

**Town of Londonderry, Vermont  
Village Wastewater Committee  
Special Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, May 7, 2024 – 6:00 PM**

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

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

**Others in Attendance:**

Melissa Brown

**Online:**

Chrissy Haskins (Dufresne Group – Project Engineers), Emily Hackett (EI - Environmental Engineer – VT DEC), Achouak Arfaoui - Indirect Discharge Technical Analyst and Regional Engineer for the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC)

**1. Call Meeting to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:23 PM.

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

No additions or deletions

**3. Approve Minutes**

Tom Metcalfe made a motion to approve the minutes of April 5, 2024 meeting of the VWC, Sharon seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**4. VWC – Updates and Next Steps**

**a. Status of Final Design Contract with Dufresne: Chrissy**

Chrissy believes Emily has approved the contract, but is still waiting to hear from Emily. The 100% Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) has been approved.

**b. Status of archaeological work in advance of additional soil investigations: Chrissy**

Chrissy said the Archeological work is included in the ARPA Design Step Contract and is ready to begin as soon as that contract is approved. She added that the precious time crunch was June 1<sup>st</sup> to have this work done, but deadlines have changed now to September 30, 2024 with Permit applications having to be submitted by the September 30<sup>th</sup> deadline. She said the Archeological work is critical, but with the new timeline the urgency is eased somewhat. Melissa asked if that puts the Town at risk as far as meeting the project schedule timeline.

Chrissy said all the deadline changes from the State and as a result don't put the project at risk. Tom said he thought it was important to see the breakdown of the contract schedule to see if it gets to the 9-30-24 deadline. Chrissy said the Design Step also requires a 30%, 60% and 90% review process and they are factored into the written contract agreement.

Tom asked if the schedule had yet been shared with anyone. Chrissy said the schedule is in Dufresne Group's (DG) contract proposal (now approved) and will be forthcoming when all the approval paperwork has been completed. She said the 9-30-24 deadline is for the 90% design level. The 100% design level would come after comments come back from the various agencies permits had been submitted to. She said the next deadline according to the grant schedule would be the bond vote, which for Londonderry, has already occurred, then the final design in September.

Tom asked if programmatically if Londonderry was on target for meeting state and federal requirements to maintain the grant. Chrissy responded that that was correct. Tom suggested that if we are able to submit 90% design earlier than 9-30-24, it would be advantageous for the putting the project out to bid, asking when bids were required to be requested by. Chrissy responded that per the grant agreement, the project (both villages) would have to go out to bid by spring of 2026. Chrissy suggested that Londonderry's project would be out to bid by late winter, early spring of 2025. Tom asked if that meant we would not be doing any construction during winter and all would take place during warmer months of 2026. Chrissy responded saying no, permitting would take place this autumn (2024) and once permits were in place, the bidding process could take place (late winter, early spring 2025) and construction could begin in spring of 2025. Tom still suggested that this means all would be pushed to 2026 to complete all the work. There was discussion of how many potential connections there may be to date. Sharon said she believed there were close to seventy applications to hook into the systems (north and south villages). Tom expressed encouragement in that number mentioning that a year or 6 months prior, he was wondering whether the project would go ahead. Chrissy said that piping can't be done during the winter and because of restrictions for active wildlife, tree clearing can only occur during the winter months. Chrissy suggested that someone should be hired to clear the Peelle property during the coming winter, in preparation for construction work beginning in the spring of 2025.

Emily Hackett and Achouak Arfaoui joined the meeting and discussion about the contract with Dufresne Group for the Design Step of the project followed. Emily iterated that she had approved the contract and had sent it to the financial branch of her department for approval by Tom Brown and that Tom Brown will have sent an e-mail to Shane for the Town of Londonderry to execute and return to Tom Brown, then to receive a receipt by him that he has received the executed contract. Melissa asked about the process. Emily said that either Shane or Chrissy would come to the Selectboard with the contract for execution by the Selectboard and provide a copy to the State that the contract has been executed. Emily said she believed all the necessary ARPA information is in the system to begin reimbursement whenever reimbursement paperwork is submitted.

Melissa asked if the status of or the schedule for the archeological work was included in the design contract. Tom said that the contract would include all the work that needs to be done to go to bid. Melissa asked for clarification. Emily responded that the next step would be the execution of the ESA (Engineering Services Contract) by the Selectboard and reiterated the process of sending a copy of the executed contract to the State and their sending back a receipt as a matter of formality. She said that included in the transfer of information will be instructions (she said the Town should already have from previous work) regarding how to submit for reimbursements.

Chrissy said the ESA for final design includes a scope for remaining archeological work remaining test pits that need to be done, including the shovel testing, the archeological resource assessments for each village project (two separate agreements). Iterating that included are the ARA (Archeological Resource Assessment) and a budget item placeholder for Phase 1B investigations if necessary, covering all the remaining archeological work in the final design agreement.

Tom asked what sort of field work is required for the archeological assessments. Chrissy responded that the ARA is generally a desktop assessment with some walkaround on the sites, but primarily a desktop analysis. She said any areas deemed by the desktop review and site visits to need further investigation would go into the report. From there the report goes to the Vermont Division of Historic Preservation (VDHP) and if the VDHP concurs a Phase IB investigation will begin, which would include doing more shovel testing. Emily added that the ARA includes what it known as the “area of potential effect” which includes only areas where the ground will be disturbed, including service lines. Essentially only where any sort of digging would occur, not the entire village(s). Tom asked for clarification on what that includes, listing the service connections, the pipelines, the pump stations, the septic fields. He also asked if it included construction easements. Emily responded saying it included anywhere any digging would occur, including service connections on private property. She added that because of recent changes, the VDHP will not concur with any part of the project until 90% design has been completed. She said if a pipe needs to be moved and more digging done, that would be recommended, but the full Environmental cannot be completed until the DHP concurs with all that has been done. She said this is because the NEPA process (Section 106) is tied together.

Tom asked what impact that would have on the project schedule. Emily said there will be a 30 day comment period as part of the Environmental Review and during that period it is important to try to mitigate any concerns that come up as early as possible and keeping DHP informed on all design work from the beginning will be key in reducing the amount of review later in the process. Tom asked if there was anyway to include them right away with preliminary design. Emily said they are already involved because of the shovel test pit work that has already occurred. She mentioned that VDHP would like to see design plans from 30% to keep informed of findings as the designs progress, suggesting that essentially, the earlier VDHP is looking at the project, the better. Tom again voiced his concerns about the schedule and any down time due to adjustments. Emily said that she believed Chrissy had

already begun to work on a draft environmental information document, it being called a draft because the town should not sign it until the design process is further along and additional changes can be minimized or eliminated altogether, having already been made during the draft period. Chrissy added that DG has already begun some of that work with already obtaining an jurisdictional opinion from Act 250 for both sites. She said wetlands delineation has just very recently been done for both sites. She has not yet had time to enter the information into CAD and review. Tom discussed seeing flags on the Town Prouty Park Property and asked if they were part of the delineation. Chrissy said yes and there were some other locations found on the property that would be outside of where the system was planned to be located. She said no delineation was done along the public highways as the piping would be within the “road prism” and anything that was in the “road prism” was exempt from having to be delineated as an impact to wetlands.

Emily added to Chrissy’s explanation regarding the requirement for tree cutting to only occur during late fall, winter and early spring months. She said it had to do with impacts upon migratory birds, bats and other animals in other parts of the year. She mentioned for example, that nesting eagles would require a 600 ft buffer and a federal permit to work around.

**c. South Village Survey Launch and any Initial findings, etc: Chrissy & Alyssa**

Tom asked about progress on surveying both sites and what might have been found during the survey process. Chrissy responded that the entire disposal field site had been surveyed at the Prouty site. She said the north Londonderry site had not yet been surveyed because of the thick vegetation and that trees needed to come down over the coming winter before it could be properly surveyed. She said for now, Lidar topographical information is being used for preliminary design and once cleared, adjustments can be made. She said the collection system areas have all been surveyed in both villages with base maps created and the Prouty site had been fully surveyed. She said the survey information so far gathered is for topographic information and no “conclusions” have yet been made from this information. Tom asked if any surveys had been done on individual properties. Chrissy responded that no, nothing has been done on individual properties. Tom expressed an interest in looking at the base maps. Chrissy said they would be included in the 30% design report and as soon as that had been done, the maps would be available.

**d. Response from VWW info packet mailing to property owners mailed 3/28/24: Chrissy**

Tom asked about the wastewater packet responses and if a spreadsheet has been started to sort out which properties have requested an interest in hooking up to the systems. Tom said he had gotten an inquiry from a property owner across the West River from the Montessori school with concern about hydrogeologic proximity to the south village system. Chrissy said she did see the inquiry and could have responded on her own, but wanted to follow proper procedure and asked a hydrological engineer to respond to the concern expressed. She said the distance between the concerned property is 2,165 southwest from the southern edge of the proposed leach field, was on the opposite side of the river and was at a higher elevation than the proposed leach field. The hydrogeologist had responded that the distance was too

great, the river itself acts as a hydraulic boundary and that the well was not within the isolation area of the potential leach field. There is no concern and Chrissy will send a response to this property owner.

Melissa asked when the spreadsheet might be available and Chrissy responded that she could have it prepared for the next Selectboard meeting. Chrissy said that she would make herself available to come to that Selectboard meeting to speak to the selectboard about the contract and answer any questions they might have about it, as Shane would be away on vacation. Melissa said that would be very helpful in keeping things moving forward. Tom was interested in taking a look at the ESA if possible. Melissa wanted to prepare all the information needed to have the Selectboard execute the ESA with DG so in Shane's absence it could be done.

**e. Status of Project Coordinator/ Coordination Contract: Emily, Shane, Mathew**

Tom asked if Emily knew anything about the proposed contract with the Windham Regional Commission regarding project coordination and a project coordinator for the project. Emily responded that she had been in contact with Shane recently on other matters, but had not seen anything from him regarding a proposed agreement/contract with the WRC for project coordination services. Larry agreed to send an e-mail to Shane asking him about the status of any agreement and if an agreement has been sent to Emily for review in order to keep things moving and in preparation for any Selectboard approvals that need to be made in Shane's absence. He'll also ask Shane about whether he has yet received the ESA from the State.

**f. Progress with Draft RFP for Easement Appraisals: Chrissy, Shane**

Tom asked about status of an RFP for easement appraisals. Melissa asked for clarification of her notes that Chrissy may have been involved in this process and Chrissy responded that no, she was not involved in this, thus far. Emily said that anything that would be paid for from the ARPA contract would need to be approved, but that she had not yet heard anything from Shane. Tom asked for clarification on who defines the easements and who does the appraisals for those easements. Chrissy said DG will determine what needs to be appraised and Londonderry will hire the appraiser(s) to appraise those easements. She added that she believed WRC was initially working on RFP's for appraisers, but was not sure where that was left when the budget for WRC's prior contract work was exhausted. Larry asked Emily if she needed to look at the RFP for appraisers before they went out. Emily said she needed to review any contracts with appraisers, not the RFP. She said her review would be to determine if the cost was eligible and an appropriate value under the ARPA contract. Tom asked for clarification of what properties or portions of properties were being appraised and if it included easements for service hookups at individual properties. Chrissy responded that the appraisals would be only for the properties where the systems would be located and any properties where an easement across a property for system main piping to reach a system was required. She said that appraisals for easements to properties for hookups into the system would not be done or required since the hookup would be paid for by the grant funds.

**5. OTHER – Timing, duties, and assignments etc, at this stage of the project**

Sharon asked where the VWC stood with regard to its role going forward and what are the VWC tasks going forward. Tom suggested that the VWC adds structure to the process that is important going forward and providing various parties involved (Town, Project Engineer, State and other agencies, Project Coordinator) and helps to keep the process moving forward. He said the engineering and technical expertise is with the project engineers and the State who know the ins and outs of the grant funding and process, but the VWC can remain the contact for all the parties and be available to work out any problems that may arise

**a. Review, Revise, Adopt VWW Ordinance per Draft Model proposed by WRC**

Larry asked about the status of the ordinance. Sharon said that there is a draft ordinance written and put together by Sue Westa of WRC. Tom describes it as having “boxes” for the Londonderry Selectboard to fill in based on how they wish to shape a final ordinance. Melissa said she has not yet seen the draft. Emily added that the ordinance and the user fee structure are things that other town wastewater committees have worked on and would be good tasks ahead for the Londonderry VWC.

**b. Discuss Potential Fee Structures: Chrissy, Shane**

Melissa said that the 90% PER proposed some user fees so that the VWC would have some examples and figures to draw from for potential user fees. Melissa felt the VWC remaining intact would be good for the confidence of the community even with a Project Coordinator onboard. Emily also agreed that the VWC remain intact.

**c. Loose ends?11. Next VWC Meeting Date**

Tom reviewed tasks discussed inclusive of Larry contacting Shane on the various items discussed to try to keep the project moving forward while Shane is on vacation. Sharon suggested that the VWC could also call special meetings to work on both the ordinance and the user fee structure going forward. Larry also suggested that once a Project Coordinator is onboard, the VWC could meet with them and discuss how interaction would go forward.

Melissa asked for clarification on planned capacity versus number of requests and how those numbers match up, regarding having enough capacity for all who wish to hook into the systems. Chrissy responded that some requests come from outside the planned designated service zone and some of those were a fair distance outside of the planned service area. Chrissy added that she can put together her thoughts for how potential users or those who have expressed interest should be prioritized and then Londonderry can edit and change if need be, in coordination with Chrissy so any potential edits work. Larry asked if those who may not end up being high on the priority list in the first round could or would be considered for first priority based on completion of the second leach field designed, but not constructed in this round, should that second leach field find funding for construction, doubling the capacity that will be constructed in this round of funding. Chrissy said that would essentially be the case unless a property was still too far away to make the economics work.

Melissa went back to a discussion the Selectboard had about connecting Town buildings to the system, saying the Town would like to connect all of their municipal buildings to the system, but would defer to private properties if there was a greater priority need for them.

**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 Tuesday May 21, 2024, at 6:00 PM

**7. Adjourn**

Sharon made a motion to adjourn.  
Tom 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 May 7, 2024 meeting below.

Topic: Village Waste Water Study (Gail Mann- 802-856-7669)

Date: May 7, 2024 05:59 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

You can copy the recording information below and share with others

[https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/2bmKWbuMCcYo1iTL5V9\\_wvuFXddMdGKkarAqTPdkoFdzktAbTjKVEqAAejn3PQTn.dbD\\_n207R-9NwdzE](https://us06web.zoom.us/rec/share/2bmKWbuMCcYo1iTL5V9_wvuFXddMdGKkarAqTPdkoFdzktAbTjKVEqAAejn3PQTn.dbD_n207R-9NwdzE)

Passcode: W?biDn\*3

\* \* \*