

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont
Village Wastewater Committee
Special Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 14, 2023 – 6:00 PM
Neighborhood Connections, 5700 VT Rte. 100
Londonderry, VT**

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

Others in Attendance:

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

1. Call meeting to order

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 PM

2. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda:

None

3. Approve Minutes of 10/13/23 meeting

Tom made a motion to approve the minutes of the 10/13/23 meeting. Gary Seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.

Gary asked if there may be a means by which the VWC could read and approve minutes online for expediency. It is something to look into and the suggestion was to investigate with Vermont League of Cities and Towns.

Larry needs to access ZOOM recording of October 17, 2023 meeting to list online attendees. Sharon suggested speaking with Heather Stephenson.

4. VWW – Discussion

Critical Path / Time line and tasks to move project forward – WRC

Additional Site evaluations, Timing etc - DG Chrissy Haskins

Progress Report: Status of 60%, descriptions of proposed alternatives, etc – DG/ CH

Public Outreach including: talking points, VIDEO, etc – WRC/Julie Beth Hines cc

Outreach to Property owners in both Villages within service area

Other

Discussion began with the critical path timeline.

Sue said the critical path timeline was developed to let the VWC and the Selectboard know what the most immediate next steps are. It was developed in conjunction with Chrissy Haskins of Dufresne Group (this project's consulting engineer), Emily Haskins (EI – Environmental Engineer – VT DEC).

The following was updated on 11/15/23 -

- 1) November - Selectboard must be made aware of status of project and what's next.
 - a. South Village – Advance the project towards construction; Disposal sites have been identified and there is a clear pathway to construction of a community system serving the South Village.
 - b. North Village – Use available grant resources to continue planning, focusing on potential cluster solutions. A common disposal site has not been identified. While different options are possible, it has been more difficult and time-consuming to identify these.
 - c. Village Wastewater Committee - requests that the Selectboard designate a liaison to attend bimonthly meetings, either remotely or in person, as the process moves forward.
- 2) December - 60% Engineering Report complete by 12/22/2023
- 3) January – A Public Meeting should be scheduled in early January 2024 (potentially 1/10 or 1/11) for Dufresne Group to present the 60% report, including alternatives analysis for the South Village and an overview of cluster options for the North Village.
 - a. The Selectboard should attend the meeting to hear public comment and then (at the next Selectboard meeting) endorse a preferred alternative based on the engineering report.
 - b. The 60% report will include project construction and operating cost estimates, allowing work on options for connection policies (i.e., an ordinance) and strategies for minimizing cost impacts for property taxes and connected users.
 - c. Dufresne Group will then advance engineering and planning towards a 90% report (i.e., Final Design).
 - d. The VW Committee will begin analyzing alternative fee structures and wastewater ordinances (models from other communities) that will be required for project implementation.

- 4) February 1 st – 90% Engineering Report complete

- a. Early February - Meeting with the State and Town Administrator.
- b. Detailed outline of costs, rates, available resources, and policies will be presented.
- c. Environmental Review – Public Hearing required during a Selectboard meeting. Then a 30 public comment period is required.
- d. If easements are necessary, they must be put in place ASAP (in February).

Sue suggested that this meeting may be a good time discuss potential dates and locations for the meetings to ensure there is time to properly warn and publicize them. She also reiterated the importance that the Selectboard understands they need to attend the January meeting to hear public comments so that they will be able to endorse a preferred alternative for the project(s) to go forward.

Gary asked if there were any other items of critical path importance that the VWC and the Selectboard would need to be aware of.

Sue responded that the VWC and Town will need to properly warn the meetings, and it is vital that the Selectboard attend, the January meeting is will not be a public hearing, the February meeting will have a public hearing as a part of that meeting, which will provide a 90% report on the project within this planning phase. An environmental review will be required with the public hearing. Emily said that the 90% report, environmental review and public hearing meeting in February is normally done as part of a regular Selectboard meeting and that it entails a 30 day comment period, following the meeting. She said it is important that the documents for the reports and review be made available to the public on the Town website and that the public has 30 days to present comments to the Selectboard and VWC.

Gary asked if there were any special requirements that were different with regard to the time require to post an upcoming meeting ahead of time. Sue said that the meeting warning times would be the same as the open meeting laws require for regular meetings or special meetings.

Chrissy Haskins added that in addition to the consideration of meetings, meeting dates, times and locations the VWC and the Selectboard consider how to pay for the project(s). She said that while we have no cost estimates yet, there will be cost estimates within the 60% report. At that point discussion will have to begin with different options on how the cost will be covered, who is paying for the capital costs, the user costs, maintenance costs and what the affordability looks like. Then are there any potential adjustments that can be made to improve affordability, possibly weighed against the cost of doing nothing. She said that Juli Beth Hinds has a lot of information to help us in that discussion.

Sue asked if the discussion should come before January. Chrissy said at this point the best thing that might be done is to have Juli Beth Hinds provide us with information to review the various options to be knowledgeable about them in preparation for when the cost estimates become available in late December of this year with the 60% report.

Tom asked if the estimates will include how State funding applies to those costs, with regard to what is eligible, what is not, what the Town will be responsible for and what alternate or additional funding might be available at the State level as a means to inform people about various options and should we be researching this now, if it has not already been researched. Chrissy responded that the 60% report will have cost estimates which are part of the “alternative” section of the report. The next section of the report will include information regarding how to pay for the project(s). She said that generally at the 60% report, the next section is not yet written because the “alternative” has not yet been selected. She said there are not a lot of alternatives in Londonderry’s case, but that the decision of the Selectboard needs to be made in order to write the next section. Because Londonderry has some ARPA money, further determinations can be made with regard to the cost estimate, what the difference is between the cost estimate and the ARPA funds and what the Town would need to come up with to cover any difference, so that additional sources of funding can be looked into and applied for. Discussion has already talked about some potential sources for funds. One is the Northern Borders Regional Commission (NBRC), another is the Vermont Agency of Commerce and Community Development (VACCD) if there is any job creation or affordable housing (based on State definition of affordable housing) associated with the project. She added projects can also be joint funded between the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and Rural Development. Both go by the affordability of the project(s).

Tom asked where the bond vote fit into the critical path. Sue said that it has to be completed by August of 2024. Chrissy added that normally a bond vote would occur at the annual Town meeting, but due to backing out dates for all that needs to be prepared for Town meeting with regard to warning the it and gathering all that needs to go into a Town report to ready it for printing, by the end of January, we could meet that schedule, thus a special meeting would have to be held for the bond vote. Sue said she would reach out to Juli Beth about providing some information regarding this.

Chrissy added that another thing that will have to be worked on is an ordinance for the systems. She said Juli Beth could likely help us out with that as well. She said key to the ordinance that the public will be interested in is whether they will be required to connect to the system. She said that while the ultimate decisions with regard to what the ordinance and what is contained within it will be up to the Selectboard, the Selectboard will be looking to the VWC to do the research and come up with a recommendation for them.

Tom recalled seeing a sample ordinance from Juli Beth and added that he thought the Selectboard should also be reviewing samples to get a working knowledge of what will be recommended by the VWC and what they will be making a decision upon. Gary added that

we can use elements of what other towns have done to create our own, without having to reinvent the wheel. Tom agreed and Gary suggested presenting a model with various options the VWC and the Selectboard can look at and discuss as they work toward a recommendation and a decision on a recommendation. Sue will ask Juli Beth about this, also.

Sharon asked whether Sue had more with regard to the critical steps. Sue said the 4 steps listed are the most critical in the near future and to moving on to the next phase. She added that we could discuss in this meeting what might be some good dates, times and locations for the listed meetings. Tom asked if these meetings should have the Selectboard members present. Sue said they really should be there to be able to hear the public comment. Tom asked if any Selectboard members were at the October 17th presentation. Larry responded that Tom Cavanaugh was present online and Chrissy mentioned that Martha Dale was there in person.

Chrissy added that the January meeting will be the presentation of the 60% Report and that the Selectboard will need to be there in order to make a decision as to whether to endorse the alternative they receive a recommendation to move forward with and based on public comment. It is important they commit to being at the meeting.

Larry asked if they will make the decision during the meeting. Chrissy responded that they would not necessarily have to decide at that meeting, but because of the tight timeline, they would likely have to decide no later than their next meeting.

Larry asked about the “amendment” discussed in the prior VWC meeting regarding a decision that it was believed the Selectboard had to make sometime in November, in order to have the documentation for the amendment completed during the month of December to meet a year end deadline. The “amendment” discussed was regarding a change in paths for the north village based on the difficulty in finding suitable sites for community systems and the likelihood that cluster systems would need to be investigated as an alternative. Due to the timeline deadlines and the difficulty cluster systems entail with regard to getting groups of property owners to agree, there does not appear enough time to complete that work in time to meet complete funding deadlines for projects to go to full construction. With the “amendment” the north village could proceed with further investigation into cluster systems, possibly design and a slim possibility of funding one or more cluster systems, but not all or many. It would allow the south village project to proceed under the assumption that project would go to construction, based on what had been found to date.

Sue responded that because of some confusion about the project of Londonderry’s projects with the thought they were further along, the “amendment” was not necessary as the grant agreement had not yet been completed pending the approval of the Selectboard of an alternative that would define the project. Larry also asked about prior discussion of Chrissy’s inability to complete the 60% Report based on not being able to nail down sufficient community system locations and capacity in the north village and how that

affected both projects. He also mentioned prior discussion about whether the two projects could be separated to ease that problem. Chrissy responded that in all likelihood, the projects would be separated to solve that problem, saying the first parts of each project would be fairly similar to each other until the alternatives are presented, which is where they will diverge.

Sue asked Chrissy if there were any preferences for when the early January meeting was held. She responded that Tuesdays were not so good for her, but any other days of the week would work. Sue suggested a Wednesday or Thursday and Sharon mentioned the second week of January. Larry tossed out Wednesday January 10th, Sue added the 11th as well. The following Monday would typically be a regular Selectboard meeting, but Gary pointed out that Monday the 15th of January would be Martin Luther King, Jr's birthday holiday. Sharon was not certain if they would then move their meeting to the 16th. Sharon suggested finding out from the Selectboard what their meeting schedule would be in January.

Sue asked if someone could attend the November 20, 2023 Selectboard meeting to review the critical path and timeline discussed in this VWC meeting. Tom volunteered Chrissy as the best person to represent our discussion to the Selectboard. Chrissy said she was available to do so. Larry said he would come as well to backup Sharon and Chrissy.

Sharon asked if Emily and Sue should be there as well. Sue responded that she did not think it was necessary to have everyone there as it was basically letting the Selectboard know what the next steps were and they needed to be present at the public meeting in January and will then need to make a decision soon after, about how everything will proceed from there.

Sharon was concerned that there has not been a lot of interaction between the Selectboard and the VWC. Gary added that presenting the critical path with this in mind with the addition that the VWC will be putting together some draft model ordinance or by-law to help frame the discussion and also at this to the timeline, possibly meeting to discuss sometime in early January. Sue added that it would be good to also alert the Selectboard that discussion of the fee structure alternatives will also be necessary. Tom mentioned that we should be able to find a model close to what would fit Londonderry from another town to use for discussion and editing to fit Londonderry more specifically. Sharon said she thought Juli Beth had a great way of presenting the main points and issues. Sue was not certain about the contract with Juli Beth with regard to how best to use her remaining time. Chrissy and Sue both thought that the best use of Juli Beth's remaining time would not include the initial updating the Selectboard on the critical path and making them aware of upcoming discussions, meetings and decisions they will have to make, but that using her at a later point would be more valuable, once we have a better fix on the projects and relating what other towns have done more specifically to Londonderry. Sue recommended that the 60% Report, then the January meeting should come first. Larry mention the importance of including the Town Administrator, Shane O'Keefe in the discussions and possibly even a

separate meeting to ensure he is up to date and based on his being the one to frame and present the motions of any decisions the Selectboard have to make, to the Selectboard.

Sue mentioned that she agreed with some comments by Tom Metcalfe that requested a Selectboard liaison to attend VWC meetings. Tom mentioned that it would give them a firsthand listen to what is being discussed, especially with regard to what will be their responsibility for decision making. Sue will add that to the critical path, with the agreement of the VWC. Sue also mentioned Tom's thoughts on producing a public outreach video. Tom said it may be difficult to get done. Tom asked about other towns, like Manchester that had done a video and Sue mentioned that Westford had a short, less than 4 minute, video to talk about their project. <https://www.westfordsfuture.com/> --- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VNZIG-VMDLY>

Sharon will look into using Flood Brook School again and Sue will provide AV equipment to help facilitate the meeting if Flood Brook is decided upon as the venue.

Tom asked if there was any outreach to Shane to from Emily to bring him up to speed with VWC work. Sue said she was not certain it occurred. Larry mentioned that it may have been in relation to the "amendment" that ended up not being necessary, but that it still would be important that Shane be caught up so that he can frame resolutions the Selectboard will have to decide upon.

Tom mentioned outreach to potential users of the wastewater systems, specifically in the south village. He was trying to clarify what the service area would be. Larry clarified that while the ¼ mile buffer zone outside the originally designated project service area might include areas across the river, so far there were still areas where no plans had yet been laid or expected to be laid for running across the river.

Sharon asked Chrissy to report on her updated information since the last VWC meeting.

Chrissy began with stating that properties #5 and #8 were scheduled for archeological shovel testing on Friday, November 17th. #8 is in the north village, #5 is in the south village. Both have been approved by owners for test pits and shovel testing and results of the shovel testing should take three to five days for the State sign to off on what the archeological shovel tests show, before test pits can be done, if nothing significant was found that would prevent moving forward with test pits. Test pits can be done in the snow. Tom asked about site walks for both sites and when they were done so that he could update the property matrix chart he had done. Chrissy said the site walk was done on October 4, 2023. Tom said his latest update for the chart was done on October 13, 2023.

Chrissy was uncertain as to when the test pits might be done, if there are not archeological restraints as it would depend upon the availability of Chris her test pit engineer and Hunter who will be doing the excavation. She said that even if they were not able to be done before the 60% Report is done, they would be included with assumptions, then the 90%

Report would show an adjustment based on what was found when they are done. All test pit sites are staked out in preparation for the archeological shovel tests, then the test pits to follow. Property owners have been notified of when the tests will take place, this Friday. Chrissy added that in addition to this work she will be working to move the sites in the south village alone to include in the 60% Report and developing some cost estimates. She said she should have the 60% Report done by the 22nd or 23rd of December.

Gary asked how the #8 site looked, based on the site walk. Chrissy said that based on the site walk estimates for the #8 site looked like it would be in the 3,000 gal/day range with potentially two different fields. She said there was a wetland on the property, but moving away from that, the topography and other site features looked good.

Tom asked about sites #10 and #12. Chrissy responded that they are set to go for test pits and that the thought was to try to do all the test pits at the same time, but she did say #12 the Town property would be more difficult to access and will take more time for equipment to move to the test pit sites. She mentioned that she did not expect to find anything very good there, because of the limited area (due to wetlands and slope). She estimated the capacity there to be 3,000 gal/day or less. Gary thought we should still pursue #12 as it would provide some capacity on that side of the West River. Chrissy said that they will proceed and estimated 3-4 days of doing all of the planned test pits.

Sharon asked about how many properties we have on the list. Gary suggested we remove the properties that have been eliminated to date. Tom suggested hiding them from view so properties that were investigated remain on record. He asked about various properties on the list and which ones should be hidden. He ran through the list suggesting #1, #3 be hidden, but was unsure of what to do with #4. Chrissy responded that it still could be pursued, but that contact has not yet been made with the property owners. She said that it would not make the 60% or the 90% Reports because of time. Tom will leave a question mark next to this property. It is believed to fall into the south village project. Tom continued say #5, #6 and had a question about #7. Original discussion of this property realized that the use of the property as an affordable housing project would require all the capacity of a system and that would essentially cancel out any potential capacity for to be used by other properties. Tom felt this property should be left out based in this. Chrissy said capacity would not be that great in relation to the discussed cost of the property, unless a housing project was included and the housing project would need all of the capacity. The suggestion was to leave it out for now. #8, #10, #12 and #5 will all be left on the list pending the results of test pits. Tom asked about #13 and Chrissy suggested it should be hidden due to multiple constraints due to wetlands, streams and nearby wells. Gail Mann asked to comment about property #7 and her thought that there may be more to explore there and that in her discussions, when she was Chair of the VWC the thought was to do a system that still had capacity to share. She said she would be glad to pursue it further. Chrissy mentioned she thought there were some real difficulties in an effort to find space and separation for wells and building. Gail said she was okay with taking it off the list and would pursue further with the property owner for something private. Chrissy asked

about #14. Sharon believed it might have been a duplicate and that it could be hidden from the list. Tom asked if we are eliminating #13 as well. Chrissy interjected that Sharon had been instrumental in evaluating a lot more than 13 properties, since these projects began. She also said that property #13 had numerous constraints that would eliminate it for consideration.

Properties to be hidden or removed from consideration include properties #1,#3,#7,#9,#13 and #14.

Gary commented that adding a distance from the village centers to the property matrix/chart would be very helpful. Chrissy and Sharon said they would help Tom identify property locations and distances from the village centers.

Gary asked if there was any set guidelines for requirements for pumping based on distance and grade. Chrissy responded that the hydraulic grade line will have to be looked at. She said ideally low pressure collection would be preferable, but some potential sights may require something different. She believed that the Town property identified as the Prouty Property could be reached with low pressure. Tom was thinking STEP systems could send to a centralized collection tank where it would then be pumped to the community fields, like the Prouty Property.

Chrissy gave a quick update on the Report and spoke of the where to find a description of each one of the sections that will be required outline in the Report. She said they could be found on page 11 following the bullet points. She said there will be some changes that will be made to make it project specific. Tom asked if Chrissy had yet determined what most of the systems will be. Chrissy said the soils will determine the treatment portion of the systems and that is yet come. She said the alternatives will look at whether pre-treatment can be added as a part of the system and said that will be based on the hydrogeology, the mounding analysis and whether the soils can accept more in the same footprint. Then alternatives for collection will be looked at. They include gravity collection, low pressure and STEP (Septic Tank Effluent Pumping) systems.

Tom mentioned there were 5 weeks remaining to the dates Chrissy planned to have the 60% Report completed and expressed concern that there is a lot of information that still needs to be pulled together. Chrissy said her firm uses another company. Mance Engineering to help out and also utilize some design services through Orenco Systems, which is a vendor for low pressure sewer and pre-treatment options. She added that Orenco has been aware of the project for a year and that they are just awaiting the more information to begin their work. She did not believe that pre-treatment would be a likely option since she did not see the promise of the soils accepting more capacity within the footprints outlined. She said what is being found is that the soils are accepting less than what would normally be accepted, which means pre-treatment will not be an option. Tom asked about clarification about pre-treatment. Chrissy said the pre-treatment she was talking about was system wide pre-treatment at the location of the septic field. She said

what pre-treatment would allow, based on a mounding system that allows for it would be the ability to double the capacity of a system. She said the cases they have looked at so far, the mounding analysis has not allowed that. Pre-treatment is very expensive so without the allowance of doubling the capacity, it renders a system unfeasible economically.

Emily Hackett joined the meeting and asked what questions we had for her. Tom asked if she had reached out to Shane O'Keefe yet. Emily said she had not yet had a chance to speak with Shane, but planned to reach out to him this week based on the conversations that needed to take place about the north village project grant amount. She said her team is working to figure that out, but hoped to have a grant agreement for the south village out by Friday, November 17th.

Gary had a question about the PER guidance, noting Section F regarding the operating budget saying it looked like we could project estimated cost based on other systems and can we pull that together to use for presentation and how detailed would the information have to be.

Emily said it will depend upon the system selected. She said the 60% Report would include more general numbers and the 90% would provide more specific numbers, but said there were some good examples of what some other towns have done. She cited Westford, West Burke and Wolcott as the one's that may provide the best examples. She said that Montgomery may have the information, as well. She said West Burke is a Dufresne Group project, Westford is a Stone Environmental project as is Wolcott. She added that Juli Beth has worked in Westford's and Wolcott's projects to help with the costs of those projects. Emily will get information to Chrissy on those projects. Gary said the PER's should be public information, Emily said yes and Westford's was on their website. She didn't know if West Burke's was on the One Burke website and if Wolcott had put theirs up for public viewing.

Gary had more questions for Emily about the north village and getting a feeling for its eligibility. Emily responded that cluster systems are eligible for funding, but that the north village would likely not be using \$3.9 million worth of cluster systems so the question becomes how much does the town need to get through that process and whether the funding pays for the design of a few cluster systems and Londonderry finds construction funding elsewhere or whether a few cluster systems can be built with the money allocated. She said the answer to these questions are being worked out because Londonderry is the only village that does not yet have a potential site and has struggled to find a potential site. Emily expect that some of the north village funds will likely be reallocated, but she did not yet know how much or in what way.

Tom had some questions for Chrissy about potential site #6 and it being listed after test pits of having a potential capacity or 4,000-6,000 gal/day and if site #8 and site #12 were to show some promise, is it possible the combination of the three sites would provide the capacity we are looking for in the north village. Chrissy said that even if the three amount to 11,000 gal/day we are still short of the 25,000 gal/day sought.

Larry had a question on clarifying how the two projects were seen as one and now will be separated, each with their own budget. Understanding that, how does the VWC know how best to move forward with its energies and focuses to ensure enough time is allocated to the south village so that it can take full advantage of the ARPA Grant funding and go through to construction, but also allocate enough time to ensure the north village gets as far as it might go, with the funds it ends up with, once its budget and grant funding is revised.

Chrissy reiterated that the original grant funding was a single pot of money for both villages, then additional funding was sought and granted for each village separately. Within all the funding there is funding for preliminary funding in both villages. Going forward the projects can be worked on at different speeds. The adjustment would be to allow the VWC to do more planning in the north village at a slower pace and with additional funding for construction coming later, while at the same time moving the south village project forward to final design and construction. Larry asked a further question as to timing and when with this adjustment take place in relation to the short term critical path. Emily responded by saying the south village project ARPA Grant agreement will move forward with the award amount of \$3.9 million. The award amount for north village grant agreement that will need to be changed to reflect a change toward investigation of cluster systems rather than community wide systems, as a solution. She said there is some difficulty in trying to figure out how much the adjustment would be so that money still remains to carry forward the design, if not the construction of some needed cluster systems. Larry asked if there was anything the VWC and the Selectboard needed to do to help with the adjustment decisions. Emily said that ultimately the Selectboard will need to select the alternative plan to move from 60% to 90% PER. She said at some point there will need to be a discussion with the Selectboard about the award amount, but she felt a discussion with Shane needed to happen first. She added that it was very important to keep advancing the south village project to the 60% and that the north village project will be revised in terms of award amount and timelines based on it being cluster systems instead of community wide systems. The cluster systems are more challenging because of the need for agreements between landowners that live close to one another.

Tom asked if the sites that have been or will be identified as locations for community wide systems could still be utilized. Emily said that cost is an issue and whether they can be economically built in relation to the capacity they would provide. There is the minimum of 20 connections and 6,000 or more gal/day of capacity. She said the 6,000 gal per day could be spread over two sites. It then becomes a matter of whether the grant funds will pay for the two sites or do they need to be phased. She said the capacity we have found now will cover the current need, but not the future need. Gary and Tom had questions about how to count the number of hookups in consideration of something like multi-family residents where there might be four units, but only one hookup. Emily explained that it would not make sense cost wise to have four septic tanks, one for each unit, when one larger one would suffice.

Tom said the only thing remaining would be to decide whether information comes from Chrissy in stages or wait until there is enough information to put together in a packet. Chrissy responded she would not like to release information piecemeal.

5. Next VWC Meeting

The next meeting would be Friday December 1st 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 8:03 PM

The next regular meetings of the VWC will be **the first Friday of every month at 10:09 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 November14, 2023 meeting below.

Topic: Village Waste Water Project
Date: Nov 14, 2023 05:57 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
You can copy the recording information below and share with others
https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/G04feMuTgsul02rd-FtBr2_RMJGDUOBFdCPKmHtMaZxYIt4USZYzIxpSTWqUOOh.XoETbp5FZH9F-X7T
Passcode: #du#J78V

* * *