

**RICHMOND WATER AND SEWER  
REGULAR MEETING  
November 3, 2014 MINUTES**

Members Present: Bard Hill; David Sander; Chris Granda; Bruce Bailey; Bob Fischer

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager, Kendall Chamberlin, Water Resources; Chris Fischer; Sheila Bailey; Peter Pochop, Green Mountain Engineering; Harold Irish; Joy and Robert Reap; Gary Bressor; Rod West; Marie Thomas; Kathy Sikora and Ruth Miller was present from MMCTV to tape the meeting.

Mr. Hill called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

**1. Welcome and Public Comment**

Mr. Hill asked if there were any comments from the public, but there was none.

**West Main Extension Report**

The Manager explained that there had been a meeting on Saturday with some of the residents of the study area. The purpose of the meeting was to explain the project, its implications, and to hear what the residents and owners had to say. There were about eight people present, including three property owners and the Manager had spoken with two other owners. Rod West, one owner, read a statement from Peter Mumford, yet another owner. Several owners had not been heard from at all. Additionally, there was some discussion about future connection to this line by the owner of the Riverview Commons mobile home park, who had been working with Cara LaBounty.

Mr. Hill said that there were now three phases to the project, Phase 1 was from the school to the Reap property; Phase 2 was from the Reap property to the end of the West Main study area and now Phase 3 was beyond, to the mobile home park. There was some discussion about the phase three part of the project. It was suggested that the mobile home park might use 40,000 to 60,000 gallons of the roughly 120,000 gallons available. It was noted that the 80% capacity mark was around 95,000 gallons per day. Therefore, even after connection through all three phases of this project we were well below the 80% capacity threshold where an examination of a treatment plant expansion would be necessary

Peter Pochop of Green Mountain Engineering offered a proposal to expand the scope of the current draft study to include this Phase 3, for \$1,000. There was discussion about how to approach this additional work. Mr. Fischer asked if the owner was willing to pay for this work. Mr. Chamberlin said that the town should continue to pay for this, to keep an unbiased opinion on what is involved. This was typically how the town has handled these examinations.

Mr. Hill said he was interested in this because of the possibility of additional income to pay for this expansion debt. Mr. Granda was concerned about the capacity of the treatment plant, and that the economic capacity of the town to handle the additional debt. There was additional discussion, and discussion on the need for additional outreach.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve an additional \$1,000 in funding for Green Mountain Engineering to examine the feasibility of the Phase 3 of the West Main extension study, from the Gateway area to Riverview Commons mobile home park. Mr. Fischer seconded the motion and the motion carried 5-0.

1  
2 Gary Bressor asked what are we asking of people? Are we explaining the costs? Options? If people  
3 have working systems and wells are they understanding what we would be doing?  
4

5 Mr. Chamberlin explained how the Cochran Road expansion project was handled and said that  
6 people were willing to connect.  
7

8 There was some discussion of the Reap project, and they showed some examples of what they were  
9 planning. There was some discussion of how the proposed Gateway zoning revisions would impact  
10 their plans and what they would and would not be able to do, both under the current and proposed  
11 zoning.  
12

### 13 14 Superintendent's Report

15  
16 Mr. Chamberlin deferred his report.  
17

### 18 Economic Impacts of Water Use for Fire Protection

19  
20 Mr. Hill explained that for our current water storage tank, more than half of its capacity was for fire  
21 protection considerations. He asked how do we use fire protection in town? Data provided by Chief  
22 Tom Levesque showed that 85% of calls for firefighting were to areas outside of the water district.  
23 So, then what would the town's role be, in putting water into the fire trucks tanks? He asked Mr.  
24 Chamberlin to explain more.  
25

26 Mr. Chamberlin said that when the current tank was designed in 1965, the original size was projected  
27 to be 500,000 gallons, primarily for fire protection, so that there would remain water service in the  
28 event of a fire. In 1969, when the tank was built, it had been agreed that the tank would be 250,000  
29 and that if all of the water was used for a fire, there would be no water service for a day or so until the  
30 tank was refilled. Mr. Chamberlin had put together a document outlining some of his thoughts, and  
31 took some examples from other towns to show how much fire protection accounted for use of the  
32 water. Based on a study from Edmonton, fire protection use was 5% of overall consumption. If we  
33 used that number, consumption figures for Richmond would be about \$14,576 or roughly \$1,214 per  
34 month. This is \$11,569 per year more than what we currently budget. Mr. Chamberlin also explained  
35 a little about the town of Essex, Vermont, and their thoughts behind adding some amount of money to  
36 the tax bill so that fire protection was paid for by the entire town, not just those on the water system.  
37 Mr. Chamberlin noted that by increasing the fire department's bill for water would make all in town  
38 pay, including those in and outside of the system. It is not just making those outside contribute.  
39

40 Mr. Hill said this was at least plausible to consider a recognition of the costs of fire protection  
41 throughout the town. There was considerable discussion.  
42

43 Bruce LaBounty said that having ISO flow rates only benefited those in the village, since trucks would  
44 carry their own water. Mr. Chamberlin said that ISO ratings took into account the fire system serving  
45 the area, and how compliant that system was. That system as based on gallons, not flow rates of  
46 hydrants. Mr. LaBounty said there was no way to get that amount of water to his home (about 2 miles  
47 from the water system). Cara LaBounty said that tank size was only important in the village, and not  
48 for those outside. There was some discussion, and discussion of possibility of reducing the tank size.  
49 No decisions were made. Mr. Hill said this discussion would continue on November 17<sup>th</sup>.  
50

### 51 Review of Financial Reports

52  
53 The FY2014 year end reports were reviewed. There was some discussion of how much in the  
54 positive the system really was, by taking in \$79,000 in additional revenues but over-expenditures

1 actually reducing that positive figure. The Manager said he would get additional information on  
2 reserve funding for the next meeting.

3 **2. Adjourn**

4  
5 Mr. Sander offered a motion to adjourn at 7:00 pm and was seconded by Mr. Bailey. So voted.

DRAFT