

**RICHMOND WATER AND SEWER
COMMISSION MEETING
October 21, 2013 MINUTES**

Members Present: Ashley Lucht (arrived 6:10 pm); Amy Lord; Chris Granda; Bard Hill; Bruce Bailey

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager, Kendall Chamberlin, Water Resources; Peter Pochop, Green Mountain Engineering; Bob and Chris Fischer; Sheila Bailey; Gary Bressor; Linda Parent; Donna and Toby Lyons; Doug Ferreira; Greg Rabideau; and Ruth Miller was present from MMCTV to tape the meeting.

Ms. Lucht called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Ms. Lucht asked if there was any public comment but there was none.

Tim Ramon Account Request

The Manager reported that Tim Ramon owned a duplex on Church Street that had two meters, and therefore, two ERUs. He wanted to remove one meter, and drop one account. This was an important policy decision for the system, since some apartment buildings did this already but others could possibly do this.

Mr. Raymon said he has done this work already, and now wants to drop his account. He said he paid the water bill, not his tenants. It has gotten to the point where he needs to reduce costs.

Ms. Lucht explained that the current rate policy addresses multi unit buildings on one meter. The ERU was based on consumption of the building, not per meter.

Mr. Chamberlin said that Champlain Housing had 16 units this way, on one meter. Other places had this also.

Bruce Bailey said we needed to hold off on any decisions until we understood the problem. Mr. Granda said that by going to a volume based billing system, with the ERU, it eliminated the need to have more than one meter. But going forward, we should have a policy on this.

Mr. Ramon asked what happens if someone leaves for Florida for part of the year? Ms. Lucht said they would still get charged the base ERU for one year.

After some additional discussion, Mr. Granda offered a motion to close account #2680 and was seconded by Mr. Bailey. The motion carried 5-0.

Rabideau Pump Station

The Manager explained that Mr. Rabideau had inadequate pressure at the duplex he built on Jericho Road. Regulations require the system to supply a minimum pressure, and since we could not, booster pumps were required. Mr. Rabideau had installed these, and the town required an agreement to own, maintain and purchase them.

Ms. Lucht explained that she remembered this issue, and he needed to have a minimum of 35 psi at the curb, and 20 psi under all flow conditions.

1 Mr. Rabideau said that he had between 8 psi and 12 psi at the curb stop, and required the pumps.

2
3 Mr. Hill asked why this was allowed to be built. Mr. Chamberlin said that the approval came under
4 the old State water supply rule, prior to 2010.

5
6 Mr. Hill asked if the town had a written policy on this. Mr. Chamberlin said no, we used to just rely on
7 the Water Supply Rule. Ms. Lord mentioned this was an issued raised in our Sanitary Survey that
8 happened in December of 2012.

9
10 Ms. Lucht said that having the new tank was the only way to address these pressure issues properly.
11 She added that if we have to provide pressure with the tanks, then we have to maintain them. Mr.
12 Rabideau said that the pumps were in the first floor mechanical room and were able to be accessed if
13 needed.

14
15 Ms. Lord asked if we had an agreement with Mr. Irish, the other home on a booster. Mr. Chamberlin
16 said that we need to have one.

17
18 Mr. Hill asked for a review of the bill since it appeared that some items were not associated with the
19 pump installation.

20
21 Mr. Hill offered a motion to approve the agreement and payment of pump installation subject to a final
22 review of costs and was seconded by Mr. Bailey. The motion carried 5-0.

23
24 It was agreed that the agreement for Harold Irish would be presented at the November 18th meeting.

25
26 Water Storage Tank Update – Peter Pochop, Green Mountain Engineering

27
28 Mr. Pochop talked about the proposed water storage tank. He presented to the board his draft report,
29 with conclusions, costs and other factors. He explained that this was an update to the 2012
30 Preliminary Engineering Report. The different tank design options were for two steel tanks, two
31 above ground concrete tanks and one in ground concrete tank, which was the preferred option.

32
33 Mr. Hill asked if there might be any issues with rock ledge blasting and Mr. Pochop said there might
34 be, and some money had been allocated in the estimate for this purpose.

35
36 Ms. Lucht asked if there was a present worth analysis. Mr. Pochop said that there was, which
37 included a maintenance cost over a period of 50 years. This yielded a \$125,000 difference between
38 above ground steel and in ground concrete tanks, where the in ground tank was less expensive
39 because so little maintenance was required. The actual cost difference to construct was \$80,000
40 where the concrete tank was less expensive. The steel tank would be \$1.30 million and the concrete
41 tank would be \$1.22 million.

42
43 Maureen Kangley asked about land cost. Ms. Lucht said that we were presently in negotiations and
44 could not discuss land acquisition costs.

45
46 Mr. Bailey said he was still not convinced we needed three times our current capacity. Ms. Lucht said
47 that this was a separate conversation from the last meeting. The ISO rating was explained and why
48 we needed so much storage capacity for the fire protection system. Mr. Bailey asked what we would
49 gain by going from one fire rating number to the next with a larger tank.

50
51 Donna Saks asked how much land did we need to have? Ms. Lucht said about one acre, in
52 accordance with current zoning. Ms. Saks asked if it was hanging over Jericho Road, and Ms. Lucht
53 said it would be an in ground tank, and about 12 feet of the face of the tank would be visible from the
54 road.

55

1 Mr. Hill spoke of the benefits of the larger tank and how we was trying to apply them to the town as a
2 whole. There was some discussion of this.

3
4 Superintendents Report

5
6 Mr. Chamberlin reported that the tank inspection had been done and although some corrosion was
7 found to have been worse, it was decided that any epoxy repairs might not last the winter. It was
8 agreed that the team would reinspect the tank in six months and provide an updated report on any
9 further deterioration and recommended repairs.

10
11 Mr. Hill asked what the chances were of a catastrophic failure? Mr. Chamberlin said that the
12 inspection company gave no guarantees but it was not likely to suddenly spring a leak.

13
14 Approval of Minutes

15
16 Mr. Hill offered a motion to approve the minutes of September 16, 2013 and September 30, 2013 and
17 was seconded by Mr. Bailey. The motion carried 4-0-1 with Ms. Lucht abstaining.

18
19 Adjourn

20
21 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to adjourn at 7:25 pm and was seconded by Mr. Granda. So voted.