

**RICHMOND WATER AND SEWER
COMMISSION MEETING
February 5, 2018 MINUTES**

Members Present: David Sander; Bard Hill; Bob Reap (arrived 5:45); Jon Kart

Members Absent: Fran Huntoon

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager; Kendall Chamberlin, Water Resources; Brad Washburn, Green Mountain Engineering; Gary Bressor; and Ruth Miller was present from MMCTV to tape the meeting.

Mr. Sander called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

Welcome and Public Comment

Mr. Sander asked for any public comment, but there was none.

West Main Design-Build Results

The Manager provided a recap from last month:

On January 5th the Manager received two bids for the design-build project: GW Tatro/Adrich & Elliott; and ECI (with some assistance from Dubois & King). The results indicate that the cost of Phases 1 and 2 exceed the \$1 million budget we established. In the case of ECI, they declined to provide a cost for both phases but offered a budget for what they felt would move the project forward. GW Tatro offered a cost estimate for both phases (and just Phase 1) but not a firm, fixed price.

Bard and Fran met to review the bids. Their conclusion was that the bids are either too high under current financial planning, or incomplete. The Manager warned a meeting on the 29th to meet with the residents to review options (USDA has asked to attend, also).

Update from the January 29th meeting:

We met and about five landowners were in attendance, along with others, and reviewed the two bids and the concept of the project. Also in attendance was a representative of the mobile home park owner. While most of the discussion was conceptual, it was apparent that the property owners in the expansion area were not willing to move forward under the design build results. It was also clear that the GME estimates were now lower than what the market would support, meaning that to go all the way to the mobile home park would take additional funding, as well as phases 1 and 2. It was agreed that without external investment – either through as-yet unidentified or non-existing grants, more private contributions or other support – the project was not likely to happen. Pending a federal infrastructure bill, the group agreed that this latest effort was not going to work at this time. Still, we have the two responses and if we choose not to select one, then we should formally reject the bids.

Mr. Sander agreed and was glad that we explored other options besides the Green Mountain Engineering preliminary plan. Given the scope and the issues with new users and existing users, the project was not cost effective at this time.

There was discussion on what to do next. Mr. Hill offered a motion to reject all bids as outside the project budget and was seconded by Mr. Kart.

1
2 Mr. Hill thanked the two bidders for their interest and their efforts on the project, echoed by Mr.
3 Sander. He said that this motion wasn't due to quality of bids, or bidders, but the fact that we couldn't
4 make the dollars work.

5
6 The motion carried 3-0.

7
8 Next Steps

9
10 Mr. Sander said that a federal infrastructure bill may come, and this project is essentially shovel-ready
11 if it can be funded. Mr. Hill said that in the future, different interests in users may dictate different
12 funding sources.

13
14 Green Mountain Engineering Contract Amendment – Update Bridge Street PER

15
16 The Manager explained that a requirement for application to the State for revolving loan funding was
17 an updated Preliminary Engineering Report (PER). Green Mountain Engineering had completed the
18 PER in 2010, but it required updating for 2018, and GME had provided a proposal to do that.

19
20 Brad Washburn of Green Mountain Engineering was present to explain the proposal in detail. Mr.
21 Washburn discussed the bridge water line and its vulnerable location, as well as the condition of the
22 upper Bridge Street water line and the storm water work expected to take place.

23
24 Mr. Hill offered a motion to approve the amendment to the contract with Green Mountain Engineering
25 to update the Preliminary Engineering Report for Bridge Street at a cost not to exceed \$21,210 and
26 was seconded by Mr. Kart. The motion carried 3-0.

27
28 Mr. Washburn was instructed to complete and submit the priority list applications for the Bridge Street
29 projects by the February deadline.

30
31 Mr. Chamberlin urged a full engineering update for all of Bridge Street, and gave reasons why. He
32 asked also to include an application for the rail crossing, being designed by Tyler Billingsley of East
33 Engineering. After some discussion, it was agreed that the rail crossing would be an alternate on the
34 Upper Bridge Street application but that a full PER update on all of Bridge Street was not necessary at
35 this time.

36
37 Superintendent's Report

38
39 Mr. Chamberlin reported that he met with a group of surrounding towns regarding sludge disposal.
40 The tipping fees may go up, increasing our disposal costs – moving from \$85/wet ton to \$95/wet ton.
41 This was in large part due to a possible change in future sludge disposal methods. Mr. Chamberlin
42 reported we disposed between 50 and 100 wet tons of sludge per month.

43
44 Mr. Chamberlin also reported that the abandoned steel tank and associated concrete pad would cost
45 \$50,000 to demolish and remove, according to an informal estimate he received. He urged no action
46 on this until a suitable alternative was identified, or there was a compelling reason to do so. He also
47 reiterated his desire to have the old concrete tank with shed roof converted into materials storage for
48 the town. The Water Commission agreed to discuss these items following Town Meeting.

49
50

1 Approval of Warrants

2
3 The warrant was approved.

4
5 Items for discussion at the next meeting, start at 6:00

6 Superintendent's Report
7 Follow up on votes needed on West Main bond

8
9 **Adjourn**

10
11 Mr. Kart offered a motion to adjourn at 6:20 pm and was seconded by Mr. Hill. So voted.

DRAFT