

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont
Village Wastewater Committee
Special Meeting Minutes
Friday, September 19, 2023 – 6:00 PM
Neighborhood Connections, 5700 VT Rte. 100
Londonderry, VT**

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

Others in Attendance:

Online: Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC), Susan Westa (Windham Regional Commission)

1. Call meeting to order

The meeting was called to order at 6:08 PM

2. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda:

Gary suggested adding Chad's video records request to the agenda

3. Approve Minutes of 9/1/23 meeting

Tom Metcalfe said minutes of 8/22/23 and 9/1/23 look good. Gary made a motion to approve both. Sharon seconded. Minutes from both meetings were approved

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

Chrissy spoke of test pits that were completed. Test pits from the Prouty Land showed soils to not be as good as desired, but still showed some promise. Estimates from test pits result suggest an indirect discharge at 10,000 – 15,000 Gallons Per Day (GPD) capacity. Next step for that location is to put together a concept layout and sending to hydrogeologist for review. Site presented loamy sand and groundwater at about 60 inches. This means the potential for a shallow mound system to an at-grade or a mound system depending upon what the analysis looks like. A private site done in the south village (site #2) was as expected. A mound system at approximately 3,000 GPD capacity is estimated for that site.

Private site #6 in the north village was not as good as expected. When staking out the test pits, there was a lot of water in the area, but it was following a lot of rain. Predictions for that site present a mound system in the regional program, with a 4,000 – 6,000 GPD capacity.

Chrissy had not had a chance to talk to her test pit engineer to know if the Custer-Sharp property had been done yet. Chrissy said it took an entire day to access the test pit area for site #6, causing the test pit crew to run out of time do the Custer-Sharp Town property in the same day. It will have to be rescheduled with Hunter Excavating. The estimation for the Custer-Sharp Town property is a mound system in the regional program of 3,000 GPD or possibly less. She added that getting to site #6 with piping is going to be challenging and expensive.

Tom Metcalfe asked about prior mention of directional drilling. Chrissy said the area contains a lot of boulders, so without a driller coming to look at it, it is hard to determine if it is feasible or not to do directional drilling. Chrissy added that there is also quite an elevation gain between drilling, then rising from the depth under the river to the site. Tom M. asked if the same held true for the Custer-Sharp Town property and Chrissy suggested the piping there could follow the road, crossing the bridge, mounting pipe to the downstream side of the bridge to minimize damage in flooding. The same could apply to site #6, but following the road would be a longer distance.

Tom asked if the Custer Sharp Town property was the only option for the north village. Chrissy said Sharon got approval to look at another private property site in the north village (site #8). The property owners wished to be alerted of when someone would be coming to look at their site. Chrissy needed to find out when her engineer Chris, is available to take a look at the site.

Tom M. mentioned that it would be great to be able to do site #8 at the same time the Custer-Sharp Town property is done, if that is possible, mentioning that this is all critical information to allow Chrissy to complete the PRE (Preliminary Engineering Report)

Gary asked if there were any other potential sites that need clarification. Chrissy said the only other site was #10 in the south village which was very wet when the engineers went to layout test pit sites so they went no further at that time. The archeological review has been cleared, but test pits have not been done. She said it may likely end up showing less capacity because of the water on the site, but said it still could be tested. She said the property owners are okay with doing the test pits. She added that the first time the site wss visited, the site looked very good, the second time, it looked wet.

Tom M. reviewed the potential sites that have been tested for the south village and mentioned that each was around a mile from the village. Potential site #10 would be about a half mile from the center of the south village. Tom said this is half the distance meaning less piping and drilling. He asked about the elevation change for #10. Chrissy responded that the elevation change would mean bigger pumps and crossing the bridge would not be difficult, but permission would have to be gotten from VTrans (Vermont Agency of Transportation) to place the pipe on the bridge. She also mentioned that placing pipes on a bridge means susceptibility to the bridge replacement schedule for VTrans. If a pipe were

to be placed in 2025 for example and the bridge was replaced in 2028 (also for example), the pipe would only be 3 years old, but would have to be replaced at the time of the bridge replacement. Chrissy will check to see what the schedules are for the bridge replacements in both villages.

Tom said that the Custer-Sharp property needs to have test pits done, since it is all set to go, the other would be site #8. Gail asked if any test pitting has taken place on a site on or close to Parson's Lane and a site in the north village on or close to Hell's Peak Road. She said she does not have the chart the Committee has coordinating numbers with sites. #8 is one of the Hell's Peak Road site, the other was #1 and has been stricken from the list as it has wetland issues. Gary said #8 will be looked at. Tom M. said potential site #5 looked to be the property closest to the south village and believed the owners were looking for more information before granting permission to do test pits. Chrissy said they wanted a fact sheet and Sue was working on providing one. Sue will send final version of the fact sheet to Chrissy and she will pass it on to the owners of property #5. Gail said the person who would be contact for property #5 will be gone for several weeks and said she may be able to be contacted before leaving.

Gail mentioned another potential site property on the list, saying there has been no communication back from them. Gail said that she had previously stop by the property to speak with the owners and said the owners of a portion of the property, she was uncertain as to how much, was owned by a family named Leopold, suggesting that Chrissy may be able to find how large their parcel is. Gail said the woman she spoke to was very supportive of the wastewater project and was very opened to knowing more and wondered how they might help, having moved there about two years ago. She said it is part of the larger parcel and was unclear of how much might be close to the south village. Gail said the original mailing sent likely never got to whom it was addressed as that person is no longer in the area. It is unknown where the packet of information was sent, although Sharon said she would still have the returned packet and the property is still in that person's name. Gail said it would be good to establish what is going on with that property, what the recent residents own or lease and what has transpired to be able to see what possibilities might exist, as far as how close a portion of the property comes to the south village.

Tom M. went through the discussion list to see if all potential property sites had been discussed. He mentioned site/property #4 with uncertainty about that specific property. He was unsure of the status of site #7. Chrissy said that the owner of the property was interested in using their site for a system, but would use the system on that property to develop an affordable housing project, meaning there would be no capacity free for other properties. Tom said #9 was eliminated and #10 still has potential questioning whether further testing should be done. Chrissy said #10 has the potential for larger capacity. The question was whether further testing should be done. Chrissy said it is all set to go for test pits, with archeological okay and owners okay. Tom asked if both Custer-Sharp and #10 can be done in the same day. Tom wondered whether we should still consider #7. Chrissy asked Emily to weigh in on whether development for a specific use was a good use of time

and funds at this time. Emily suggested that it would be better to look at other sites first before coming back to this one as the goal is to find capacity for needs in the designated village center now as well as future potential.

Tom spoke of another potential site, #13 off of Landgrove Road. Sharon believed that was a new property as of the last VWC meeting. Chrissy recalled that the property was being looked at during the last meeting and there are two pieces of the property, separated by the road. It also appeared to have some wet areas on it and because of what looks to be a stream, it may not present a promising site. Sharon said the VWC has not had any direct contact with the owners as of this meeting. Chrissy suggested because of numerous factors, the site may not be even good as a potential site. Tom M. recommended that Chrissy's site engineer review the site to confirm whether it may or may not be viable.

Tom asked if there were any other properties and owners that are not on the list that the VWC may have been in contact with or have contacted the VWC. Sharon mentioned a return reply from a property owner on the west side of Middletown Road, close to another potential property/site. It would be a potential property/site for south village capacity. Sharon asked if the VWC would like to consider more contact with the owners to gauge their further interest and send them the next level of information. Chrissy said she would take a look at the location for potential. Tom M. added the location as #14 saying Sharon and Chrissy will follow up.

Tom M. asked whether Chrissy could move forward on the PER (Preliminary Engineering Report). Chrissy said that all the sites that have been test pitted moved forward with hydrogeologist and preliminary engineering to use for the PER. Tom and Sharon asked if there was anything else we need to discuss, with regard to "next steps".

5. Well/drinking water testing – Timing of restart in consideration of flood.

Chrissy said she believed the test kits for water testing have come in, Sharon confirmed that they had. Chrissy was going to stop by to take a look at the kits. She mentioned that three new bacteria tests were supposed to be sent to replace those that took too long to get to the lab, in the last batch.

Sharon asked how to complete the water testing. Chrissy said she has the list of people who still need testing and would proceed with that, but would like to concentrate more specifically on the more developed village areas. Sharon asked if a new introduction letter was needed. Chrissy said if phone numbers of people on the list were available it would help move things forward. Larry asked if phone numbers were asked for and provided on the original list. Sharon said some people provided numbers. She said Rich Phelan is ready to go with this process. Sharon asked if there were new property owners. Chrissy said there were only 43 people total who requested water testing. Some of those have already been tested and 5 requests were from commercial properties that cannot be tested under

this state program. 11 tests have already been completed. Three of those tests have not have the bacteria portion of the testing done.

Gary asked about requirements for testing commercial enterprises in either of the villages. Chrissy responded that testing requirements are only for public water supplies and said that begins if a commercial enterprise serves 25 people a day for more than 60 days a year. She said that because most businesses are open 60 or more days a year and are likely to see 25 customers in a day, they would likely fit into requirements for testing. Gary asked if water testing information for businesses were available through FOIA (Freedom of Information Act). Chrissy responded that they are available through the state website without FOIA, online. Gary asked if Chrissy has looked to see what information is available for Londonderry. She said that she believed she had located all the information for public water systems in Londonderry. She said not all wells are permitted that probably should be permitted in part because of State staffing. She said for the ones that have been permitted, she has them listed and can look up their data.

Gary suggested that public water systems would probably be tested for the same things private systems would be. Chrissy said that they may not be tested for as much as those using the water on a transient basis would not be like residents who are using the same water on a daily basis. She said the testing would look for nitrates and bacteria. For some testing the bacteria testing would be on a quarterly basis and nitrates on an annual basis. Non-transient community systems like an office or a school, where people use the same water every day, additional testing for more chemicals, minerals, etc. is needed. Transient non-community systems like stores, restaurants and lodging have fairly minimal testing requirements. Most commercial systems in Londonderry are going to be Transient non-community systems

6. VWW Public Presentation – Sue Westa, WRC

Sue said not much has happened since the last meeting since the speakers are planning to meet on October 5, 2023. She said Sharon had looked into the location for the October 17th meeting and found that the cafeteria at the Flood Brook School was available, as the gym floor at the school was going to be replaced and would be under construction. The capacity of the cafeteria is a little over 100 and Sharon has filled out the form required by the school to schedule the space, saying the filled out form is in the schools hands. Sue said the only thing that would need to be investigated would be the school's AV (audio visual) equipment, if they have any and if anything needed to be brought to the school by WRC, the Town or others, for the presentation. Need to know if everything can be plugged in, all equipment is working and audio can be heard and visuals seen by attendees. Sharon asked those questions of the school as a part of filling out the form they require and answers to the questions should be known this week.

Sue said she will finalize the flyer for the meeting is all are good with the meeting date. Sue looked into QR codes to generate for the flyers and found a limited version she thought would be good to add to the flyers. Gary asked about where the QR codes would direct

people and if it would push to the WRC website. Sue said, yes, it would only direct people to the website where they could then find information about the event. She said she was not going to be taking RSVP's which everyone agreed would be unnecessary. Sharon said she announced the meeting in the last Selectboard meeting which was taped. She said the Town Moderator was uncertain if he may be available for that date, but that we should know soon. Gail asked if the Committee would like to repost the informational pages on wastewater to the Facebook page along with the flyer about the event. Sharon agreed that the informational pages were good and useful and that it would be helpful to run them again. **The time for the October 17th event is agreed to be 6:00 PM.**

Emily asked if there will be a virtual option for the meeting. Sue said she will plan to bring equipment for a virtual option, but was unsure of how it may work with a lot of people in attendance.

Other publicity would include newspapers, the Chester Telegraph and the Vermont Journal (the Town's paper). Gail will coordinate with Sue with regard to who to contact and Sue will put together an announcement article for the papers. Gail will post the flyer for the event on the Facebook Londonderry Community Forum as an announcement from the Facebook, Village Wastewater Project page. Sue said to let people know about it also, through word of mouth and Sharin said we can post at the Post Offices as well.

7. Other Business

Sharon asked Emily what her thoughts were about where the VWC stood in terms of where we should be. Emily said it was exciting to hear about the various potential sites and system capacities and especially the larger indirect discharge system on Town property. She suggested that the committee keep plugging away, recognizing the goal is to get as far along as possible in the process, if it does not mean going to construction, ultimately. She said river crossings are very expensive and the preference us toward directional drilling vs. a pipe on a bridge. She said going through cobble can be very difficult with directional driving, but it remains preferable and just keep progressing in our work and keep educating the public. She said it was good to hear about the test pit information. She said establishing where all the alternatives are for potential sites is very huge step and important and critical to the PER and the 60% environmental review with presentation to the public and the overall process.

Tom had a question about the process and that our October 17th event being the lead in to a November 60% public meeting. Emily said she thought we were a little behind on that schedule and said it is not anyone's fault, but the nature of these sorts of projects. She suggested we look at how Westford, VT is doing their informational meetings leading up to a big public meeting, using important touch points. They are getting ready to do their bond vote and have had two really good public information meetings, leading up to the bond vote informational meeting. Look at what other towns have done. She felt there was more support for the south village and said that at some point, we may have to choose to focus

on one village over the other, saying the south village may have better prospects, but get the north village to the point land purchases have been made. She said it is hard to see currently how everything is going to pull together and that more should be known in a couple of months, allowing for a better vision of how to move forward.

Chad Stoddard's request. Gary said there was a request from Chad Stoddard to provide the video recordings of the meetings. Larry responded that he gets the link to the video recordings from Neighborhood Connections (NC) a day or two after the meeting (apparently they are not accessible by NC immediately after the meeting) and a copy is sent to Sharon, but there has been no word he has seen from the Town as to who to send the links to the meetings to. The meetings had been recorded as a means to view and review some of the technical information spoken about in the meetings that are difficult to capture in written notes taken at the meetings. There was no contact initially from the Town about what to do with the recordings and as Secretary, he did not keep them after making use of them for the minutes. There still seems to be confusion as to who the minutes are to be sent to at the Town Offices, where they are kept and who is in charge of receiving and maintain them. He suggested that this is something that should be clarified and needs to be clarified and all parties involved should be notified of this process and be good with it. Larry will try to locate links sent from Neighborhood Connections and send them to the Town Offices. Sharon will try to sort out with Town Officials.

Chrissy wanted to add an announcement about a free RCAP class for town officials, about management of municipal wastewater systems 6:00 to 8:00 PM on September 20, 2023 (the following evening) Chrissy will send information to all VWC members.

8. Next VWC Meeting

Next meeting would be scheduled for the third First Friday of the month which would be October 6 , 2023, in the evening at 9:00 AM

9. Adjourn:

Tom made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Gary seconded, motion approved
All approved to adjourn and the meeting was adjourned at 7:46 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

Link to AV recording of September 19, 2023 meeting below.

Topic: Village Waste Water Study (Gail Mann- 802-856-7669)
Date: Sep 19, 2023 06:06 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

[View Detail](#)

[Share](#)

You can copy the recording information below and share with others

https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/focrUwTWRIAF13qVnIbF3AS_bTbYqAtaJTzHhyxJPHil7X0Z9UVbcyd6l5-ROaSP.y5h_AD4rKxSIW4aW

Passcode: f0jUt=90

* * *