. They would also have to be reviewed by Achouak Arfaoui as well. Chrissy asked if Indirect Discharge has a longer turnaround than 45 days. Emily said that Achouak is generally a little faster. She added that the wild card in the process is if we need to bond for the project(s) the Bond Process has to happen and the environmental review will then have a 30 day comment period, but that can take place at the same time as 30% design. A facility plan out of Step One cannot be issued until the environmental review is done. The process involves some variables as to how things can be done, in consideration of things that can be done at the same time and things that cannot be moved forward until certain parts of the process are completed.

Tom asked if there was a CPM (Critical Path Method) which would tell us where we need to be when, in order to meet the deadlines. Chrissy said there is no CPM and the current contract only runs through PER (Preliminary Engineering Reports). Towards the end of the PER process a planning loan application would have to be made for final design. Funding for design would come through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. When closer to the end of the PER process, there will be a much better idea of how what the scheduling will look like. The current unknowns about site selection are what is making it hard to nail down how scheduling is looking going forward.

Sharon had a question about schedule for timing. Chrissy and Emily said that there was a list of deadlines. Chrissy sent it to everyone on the Committee again. Tom asked if it had all the approvals, etc. Chrissy reviewed all the dates of the milestones and what they include. It's a high level schedule. Tom mentioned that he thought permitting may be the biggest concern. Chrissy said permitting is becoming slower, even with ARPA projects getting priority. If any potential site needs an ACT 250 permit, it may take longer. Sharon asked how Chrissy felt about being able to complete the process, based on where we are. Chrissy said the test pit results will be a big help in moving forward with preliminary design and finishing up the PER. Then the final design process could move forward. If permitting reviews were 45 days or less, she said that would be reasonable. She also believed that none of the parcels being looked at would fall under Act 250 review. Emily said that would not be known until the Project Review Sheet had been done so the project is defined. She said the Project Review Sheet is required and based on acreage. If the project is less than 9 acres, it would not have to go through the Act 250 process. Chrissy clarified that she thought none currently would fall under Act 250 jurisdiction, but newly formed properties from a purchase, may end up triggering an Act 250 review. Emily said additional permits may be needed for things like crossing a river, but with ARPA prioritizing, these will be a part of that. She said that there are a lot of ARPA projects that will be coming in.

Sharon asked if there were any other questions.

Sue Westa brought up the community engagement/public meeting on September 19th. She asked if the meeting should go forward in consideration of concern about both village projects. Emily asked Chrissy about when the 60% PER might be done because a public

meeting needs to be done for that as well. At that point the Committee would make a recommendation to the Selectboard about moving forward. Emily wondered if the two meetings might be combined to still happen on the 19th to help move things along faster. Chrissy responded that test pits would likely be done by the 25th of August. She said her hydrologist is taking about 2 weeks to turnaround test pit results which would his results at about September 8th, leaving only about a week to do a 60% PER which Chrissy thought would be very tight. Doable, but very tight and Emily added, that would be if everything aligned perfectly. Emily mentioned that Grafton is doing an informational meeting and then a 60% meeting a month late, suggesting we may want to do the same, since our momentum has slowed a bit and in order to keep things moving. Chrissy added that she would check to see if there might be a possibility to move up doing the test pits to try to complete by the 18th of this month. Emily said that Chrissy may want to check with Scott Dillion the State survey archeologist to see if everything needs to be routed through Emily's group. Chrissy will check. Tom asked if reports or scope can be done concurrently. Emily said all SRF (State Revolving Fund) projects technically have through the state engineer, then is submitted to the Division of Historic Preservation archeologists. She wants to make sure there is no hold up in the process as there seems to be some confusion at times.

Emily repeated who she is to Tom Metcalfe. She is in charge of the ARPA Village Wastewater Program as well as a design engineer for the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund (CWSRF) and she is in charge of both Londonderry village wastewater projects for both ARPA and CWSRF.

Sue Westa wanted to try to discuss the community engagement more and Sharon added that there was discussion of possibly doing two, including the 60% PER, required environmental review, public meeting.

Sue threw out the possibility of doing the second meeting in October and asked Chrissy and Emily were ready to present something on September 19th. Sue said she could get all to discuss this more in next few weeks with Emily and Chrissy and Juli Beth Hinds, to make a plan. Sue said the word should get out about the meeting and Sharon suggested that a lot could be built on what we already have used for prior engagement. Sue thought the information should go out by the end of August and be posted on the website, posters around town and sharing by e-mail etc. Post on town's website and an article in the Chester Telegraph. The place is planned for Flood Brook School, which has been reserved for that date. The time discussed was 6:00 PM. The second meeting would be based on Chrissy's report a month later, which could be announced at the meeting on September 19th. Tom asked about whether there would be power point presentations and coordinating them among all the presenters so there was no overlap. Sue said that would be discussed in their call to coordinate.

Sharon asked if there was anything else regarding the upcoming meetings. No one had anything additional.

5. Well/drinking water testing – Consider and select date to restart

Chrissy said that there were 9 kits at the town offices that have expired bacteria sample bottles. The State said they would replace the bottles if we sent back the entire kits by getting them to one of the courier locations and they will send new ones. She also mentioned that there were several bacteria samples that sat too long, that could not be tested, so she is working with the State to get new bottles to retest those properties. Sharon said she had been taking the samples dropped off to the Town Offices by Rich Phelan to the Springfield courier site and said she could return the nine kits. Chrissy will let them know they were coming and suggested labeling the kits that they are expired and from Londonderry. Tom said he could take the kits to Springfield as he had to be over that way on Thursday. As soon as the State receives these expired kits, they will send new ones. Courier time pick-up is at 100 Mineral Street, Suite 104.

Sharon asked if there was anything else. Larry mentioned the Selectboard meeting the night before discussed a letter from a member of the Doane family whose father had donated the property regarding concern for use of Pingree Park for community wastewater. Sharon explained the situation to Emily and Chrissy.

Sharon asked if there was anything else.

Chrissy said there is one more site in the south village that may be considered depending upon how the Prouty Property works out. May need more sites in the north village. One other potential in north village still needs permission to walk the property to check out preliminary suitability. Sharon will contact the owners. Keep looking for potential sites.

Scheduling the next meeting, to be September 1, 2023 at 9:00 AM.

6. Adjourn:

Tom made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Larry seconded, motion approved
All approved to adjourn and the meeting was adjourned at 4:37 PM

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
Sharon Crossman, Interim Chair

* * *