

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

**Neighborhood Connections, 5700 VT Rte. 100
Londonderry, VT**

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

Others in Attendance:

Martha Dale

Online:

Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Shane O’Keefe (Administrator, Town of Londonderry), Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC)

1. Call meeting to order.

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

2. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda:

Shane requested discussion of a scope of work for a Project Coordinator be first on the agenda due to his having to leave the meeting early. All approved.

3. Approve Minutes

Later in this meeting Tom Metcalfe made a motion to approve the minutes of the 3-19-24 meeting of the VWC, Sharon seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

4. VWC – NEXT STEPS post SB approval on 3/18/24 of Draft VWW Info Packet to property owners in project target area.

- a. Discuss South Village Survey Launch and any Initial findings, etc: Chrissy & Alyssa
- b. Response from VWW info packet to property owners mailed 3/28/24: Chrissy
- c. Update re: Process for contracting /hiring Project Coordinator: Emily, Shane
- d. Proceed Draft RFP for Easement Appraisals: Chrissy, Shane
- e. Confirm process for responding to incoming email re: Comments/Questions

Shane wanted to make sure the VWC is clear on a Project Coordinator position, stating that the Town staff is currently fully engaged with Town business and projects.

Tom had put together a list of bullet items describing what he thought a Project Coordinator's duties would encompass and asked for additional input from Shane and Chrissy if they see other additional things or overlap with things they would be doing.

Tom's list of bullet items are as follows:

For Design step of the project;

- ARPA Vermont pay applications review.
- Bid item preparation and review (to ensure consistency with how contract is organized with Chrissy's recommendations).
- Engineering pay applications review (of Dufresne Group work).
- Permit coordination and expediting (ensuring permit issues are attended to on a timely basis).
- Critical path management and scheduling (meeting time critical deadlines).
- Resident liaison manager (liaison for Town involving connections to the system)
- Sewer ordinance coordinator (work with Town Administrator and VWC on how ordinance is being prepared and submitted to SB for approval).

For the Construction step of the project;

- Contract coordinator with Vermont and local government (coordination of the requirements of the town into the front end documents for the EJCDC® (Engineers Joint Contract Documents Committee®) between the Town, State and project engineers.
- Vermont construction pay applications review and preparation (pay applications to pay contractor(s) for work performed).
- Coordination on change orders and request for information for the Town.
- Coordinate bidding and award for the Town (going through bid process and managing any issues that may arise).
- Coordination of contract and permit closeouts with Vermont state agencies.

Shane thought Tom's list of Project Coordinator responsibilities sounded good for applying to a scope of work and said he would be willing to work with Tom to create a scope of work to be run by Emily and Chrissy. He mentioned that Emily had already commented online in text saying, "we need to focus on Step 2 Design Project Coordination at this point for Scope of Work. Step 3 tasks would be another scope of work when ready for Bid and Construction."

Chrissy clarified that the projects are separated into 3 steps. Step One is the planning phase, Step Two is the design phase and Step Three is the construction phase. She said that funding is also separated into the various steps so focus at this time should be on finalizing Step One, starting with and continuing Step Two. She said that Dufresne Group (DG) will be doing bid preparation using a EJCDC® format with modifications from the State which are required to be used. She added there is some flexibility in supplementary conditions where specific Town requirements could be added in, but said there is very little else that the Town will be able to change. She said

that DG would handle all the permitting as it has to be done by a licensed engineer. She continued by saying reimbursement requests would be a good responsibility for a Project Coordinator. She said that there would be no separate requests aside from engineering and they will all come on a single request form, adding that Shane is familiar with how they come and with doing them. Schedule management would be a good responsibility for a Project Coordinator (PC). Acting as liaison for residents and working with DG would also be a good job for a PC as well as ordinance coordination. When the Construction step (Step 3) begins, DG will be handling most of that work and there will be further conversation at that time to determine what may be needed beyond their responsibility.

Emily added that her office review of the scope of work just wants to make sure the PC will be doing all the things the Town wishes them to do and not overlap with DG's scope. Tom said he will work further on a scope and send to Shane, Chrissy and Emily for review and comments. Tom asked if a PC would be hired through Emily's office. Chrissy said the PC would be contracted by the Town with a required review by Emily's office to go over the scope and the budget. Tom asked if there is a current contract with Windham Regional Commission (WRC) and a standard scope of work document that would be inserted into a contract with WRC. Chrissy said there is already a contract with WRC which could be modified with a new scope and budget developed by WRC. It would still have to go to Emily for review because of the new scope and budget.

Tom asked if the pay applications for these types of services was monthly or quarterly. Emily responded that for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) applications could only be made monthly and for ARPA application can be made more than once a month. She said the applications need to be accurately separated as to which funding they will be drawing from or they cause a lot of confusion for those doing the reimbursements. She added that this would be a good job for a Project Coordinator to work with DG to ensure requests went to the proper funding sources, saying this will help with expediting reimbursement. Chrissy added that the only CWSRF funding remaining is for finishing up Step One work and once that work is completed the thought is that all funding will come be sourced from ARPA. She said there were separate funding numbers for the Londonderry projects, one being for the north village and another for the south village. She continued to say that for each step there will be separate numbers that apply for each village, so Step One has separate numbers for each village, Step Two (Design) will have separate numbers and Step Three (Construction) will mean another set of numbers.

Tom asked if Chrissy knew of anything going forward that would not be covered by ARPA funding. Chrissy said that once the work funded under the CWSRF funding was completed all work was budgeted to be paid for by ARPA funding. Emily said the bond vote portion would be paid for by Town which would be a loan through the CWSRF. She didn't know if there was any subsidy available for design in the next fiscal year which is something the Town may want to look into to take advantage of all the funding the Town might be able to use. Chrissy added that once construction began, the Town portion (the bond amount – loan through CWSRF) would then be used.

Tom asked if there will need to be funding to pay for the preparation of the application for

Step 3 which is not covered by any funding that is in place or will be in place? Chrissy responded that there will have to be a loan application filled out for the CWSRF loan in the bonded amount. She said DG will be doing that work. Tom asked if that will fall under the scope of work for Step Two. Chrissy said there may be a small portion of work that would involve gathering information from the Town to fill out the application. Tom asked if the WRC contract funding for Step One was still in place. Emily responded that that funding, used for public outreach, had already been exhausted. She added that their budget had been exhausted by last August, but they had continued to work being mindful that the bond vote came later than originally thought it would be.

Because of Shane's short availability for the meeting, agenda items were delayed. Martha suggested a return to the top of the agenda to complete those items.

Tom had several items he wished to add to the agenda. One was the status of the final design engineering contract with Dufresne Group and the scope of work review. Another was the status of the 100% PER (Preliminary Engineering Report).

Minutes of 3-19-24 meeting were approved

Sharon moved to the next steps discussing the approval of the packet that was mailed to property owners on 3-20-24 and where the south village survey launch stood with any findings thus far.

Chrissy said as much surveying had been done as could be done in both the south and north villages before the weather moved in with substantial snowfall, but they were able to finish up all but some details which will be needed and surveyed later. She added there were no findings to report adding it was just a topographical survey. Tom asked if it involved properties. Chrissy responded that the survey at this time was of the public R.O.W. (Right of Way) and building corners, saying that once more information is known about locations of septic tanks, septic field, where their line comes out of their building which will be coordinated and done at a later point once it is known which properties will be hooking into the system and where lines to the buildings will be located. She said if there were any obvious and easy features like septic tank covers, etc. they added it to the survey they had done, but otherwise they would have to go back for more detail at a later date.

Tom asked if the public R.O.W. survey included non VTrans R.O.W.'s like Main Street and if VTrans had topo maps that could be used. Chrissy said they needed to have their own surveys and VTrans would not be able to provide them with the information they needed in a format they could use. She said topo surveys were done of the Prouty property area that was intended to be used, down Rte. 100, up Crescent Street, up Middletown Rd., down South Main Street, Old School St., the North Main Street and up Edge Hill Road in the north village. Sharon asked how far down South Main Street in the south village did the surveying go. Chrissy responded that it went as far down as the Swinburne residence. Sharon asked why the surveying stopped there. Chrissy responded that the properties get larger past that point and the report shows that area

as the core user area. Tom mentioned that it could go further within ¼ mile if enough people expressed an interest. Chrissy said this was correct, that the area ¼ beyond the designated village center was possible and people beyond that could also be served, but would have to pay for their connections, saying it would not make cost effective sense run a long pipe to a single hook-up. She said there were requests from people outside the service area and she has let them know that those inside the service area will get first priority. She added that if there was a cluster of properties that wanted to hook up outside of the service area and there was available capacity, it would be more cost effective to run a pipe to them.

Sharon asked what Chrissy was seeing from the returns of the letter sent out asking property owners about interest in hooking into the system. Chrissy said that so far she had only received two responses from the letter. Prior to the letter she had gotten 12 inquiries about hooking up, not including the town hall, the town offices and the library. She said about a half a dozen other property owners had asked questions about the system, but without yet expressing an interest in hooking into the system.

Martha said she had heard from people who are not full time residents who felt out of the loop regarding the project and had gotten the letter, but felt it did not provide enough information to them for them to make decisions about whether to hook into the system. She asked where she could direct them for more information. Tom said the Town website has information about the project and Larry thought the WRC webpage was still on the WRC website. Chrissy added that her contact information was on the letter that went out and that would be the best way for people to have their questions answered.

Sharon said she thought it was curious that people were not getting enough information and wondered if the VWC should do a second letter. Martha mentioned that the people that contacted her knew of informational meetings, but had not watched any of the recordings. Larry said that the 3 informational meetings done to date were recorded to the Planning Commission ZOOM account which resided at the Town Offices. He added that all the meetings were also recorded by GNAT (Greater Northshire Access TV) and he will send links to those meetings to Martha. Martha thought information should be easily made available rather than having a difficult time trying to find them. All agreed.

Chrissy was curious about who had gotten the letters since Martha said the property owners were near Parsons Lane, saying that letters were only sent out to those in the designated service area, which would not extend that far. She didn't want Martha to identify the property owners by name, but asked if Martha could indicate which properties got the letter. Martha indicated that the property owner who got the letter lived one property away from Parson's Lane and then mentioned it to another property owner on Parson's Lane. Chrissy said her list only included property owners in the designated service area. Sharon said she had worked with the Town Assessor to develop the mailing list saying the total sent out was 101. Tom asked how many were in Chrissy's list. Chrissy said that her list for both villages included 87 properties, adding that the problem with adding people to the list meant that some people may want to hook into the system and will not be able to. There was confusion as to how the extra properties were

added since Chrissy provided addresses to the properties in the planned service area. Sharon thought it may have had something to do with people who owned properties both within and outside of that area. Chrissy said she got a e-mail from someone who had gotten the letter who was 3,500 feet beyond the planned service area and another had e-mailed her to say they had thrown out the letter. Another had not yet gotten the letter, but got it a little later because of being out of town. Tom mentioned that the letter asked people to respond by April 8th. Martha mentioned that it was a quick turnaround, but that it was needed for the timeline the project is on.

Chrissy said the contract had not been finalized. She said she did get the responses she need to get from Emily.

Tom said he was willing to work with Chrissy and Shane to develop a scope of work for the project coordinator.

Sharon asked about the RFP's for easement appraisers. Chrissy responded that she is not involved in that and Shane is working on them. Larry believed that Shane had already sent out RFP's to appraisers to see who was available. Tom asked how many properties need appraisals. Chrissy said she believed it was three total. Tom asked if appraisals would be needed for all of the service connections. Emily said no appraisals would be needed for the service connections paid for by the project, but they would need temporary and permanent easements on private properties. Chrissy added that appraisals would need to be done where systems are located on private property and where a main pipe crosses a private property.

Chrissy is handling questions from potential users or others, that are of a technical nature and said she would refer any Town related questions to Shane, the VWC or others. She added that so far all questions have been technical. Tom asked about the nature of the technical questions. Chrissy responded that they have been about whether pumps make noise, will the pumps be run off of their property's electrical service, can the pumps run off a generator, etc. Tom said the pumps should use no more power than their water pumps.

- 5. OTHER – Timing, duties, and assignments etc, at this stage of the project**
- a. Review, Revise, Adopt VWW Ordinance per Draft Model proposed by WRC**
 - b. Discuss Potential Fee Structures: Chrissy, Shane**
 - c. Loose ends?11. Next VWC Meeting Date**

Tom suggested the VWC was in the “review and revise” stage for the VWW Ordinance and asked if we wanted to address it now or later and whether it would be useful for people to know how the Selectboard (SB) plans to pay for the capital costs with regard to applying them to the grand list or users only. Martha asked when this discussion should happen. Larry said that the VWC had already recommended to the SB that the capitol costs should be spread across the grand list and that users only pay for the operation and maintenance (O&M) costs through user fees.

Martha asked if Sharon would talk to Shane about the soonest this decision could be placed on the Selectboard agenda. Larry suggested from a comment made that the bond vote was in some ways a confirmation that the capital costs be spread across the grand list.

Martha iterated that second home owners have expressed that this is another add on to their tax bill that will go to something they do not directly benefit from. The VWC and Martha understood and agreed that there is a benefit to all taxpayers, even if it is not a direct benefit from the standpoint of plugging into the system.

With regard to the ordinance, Tom asked if there was a central location for the ordinance that all could recommend changes to on the same document to avoid the submittal and confusion of all submitting different documents with their edits and then trying to coordinate them all. He recommended something like a “Google Doc” where the SB, Shane and the VWC could edit and have the edits tracked (and rejected or accepted), it would be very useful to this process, perhaps having Shane or the Project Coordinator be manager of the document. Martha suggested that Shane would be the person to bring a draft to the Selectboard for their comments then a revised draft for final approval based on recommendations from this committee and Shane to adopt the ordinance. Sharon will resend the ordinance that Sue Westa had worked on and modified preliminarily to fit Londonderry to Martha, Melissa and all on the VWC.

The discussion turned to fee structures, what to recommend and how to coordinate. Larry brought up “high strength waste” and a higher fee for properties that need pretreatment and how to structure those higher fees since the O&M will be higher for those properties that need pretreatment. Tom discussed suspended solids and BOD (biological oxygen demand) and presented a possible means to base the higher fees on by testing BOD.

Emily suggested a surcharge for high strength waste saying each community has a different number for BOD limits. She said pretreatment is more challenging in that it falls under a different program. She said that the Town may want to put in the ordinance that a brewery requires pretreatment or that a restaurant needs a grease trap. She added that Wolcott’s ordinance would be a good example of how they have addressed pretreatment in a similar situation to Londonderry. She said Montgomery, VT has a larger system based on having more restaurants and being a ski community, but they may be a good example. She was unsure of whether they had a set BOD value. She suggested Londonderry could set a BOD value as an option. She said Brattleboro is going to a very large system and thought they had set a BOD value of 200. Chrissy said the Regional Program (for wastewater) is now requiring pretreatment for any business that does any sort of food service. Tom asked if this was a retroactive regulation and Chrissy responded that those already in business are grandfathered. It applies to all new businesses or changes of use which would include food service. She said any sort of food prep, including serving coffee, the regulation applies. Tom asked what sorts of concerns like this there are for the Londonderry systems. She said high BOD, unusual pH levels would be a concern.

Emily said that there will likely be some internal discussion regarding this as it appears to be a new requirement. Chrissy said that this has been a requirement for all Regional Program permits

over the last year for any sort of food service, mentioning one business in Londonderry that is struggling with this requirement.

Tom asked about his additions to the agenda. He asked Chrissy where DG was with the Step Two contract. She said she has gotten all the comments she needed from Emily, but that she had been ill all week. She said she will be working with Shane to have it done for the April 15th Selectboard meeting. When completed, that would still need approval from Emily. Chrissy said she has the scope mostly written, but had not had a chance to complete it while she was ill.

Tom asked about the status of the 100% PER. Chrissy said she had received comments from Emily on the report, which were very minor, but that she had not worked on that this week because of being ill. She said that should be done very quickly and said that it must be completed and back to Emily for approval by April 15, 2024 per the grant agreement.

6. Next VWC meeting date?

Sharon asked about meeting schedules ahead in consideration of the work the VWC is continuing

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**

The next meeting of the VWC will be on April 16, 2024, at 6:00 PM

7. Adjourn

Sharon made a motion to adjourn.

Larry seconded.

Motion passed.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:20 AM

Respectfully Submitted,

Larry Gubb

Secretary, Village Wastewater Committee

Approved _____.

Village Wastewater Committee

Sharon Crossman, Interim Chair

Link to AV recording of April 5, 2024 meeting below.
Topic: Village Waste Water Study (Gail Mann- 802-856-7669)
Date: Apr 5, 2024 08:51 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
You can copy the recording information below and share with others.

https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/MKMMnhI5SrrXJiMvRjMrW8t5qV2f-fV8S8muClymMgDS8DdpLzQKbu_oatdw_cYm.LfIDlnjnyoW78zE

Passcode: x9qFFpd.

* * *