

January 8, 2019

**MEETING MINUTES**

**VILLAGE OF LUDLOW  
WATER COMMISSION**

**Regular Meeting**

**January 8, 2019  
5:00 PM**

**Board Members Present:**

David Rose, Chair	Robert Gilmore (absent)	Ron Bixby
-------------------	-------------------------	-----------

**Staff Present:**

Scott Murphy	Chuck Craig	
--------------	-------------	--

**Others Present:**

Patrick Smart, Agency of Natural Resources	Dana Nagy, Agency of Natural Resources
--	--

**1. Call to Order:**

- a. David Rose called the Water Commission meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

**2. Consideration of any Changes, Additions or Removal to the Agenda:**

- a. Scott Murphy said there are no changes to the agenda.

**3. Approve Minutes:**

- a. MOTION by Ron Bixby and seconded by David Rose to approve the minutes from the December 4, 2018 meeting. All in favor and the motion passed.

**4. Comments from Citizens:**

- a. There were none.

**5. Water Removal Request:**

- a. David Rose said there is a request to remove the water allocation at 136 West Hill Road by David Nichols of DPC Associates.
- b. MOTION by Ron Bixby and seconded by David Rose to approve David Nichols request to remove the water allocation at 136 West Hill Road. All in favor and the motion passed.

**6. Review Godfrey Water Tank Options & Discuss with State Engineers & Otter Creek Consultants:**

- a. Scott Murphy said that he and Robert Clark from Otter Creek Engineering attended a meeting in Montpelier to get a better idea of what the State was looking for regarding the Godfrey Water Tank Level Control Construction Permit Application and Patrick Smart and Dana Nagy from the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation,

January 8, 2019

- Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division offered to meet with the Water Commissioners to provide more clarity.
- b. Robert Clark provided a brief summary of alternatives that he and Mark Youngstrom recommended.
  - c. David Rose asked Patrick Smart and Dana Nagy how they felt about Option #4 which would allow the Godfrey Tank to overflow creating water turnover within the tank.
  - d. Patrick Smart said that from a state-wide perspective there is not one instance in the State of Vermont in which a permit to operate was granted for an overflow. He said this option would create too much waste of chemicals and water.
  - e. Robert Clark said few systems in the state haven't gone through recent or modern upgrades and in general the state has made it clear that they don't want to waste water and chlorinating would be wasteful.
  - f. David Rose asked about Option #3 which proposes adding a mechanical valve to the main line on Andover Street at the location of the present altitude valves. He said this was not originally considered because they did not want to rely on controls to open/close and fill the tank. He thought original Option #1 which proposes installing components within the unused well head building located at the Little League Field would address the issue and at the would be the most practical.
  - g. Robert Clark continued the conversation and said Option #3 it was not ideal.
  - h. Patrick Smart said Option #3 was reliable and used by other communities in Vermont. He encouraged the Water Commission to talk with other communities.
  - i. Robert Clark said there would be zero redundancy.
  - j. Patrick Smart said they could install a bypass valve.
  - k. Ron Bixby asked if the only difference in fire protection was the valve.
  - l. Robert Clark said they could have the system evaluated through ISO because he is unsure of the rating.
  - m. Ron Bixby said as Deputy Chief of the Fire Department he would not want to compromise the fire protection.
  - n. Patrick Smart feels the difference between Option #1 and Option #3 is that in Option #1 there could be less turnover and a higher water age and ice formation in the Godfrey Tank. He said in Option #3 when you are forcing to fill the tank from distribution you would force more water in and out and increase the chlorine residuals.
  - o. Robert Clark agreed that Option #3 would have an increased residence time. He went on to say that he thinks #3 is a viable option but could cause turbidity to the users as the water in the lines would be moving in a different direction than it historically has.
  - p. Robert Clark said it would be guaranteed to turn over more water.
  - q. Chuck Craig said he was in favor of Option #4 as they can treat more water at the WWTF and felt that there would be a lot of customer complaints with Option #3.
  - r. Scott Murphy asked if the water turbidity would be permanent or would it subside after time.
  - s. Chuck Craig said he did not know and thought maybe it would subside after a while.
  - t. David Rose asked from an agency standpoint would there be an equal chance for a permit if they go with Option #1 or Option #3.
  - u. Patrick Smart said they are willing to proceed with a permit with Option #1. He said it may not get you all they way through and it require testing with a metering pump to

- be sure the tank is mixing and turning over. He said they are willing to look at this step.
- v. Robert Clark asked Patrick Smart if could explain to the board why Option #4 would not be allowed.
  - w. Patrick Smart said they would need to carefully evaluate it. There are concerns with the waste of water and would question if it would provide the proper turnover.
  - x. David Rose said this was an issue last year during the inspection and said as you know the Village is working on it but is concerned they would be sited again.
  - y. Dana Nagy explained that the inspection would not happen for 3 more years.
  - z. Patrick Smart said they are geared toward public health protection. He asked the Water Commission to provide a budget with the capital investments and a proposed schedule. He said to provide this in writing and they will work with the water board.
  - aa. Patrick Smart continued that it could work its way into a schedule and permit to operate.
  - bb. David Rose thanked Dana Nagy and Patrick Smart for coming down. He said it was very helpful and that the board was not going to make a decision tonight.
  - cc. Patrick Smart reminded the water board to keep the States revolving loan fund in mind for funding.
  - dd. David Rose asked what the expense if Option #1 didn't totally resolve the issue and a second step of adding mixers to the tank was required.
  - ee. Robert Clark said \$25,000 with a glorified blower to move water.
  - ff. David Rose said he had concerns with Option #3 on account of complaints from users with turbidity.
  - gg. Robert Clark said they would help to set it up with the bid and contractors should not be a time delay sometime in March.
  - hh. Scott Murphy said they will make a decision at the next meeting scheduled on February 5<sup>th</sup>.
  - ii. David Rose asked what Mark Youngstrom recommended.
  - jj. Robert Clark said Option #1.

**7. FY 2020 Budget Workshop:**

- a. Scott Murphy said there is a decreased amount in fees.
- b. David Rose said they may need to look at another water rate increase in May. He said we can take another look at it next time to see if we are ok.
- c. MOTION by Ron Bixby and seconded by David Rose to approve the FY 2020 water budget as presented. All in favor and the motion passed.

**8. Other Business:**

- a. David Rose asked how the Bridge Street project came out.
- b. Scott Murphy said the total was \$149,000. He said the bid was \$114,000 with add on's. He added that the second lowest bid was \$175,000. He said they are still working with Gurney on a \$15,000 difference.
- c. Ron Bixby asked if repairs had begun on the Vail Bridge.
- d. Scott Murphy said it was patched yesterday by installing a plate and then paved. He said they looked at several addition spots of concern to get us to 2021. Scott said they

January 8, 2019

- are asking the state to move us up the ladder and that the SWCRPC is also willing to help.
- e. David Rose asked if users have noticed increased pressures at Bridge Street.
  - f. Chuck Craig said the project was all buttoned up with Gurney Brothers and there was still some plumbing in the basement of the Graves property to finish.

**9. Set Date for Next Meeting:**

- a. David Rose said the next meeting is schedule on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

**10. Possible Executive Session/Personnel/Contracts/Legal Issues:**

- a. David Rose asked if an executive session was needed.
- b. Scott Murphy said no.

**11. Adjourn:**

- a. MOTION by Ron Bixby and seconded by David Rose to adjourn. All in favor and the motion passed.
- b. Meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Pam Cruickshank  
Recording Secretary

---

David Rose, Chairman

---

Robert Gilmore

---

Ronald Bixby