

**RICHMOND WATER AND SEWER
COMMISSION MEETING
May 5, 2014 MINUTES**

Members Present: Ashley Lucht; Bard Hill; Bruce Bailey

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager, Kendall Chamberlin, Water Resources; Sheila Bailey; Bob and Chris Fischer; Connie Doherty, Finance Assistant; Donna Lyons; Jackie Washburn; Peter Pochop, Green Mountain Engineering; Bruce LaBounty; Cara LaBounty; and Ruth Miller was present from MMCTV to tape the meeting.

Ms. Lucht called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. The meeting was held in the Richmond Free Library.

Water Storage Tank Discussion

The Manager explained that the town was preparing to file a site plan with the Development Review Board, and also apply for funding. The tank size was a large outstanding issue for both of these actions.

Mr. Bailey said he was concerned about committing to the largest size tank without knowing the full costs. He wanted to know what the costs to the customers would be first and then decide the tank size.

Ms. Lucht said we had deadlines to get this tank approved and constructed. The Manager's presentation from Town Meeting gave a wide overview of costs. Ms. Lucht spoke more about this presentation and what some of the costs might look like.

Mr. Hill said the wild card on costs was grant funding. Mr. Chamberlin said yes, but that only reduces what you might pay but the large tank is the most effective solution.

The discussion turned to the Chlorine Contact Time project, and how that would affect the water storage tank project. Peter Pochop explained that both projects would qualify for state revolving loan fund monies and possibly USDA Rural Development monies.

Ms. Lucht further explained that in the view of the state revolving loan fund, and USDA, our principal problem with the tank was Public Health. They would only fund the consumption part of the tank and ISO fire storage was not part of what they would fund. That meant, the amount they would fund was less than the full cost of the tank. The CCT project would, however, could also be included, but any balances on either project would need to go for funding through the Vermont Municipal Bond Bank.

Ms. Lucht said that the real decision was basing the tank size on ISO fire protection and did we want what boiled down to a 2-hour storage or a 3-hour storage.

Jackie Washburn asked if we should choose which projects we do now, and only do what was determined to be an emergency need? She asked about costs for the driveway improvements and the Chlorine Contact Time and asked what was absolutely necessary.

Mr. Chamberlin said he would rather lose the generator than the driveway, since without an improved driveway at the higher location, he would not be able to get the generator to the water house. There was more discussion on this.

1 Maureen Kangley asked if we could walk the site of the access road.

2
3 There was more discussion on the water tank. Several audience members urged to wait on the tank
4 size decision until the full board was seated at the next meeting.

5
6 Mr. Bailey said he was in favor of a 550,000 gallon tank, and he's not seen anything to persuade him
7 that a 760,000 gallon tank was the best option.

8
9 Mr. Hill said he was inclined to support the 550,000 gallon tank but there were still some process
10 steps in the decision making that were outstanding.

11
12 Mr. Chamberlin again urged a 760,000 tank and said that it was the best thing for the future of the
13 town. This was a 100-year project and it should be built with that in mind.

14
15 Donna Lyons said affordability now was the issue and Mr. Hill agreed.

16
17 After additional discussion Ms. Lucht said that this discussion was tabled until the May 19th meeting
18 where the full board would discuss.

19
20 Mr. Hill offered a motion to table the discussion on tank size until May 19th and was seconded by Mr.
21 Bailey and the motion carried 3-0.

22 23 Delinquent Septage Policy

24
25 Ms. Lucht asked how the interest was compounded. Connie Doherty said monthly. Ms. Lucht said it
26 needed to explain that in the policy. There was discussion on this, and also to change the interest
27 rate from 1.5% to 1.7%.

28
29 Mr. Hill offered a motion to approve the delinquent septage policy, with amendments making the
30 interest compound monthly and changing the interest rates from 1.5% to 1.7%. Mr. Bailey seconded
31 the motion and the motion carried 3-0.

32 33 Additional Policy Matters

34
35 Ms. Lucht noted that there were still outstanding questions with the new rates, such as how do we
36 correct or change allocations under the new system. The new system uses living units which
37 includes apartments, duplexes, etc. How do we know when these are either created or eliminated?
38 What if the assignment is wrong, or a new owner changes, etc. What about home daycare – is this
39 residential or commercial account?

40
41 There was some discussion but agreement that these questions needed to be answered.

42 43 Adjourn

44
45 Mr. Hill offered a motion to adjourn at 7:05 pm and was seconded by Mr. Bailey. So voted.