

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont  
Village Wastewater Committee  
Special Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 5, 2024 – 9:00 AM**

**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:**

Martha Dale (Londonderry Selectboard)

**Online:** Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Gail Mann (resident), Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC), Susan Westa (Windham Regional Commission), Shane O’Keefe (Town of Londonderry, Town Administrator)

**1. Call meeting to order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 AM.

**2. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda:**

No additions or deletions.

**3. Approve Minutes of 12/19/23 meeting**

VWC agreed to defer approval of 12/19/23 minutes until the next meeting.

**4. VWW – Discussion**

**Progress Report: Chrissy Haskins DG - Site evaluations, Timing, descriptions of proposed alternatives, Status of 60%, etc.**

**Plan for January Public Information Meeting #2: Sue Westa, Juli Beth Hines-format, talking points, speakers, video, location, date/time, etc.**

**Notify Property Owners in both Villages: VWC: distribute/hand out invites, info.**

**Critical Paths: is project on track? what’s new? what’s next?**

**Other**

Chrissy led with discussion about the 60% report. She said Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the report were updated from their original inclusion in the 30% report.

Tom had a question about the estimate for future expansion or underutilized buildings based on approximately 30% of the estimated flow for the north village and 10% of the estimated flow for the south village. He asked if this was based on unoccupied buildings or buildings with less than 100% utilization now. He was trying to understand the basis of how the percentages were reached. Chrissy responded that it was an estimate based on the apparent amount of additional development in the north village versus the south village.

Tom asked about the masterplan study for the south village and Sharon responded that the study will be similar in nature to what was done for the north village and will begin this month.

Tom also asked about a past wastewater engineering study by Enman Associates and where the proposed site was for that study. Chrissy responded that it was the “Prouty Land” and there had been an estimate of 98,000 gal./day utilizing floodplain areas which cannot be used under this grant. She was unsure that any test pits were done at the time but said that the test pits recently done showed a lot less capacity, in part because of areas unable to be utilized in the flood plan under this grant and the study being for a soil based indirect discharge centralized system.

There was a question about an indicted “illicit discharge”, but to protect the privacy of those involved in the situation, it was felt it should not be a part of the discussion at the meeting. Martha asked if there was any relation to any e coli levels in the river. Chrissy said that it was unrelated and believed to be coming from a single sink which is discharging without being connected to a wastewater system. The reason for including it in the report was to add points (regarding need) for what was the funding application. Tom suggested that if there were a detailed report on every septic system in town a better portrait of need would be established, but doing such an analysis might be unrealistic to the scope of the project. Larry mentioned that a survey was done that allowed property owners to voluntarily respond with the condition of their current systems.

Chrissy said Section 3 of the report was a summary of what had been previously reported.

Tom said he was surprised to find out that from a regulatory position it was permissible to have a septic system in a floodplain. Chrissy explained that if a system fails, currently it can be replaced in the floodplain, but not the floodway. She said there are two septic systems in the south village that are in the floodway, which cannot be replaced, but are grandfathered until such time as they fail.

Chrissy began speaking about Section 4 of the report. She said that this section had been rewritten from the 30% report because of significant changes in findings from when that report was written. She started by pointing out the explanations of the various types of

systems with their advantages and disadvantages. She mentioned that for ARPA funding, the systems have to be soil-based systems and cannot be a direct discharge system. She mentioned that a spray field as part of a package plant would be the type of system that could utilize ARPA funding, however spray fields appear to run into opposition based on public perception of spraying effluent onto the ground, even though it has been pretreated. It was thought that there would be difficulty in getting public approval for that type of system.

She discussed the various options looked at for septic systems then the various types of collection systems.

She discussed the evaluations the various sites that had been looked at and tested saying that the mounding analysis from Lincoln Applied Geology was still pending on several properties and that numbers were still being used to identify the properties until such time as the owners are ready to have their properties identified by name and more complete analysis and agreements had been made.

The information that was known was used to provide the estimates used in the report.

Tom was concerned that the contributing areas versus treatment sites was not clear. Gail mentioned that she too had difficulty understanding. Chrissy said that, again, because of privacy issues at this stage she did not want to identify the private property sites yet.

She explained why some systems cost more or less based in the size of the system and that for Drip Dispersal systems the cost comes down based on a larger size project,

She said there was still pending analysis to determine things like a liquid only sewer.

She explained the various tables and options for estimated costs.

Shane asked about how costs for easement agreements were derived. Chrissy said the private properties involved were land only and she took the total acreage of the properties then divided assessed value by the number of acres to estimate the cost of the easement areas that would be required.

Martha asked what the amount allotted to each village was. Chrissy said for the sake of rough figuring, the figure was \$4 million per village. She said that is believed to cover 90% of the total project costs and Shane was in conversations with the state to confirm that.

Shane said that an agreement for the ARPA funding was received but did not appear to include a local match of 10%. He said that would be great news, but wanted to confirm with Emily as to whether that was truly the case as it would mean the difference between the Town having to raise the 10% or not. That would mean a bond vote and preparation for the bond vote beginning right away.

Larry asked about the sum total of the estimates for the two recommended sites adding up to \$7,000,000. Chrissy confirmed that yes, based on the estimates to date, it would fall within the \$7.8 million grant total (\$3.9 million per village) and the match, assuming the local match was still a part of the agreement.

Gail asked a question about how many housing units would be served by each system.

Chrissy responded that we would get to those figures, but also mentioned that she was surprised at how the numbers had come out and that they were looking to come within the 2% of MHI (Median Household Income) which indicates affordability.

Chrissy said that an environmental information document will be done, which is an environmental review of the recommended alternatives, but had held off until getting a decision as to what the VWC wanted to do. There is a potential for use of an additional area, which lies under one of the existing mounds on the Prouty property, but it would require moving the mound to test the soil. If there was a need for additional capacity, that might be a consideration for the future, but it could not be done for this funding because of the timeline. There has been no prior testing of the site. She did say that the sizing for the collection system in that area if the area under the mound was included, would double the amount of capacity to about 13,000 gal/day.

She mentioned that if there is only one system that goes ahead in each village, they would not necessarily have to adhere to the service area sectors proposed. They could be mixed according to priority needs. She said cost estimate and life cycle cost comparisons were for conventional trench and for drip disposal systems on the larger Prouty Property only because drip dispersal would not be cost effective for the smaller size system on the other viable alternative property. She said that for collection systems, liquid only types would work for both sites as well as gravity systems. If gravity is used there would be a central collection tank and then pumping from there to the disposal fields.

Tom said he didn't feel the description of the gravity systems that would be used was explained clearly enough and that he felt people might believe a gravity system did not include any pumps. He thought there should be more added to explain that pumps still would be needed beyond the gravity collection. Chrissy said she would add something to ensure that was clear. Tom went on to say that the pumps would add to O&M expenses (operation and maintenance) and thought there may have to be a licensed operator to maintain them. Chrissy responded that there would be no requirement for a licensed operator for these size systems. She said the systems would definitely have to be maintained but would not require a licensed operator until they were in the Indirect Discharge Program, where the capacities are over 6,500 gal/day for a single system.

The discussion moved on to cost estimates and non-economic estimates and summaries of costs and life cycles and all that was included in those analyses to establish total project cost estimates. She said this will be included in the Environmental Review and then all will

be combined into the 90% report, which she said would then be considered the final draft report and that would have to be completed by the end of January and submitted by February 1<sup>st</sup>. She said the 60% report includes most of the information, the 90% will fill in the information that was not yet known.

As part of the required outline/format of the PER (Preliminary Engineering Report), design criteria is included. Operation and reserves are in the report and recommendations for reserve costs should be built into the user fees to take care of repairs and replacements. The report also presents various options for how the systems could be managed. One option was a municipal system, owned, operated and maintained by the town, a fire district which would require a vote by the town to create and where the fire district would own, operate and maintain the system. The municipality sort of system is the type used in Manchester, for example, where only a portion of the town is serviced by the system and when there is a bond vote or an ordinance change on anything related to the system, the entire town gets to vote on the bond or ordinance issue or any changes. This would be how it would work in Londonderry under a municipal type of “ownership”. With a fire district (FD), only the users get to vote on the issues related to any bond or ordinance issues and changes related to the system, because they are the only people in the established fire district. A fire district is also a municipal like entity and has all the same eligibility for grant opportunities that a municipality is eligible for. Shane added that a fire district also has all the administrative costs that a municipality would. He also added that under a municipality ownership, it would be considered a utility, and the annual budget does not come before the voters for approval, but is approved by the selectboard and added that the funds do not disappear at the end of the year as they do in a town annual fund, but would be rolled over from year to year.

Chrissy mentioned there are also options for a non-governmental entity owning the systems like a cooperative or an LLC (Limited Liability Corporation), but they are not eligible for the same sorts of grants and/or subsidies that municipalities and FD’s are eligible for and any changes would have to come before the Public Utility Commission (PUC) for approval. She said that generally, the only sort of private entity ownership seen in Vermont is by homeowner associations (HOA).

Section 5 of the report discusses the recommended projects/alternatives. Chrissy said this section answers questions about cost per dwelling unit based on “EDU” (Equivalent Dwelling Units). Cost estimations for EDU’s were based on a discharge of 280 gal/day/EDU. A three-bedroom house for example, would have a required capacity of 420 gal/day to meet the total maximum rated discharge from such a dwelling. A 4-bedroom house would require 490 gal/day. She explained that when 5 or more residents are hooked into a system, the state flow requirement per unit is able to be reduced.

This established the number of EDU’s that could be served by each potential system alternative, then establish what the cost/EDU would be to construct and maintain each potential system alternative. She said that for the Custer Sharp property, the private

system #2 and private system #3 the cost per EDU were over \$300,000 over 30 years plus O&M. For private property #1 and the Prouty property in the south village the cost per EDU is significantly lower. She said affordability of the first three mentioned looked to present those systems as not practical on a per user basis.

Gail had a question about current capacity needs versus future needs. She asked if it would account for growth. Chrissy said there would possibly be extra capacity if priority properties (properties with a real need to hook in) were established first and their needs calculated. If they did not use the total capacity there would be room for additional hook ups, due to a variety of things like expansion of existing properties or development of something new.

Gail asked this was true for both villages and brought an example of someone interested in developing a property to include 16 units of housing but thought that would use up a great deal of the capacity for any viable system alternative now known as potential. Chrissy responded that it likely would not fit in this potential system in the north village after the priority properties were taken into account. She said that the search for potential sites has not yet been able to find a place to develop more capacity. Sharon wondered if that meant we were not looking for any additional sites. Chrissy said that for the purposes of this report and adhering to the timeline requirements for ARPA funding there was not enough time to continue to search for something that would be able to be included in this funding because of the time needed to do all the research and testing that has been done for every site to first determine their potential to go to test pits, then beyond. The time requirement to move the potential sites that have already been identified is getting very tight and continuing to search for inclusion under this funding would risk losing those projects, by not getting the work completed for them under the timeline. She said a search could continue, but it would have to be under different funding for costs associated with the search, the testing, design and construction of any sites found. She said cluster systems might work, but they too, require a great deal of time to pull together, in consideration of testing, getting property owner agreements, design and construction and they too would not meet the timeline required to go to construction.

She said that initially the plan discussed with Emily Hackett, the State representative for this project and grant was that without a viable community system in the north village some of the available funds could be spent to look for viable locations for a few cluster systems, test the sites, get the landowners that would be hooked in to agree to hook in, design the systems and possibly construct one or two. That was before all the information on the viable community system in the north village was known. She said there may be an option to continue forward with the viable community system and still look for potential cluster system sites at the same time.

Shane asked to clarify how the costs for continuing to look for cluster system sites would be covered. Chrissy said that the one viable community system in the north village was below the grant funding of roughly \$4 million and thought maybe some of the remainder that was not used by the community system, could be used for continuing to look for cluster system

sites. She said the State would need to do the adjustment of the grant agreement for the north village to move forward with proceeding with the community system to through to construction and adding a search for and some testing and design development of any cluster system sites.

Martha asked if the Selectboard and/or Shane had signed off on what the Town would need to make any decisions on at this point in the sequence of the timeline requirements or the procedure in general and if anyone was waiting on the Selectboard to make any decisions to keep the project on time and on track. Shane mentioned that the ARPA grant agreement had been received by the Town and was waiting to hear back from Emily on the applicability of the local 10% match. He said that Emily was willing to see how things proceeded in this meeting, the public meeting on January 10<sup>th</sup>, and a following SB meeting before a potential granting of authority to sign the ARPA agreement decision at the Selectboard meeting of January 22<sup>nd</sup>. He said there was no rush on the agreement as long as it was signed by the end of the month. Chrissy added that the SB could also accept the report and recommendations on the 22<sup>nd</sup> as well.

Tom had some additional thoughts on how to keep things moving forward but was not sure it is ready to go in the north village. Chrissy said the findings in the north village was a surprise as far as viability. Shen mentioned there were concern by the State initially and still somewhat remain as to any viability for a community system in the north village and a concern for being able to do two projects and get the to meet the timelines for construction and paperwork. She said the newer discovery that one property was viable in the north village was encouraging overall that both villages would have projects, but the final decision is based on a combination of the recommendation from the VWC to the Selectboard, the SB acceptance of the recommendation and the State's final assessment of whether both projects can meet all the requirements of the timeline to construction and submittal of all paperwork by the end of August 2026.

Chrissy said that if the Town ultimately decided it would like to do systems in both villages, the schedule will be met.

Chrissy went over the rest of Section 5 regarding estimated project costs for both villages with breakdowns given for each village project, financing options, to cover what ARPA funds would not cover, if necessary. Section 5 of the 60% report also talks about the the rates for users would look like. There was also information on the variety of options for borrowing money for the ten percent match and O&M expenses across a 30-year time period. The annual amounts for the cost of the loan at 3.5% plus O&M came out to be in the \$19,500 range. With users only paying for the annual expenses broken down into 23 EDU's (Equivalent Dwelling Unit) the cost per user came out to be \$840/EDU. Another option included the ARPA funds plus the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) for the 10% match. Another included ARPA funds plus USDA funds for the 10% match. She said using the USDA was more complicated. She said the amounts are small and not guaranteed and

we would have to check eligibility. She did not recommend that option. Sue also agreed that the use of USDA was not certain and was only available for loans, not grants.

Chrissy continued to say with use of CWSRF funds the amount per EDU drops to \$822/year which based on the Media Household Income (MHI) that is considered “affordable”. She went on to discuss the estimates in the report that were based on spreading the capital costs across the entire tax base of the town. This would mean all property owners would pay for a portion of the capital costs for the projects based on their assessed value. Based on this option, the cost per year for a property assessed at \$200,000 would be \$4-\$5. With this option the annual user cost per \$200,000 of property value, plus their O&M costs, (which only users pay for), would be, \$417-\$418 dollars. She mentioned the potential concerns with having the entire town fund the capital costs over 30 years at the extra \$4-\$5 per \$200,000 of assessed value each year, but said these concerns vary from town to town with some people believing it is a good thing to support their villages or downtown areas to keep them vibrant and healthy. This is a decision for the town. She continued to discuss what would happen to the costs with the reserve funds added in and suggested a reduction in the amount put aside annually for a reserve fund. She said reserve funds can be decided later based on how much people can afford or desire to set aside. She said the most important costs are the capital costs and the O&M and mention she was surprised that the analysis concluded they were so affordable. She went on to say that these costs are all assuming the full capacity of the systems are being utilized, with regard to the cost for the users. She said if only half the potential full capacity users of the system are hooked into the system, they still have to cover the costs for O&M of the entire system.

Tom mentioned that the O&M costs might be less with fewer people hooked in. Chrissy said that if there is pretreatment involved and cost for running pumps (electricity) and annual maintenance for flushing systems, etc. Individual septic tanks may need to be replaced and estimates assumed the replacement of all tanks. Tom asked if maintenance at each property, like tanks, pumps and pumping would be born by the town or by individual users/owners. Chrissy said that it could be done where the owners are responsible with an ordinance that outlined their responsibilities, saying that it would also have to include enforcement of the ordinance to make sure people were adhering to it. She added that the life of the system is prolonged by the town maintaining the entire system from the tanks to the location of the disposal fields and recommended that arrangement over individual maintenance but said the town could decide to do it either way, but the cost estimates included having the O&M done by the town.

Shane asked about what would be included in any sort of ordinance and if it would include such things as what could and could not be put into the system, such as hazardous waste and other things that could adversely affect human health and the health and function of the system. Chrissy said that an ordinance would be needed regardless of who would be responsible for maintenance for any part of the system and the ordinance would have to include what could not be put into it. Tom asked if the pumps might have any sort of sensors that could pick up the kinds of thing that could not be put into the system. Chrissy



said she did not believe there were any sensors on these systems. Tom suggested that it was a concern for the town that they should know if things were being put into the system that should not be put into it and if there were a means to identify where the source was. Chrissy said it would be difficult to monitor everything that might be put down someone's sewer system and deferred to Emily for any additional comments with regard to that. Emily added that even with individual systems owned solely by the property owner, the same sorts of things should not be put into those systems and that even with larger city wastewater systems the monitoring is not being done at the individual outlets but where it comes into the treatment facility. She said a good ordinance and education should help prevent this problem. Shane brought up a concern that if a property owner put system harming things down their own sewer, they bear the price for the failed system. With a community system, someone might not be as concerned since they don't bear the full cost of a failed system. Emily responded that this is where a good ordinance would come into play and Chrissy added that even if it were feasible to monitor everything put into the system, the cost would be prohibitive for the monitoring equipment. She also said that even water systems cannot test for everything that might enter them. Shane said that sludge is tested for things like PFAS and maybe periodic testing in that way could reveal if something harmful to the system was being put into it.

Sharon asked if Emily had a specific time frame for participating in this meeting. She said she is reviewing the 60% report so she can provide comments to Chrissy before the public meeting, and she has spoken to Shane about so details that she could speak to him about following the meeting if he were available then. She said she would just continue to listen and jump in with comments when needed.

Gary had a question about acquiring a VTrans (Vermont Agency of Transportation) permit as part of the projects that would be necessary, and Chrissy said she would add that to the report. Gail had a question about an executive summary of the report and a glossary for the report and Chrissy said Section 6 provided a high-level summary but did not have a glossary. She said she could add something but was not sure what terminology was confusing or not known about. She said the report was a technical report. Tom said he believed all acronyms were identified but wasn't sure if the MHI acronym was identified as referring to *Median Household Income*. Sharon said she found different titles and different labels for some things. Chrissy asked if Sharon would identify where they were so she could correct them.

Chrissy continued with review of the costs for the north village saying the costs were a little higher due to the distance for conveyance, but that the user costs were not that different than the south village project, but user costs would be better if brought below \$1000 a year as the highest option cost.

Larry broke down the annual costs for users if the full tax base pays for the capital costs into monthly costs for users saying the north village costs would be approximately \$35 a month and for the south village, approximately \$38 per month. Sharon said these breakdowns

were very important for people to hear and Tome said that this allows them to compare what it would cost in other states, saying it sounded comparable to what he would pay somewhere else. Larry added that even in Vermont the estimates for Londonderry are comparable to costs in some other places in Vermont, if not slightly less, but there are a lot of variables that affect the cost.

Sharon wondered if we should mention a monthly breakdown. Tom said he thought the annual costs listed did not seem problematic.

Tom also asked Shane about reserve funding. Shane said that currently there are two Town reserve funds, one for building and one for roads and highways, including equipment, which are approved annually by the voters. He said there was also an unassigned balance that could be used in the case of emergencies. He said that this year a policy for that fund was approved to hold roughly 12%- 15% of annual expenditures in that fund. Tom asked if the Town would consider placing a reserve amount for these projects into that fund. Shane said that would be a political decision that would be up to the Town. Chrissy said that they calculated their estimates based on the reserve funding being paid for, only by the users. Shane said that there would be a combined cost to the taxpayers of both villages that would be a combined total of the estimates for the assessment per \$200,000 of value and that perhaps the combined cost would be mentioned.

Chrissy said she did an analysis of what the costs would be considering all the costs spread evenly across all users and the total capital costs for the two systems. She said the average annual user cost of \$965 dollars with no tax base support and no reserve fund contribution or \$445 with tax bas support without any reserve fund costs.

It was agreed that even though Chrissy had broken down the cost estimates by village, the costs and management of both systems would be combined. Chrissy said she would be glad to present them as combined or add the combined costs to the breakdowns by village, so people have an idea of what each village estimates were if it were decided to go with only one project.

Tom asked if Chrissy would include all the details of how she arrived at all the cost estimates in the report. Chrissy said she has all the breakdowns as backup and an appendix to the report. Tom said he was interested in seeing the details.

Sharon said the community will have several basic questions and wondered how Chrissy would present everything in her presentation. She said she would not go into the same sort of detail as she has with us in this meeting. Sharon wanted to make sure there would be enough time to include time for questions.

Emily said that the priorities of the public meeting was to meet the requirements of the States and ARPA funding which is to present and explain the various alternatives (potential sites). She said this is critical and a requirement for the Environmental Review as well.

Sharon said that more people are becoming interested in hooking up as they find out more and wondering how they manage to go about doing that. Chrissy said that more information will be forthcoming in the 90% report, but that she will also discuss “next steps” at the end of the January 10<sup>th</sup> presentation and add that if people are interested in connecting to contact this, the Village Wastewater Committee (VWC) and even if one does not fall directly in the designated area, but is in close proximity, to let the VWC know because there may be a means to connect them.

Tom said that if Chrissy explains how the O&M would do things like replace their tanks and take care of their entire systems from there, they may believe such a service would be well worth the annual cost to hook in. Tom asked about conclusions and recommendations and asked if she could add how it may provide for additional economic growth based on available capacity when everyone who wishes to sign up to be hooked into the system signs up to be hooked into the system. Chrissy agreed.

Shane had a question about how people that may not want to connect right away could connect later on, with regard to planning that into the system as it is constructed. Tom said that from an engineering standpoint, to do a wet tapping into the line, in his opinion because finding a preinstalled hookup valve would be difficult without good mapping and marking of their locations, but more importantly, a preinstalled valve is likely to be corroded by the time someone would like to hook into it. He said that that for people who do not want to connect now, they could connect later, but at a cost to them for the connection work. Shane was concerned about the latter connection costs for things like road closures and traffic control during installation of a connection.

Chrissy said that incentives to hook up early are a good way to make sure all the capacity is signed up for and those who might want to hook up, if there is capacity that is not yet claimed, but that lie outside of the designated areas and the buffer, their hookups would not be paid for by the grant funding, but they would still be welcome to hook up, assuming they paid for the cost to hook in and the ongoing costs as any user would. She said one way to incentivize hook up during construction would be to offer the incentive of paying for all hookups for those who committed by a certain deadline to hook up and saying anyone who missed that deadline, could still hook in, but have to pay for the costs of hooking up on their own. She said the date to commit to hooking up would have to be before final design is complete to ensure the hookups were part of the final design. ARPA funding could still not pay for any service hookups outside the ¼ mile buffer, but the town, if they chose to, could pay for those hook ups.

Tom asked if a hook up could be reserved and installed ahead of time to avoid disruptions caused by later hookups, but just not used until the owner decides to hook in. Chrissy that unless a person who had a reservation was not paying yet as a user, they would mean the system would not be fully utilized, especially if someone else, could use that allocation from the beginning or much sooner than those reserving the allocation, but not using it yet.

Emily added that allocations need to be signed up for because easement agreements are required for any hookups. She reiterated that people outside the buffer can sign up to be hooked into the system but would either have to pay for the cost of the hookup or have it paid for by a loan from the Town and the Town would have to front the cost of the hook up.

Discussion moved to public outreach and publicity for the January 10th meeting, reviewing previously discussed plans for the meeting, with the time, date, seating and equipment for online participation, snacks, cider and water. Juli Beth Hinds will not be available for the meeting. Sue asked if the VWC wanted her to make the ordinance from Westford sample more specific to Londonderry. The VWC agreed. Sue was unsure of the funding for the WRC work. Shane was unsure of funding for the WRC work through the ARPA agreement. Emily stated that it was eligible through the ARPA grant funding, but if additional funding was needed there would have to be an amendment to the agreement, to establish how the ARPA funds are being used in consideration of what percentage of funds can be used for various aspects of the project. Shane will discuss contract details with Emily and Sue.

Tom brought up “next steps” and Shane said that would be a discussion at the January 22nd Selectboard meeting.

#### **5. Next VWC Meeting**

The next meeting would be Friday, January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024 at 6:00 PM at the Twitchell Building (Town Offices).

The next regular meetings of the VWC will be **the first Friday of every month at 10:00 AM** and **the third Tuesday of every month at 6:00 PM**

Regular meetings held at Neighborhood Connections may be attended remotely as follows:

Via web: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89286067592>

Via telephone: (646) 931-3860

Pass code: **K1s6vb**

Meeting ID: 892 8606 7592 - (<https://zoom.us/>)

#### **6. Adjourn:**

Tom made motion to adjourn, Sharon seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:18 AM

Respectfully Submitted,  
Larry Gubb  
Secretary, Village Wastewater Committee

**Approved** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Village Wastewater Committee**  
Sharon Crossman, Interim Chair

Link to AV recording of January 5, 2024 meeting below.

Topic: Village Waste Water Study  
Date: Jan 5, 2024 09:02 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

You can copy the recording information below and share with others

[https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/UvxLG7zLpdqzN\\_FYXWiwMcW8feFhEvnEQKmlHKM\\_S-QBYQcHI9BqxgkCg1HOgLFB.P3N01YO4D-K8D3pU](https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/UvxLG7zLpdqzN_FYXWiwMcW8feFhEvnEQKmlHKM_S-QBYQcHI9BqxgkCg1HOgLFB.P3N01YO4D-K8D3pU)

Passcode: L6DB&S6-

\* \* \*