



Town of Shelburne, Vermont

SELECTBOARD MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, May 12, 2020

Shelburne Town Offices, 5420 Shelburne Road, Shelburne, Vermont

VIRTUAL/REMOTE MEETING LOGIN/CALL IN DETAILS BELOW

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85809112621?pwd=eWQrK0pOUjIQOG1vakxySEc3aTlqQT09>

Meeting ID: 858 0911 2621

Password: 2xmyWC

Dial by your location

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 858 0911 2621

Password: 463730

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kcATiSX1y4>

Call to Order/Roll Call 7:00 P.M.

***Approve Agenda (note late breaking request to add a routine wastewater allocation...)** 7:00 P.M.

***Approve meeting minutes of April 28, 2020** 7:00 P.M.

Public Comments 7:05 P.M.

Selectboard Comments 7:15 P.M.

Town Manager Report/Update 7:20 P.M.

Rescue Squad Update 7:25 P.M.

Rescue Chief Jacob Leopold will offer an update on current Rescue Squad operations – staffing, call volume, reimbursements, funding, and overall budget.

Pro-Tem Financial Advisory Committee informational update 7:35 P.M.

As you know, this committee has met regularly to fulfill its mission. Chair Don Porter will offer an overview of current areas of inquiry and work effort, all leading up to a more comprehensive presentation to the Selectboard on May 26.

***Shelburne Road corridor wastewater capacity issues – overview and solutions** 7:45 P.M.

The short story: “Houston, we have a problem”. It was presumed recently based on calculations, which have now been confirmed by on-site engineering analysis of the sewer main on Shelburne Road and actual flows, that this pipe is currently over capacity and cannot handle more wastewater flows. Roughly speaking, the sections of pipe involved lie between Bay Road and Longmeadow Drive. This is a high priority issue for the Town, in that the Shelburne Road corridor is the Town’s own designated ‘growth area’, where new development or redevelopment has been promoted and encouraged in the Town Plan and via Form Based

Zoning. Yet now we have a key limiting factor to that very growth the Town desires, and where major projects are still being proposed.

Once we learned of this matter, we immediately contracted with Aldrich & Elliot to conduct on site analysis, and to identify, describe, and estimate costs for solutions to this problem. They responded timely, and we have in hand a report with that information (distributed under separate cover). The purpose of tonight is to offer an overview of the problem, and inform you of possible solutions and a cost-sharing concept for your consideration that would help pay for this essential infrastructure.

In briefest summary, there are two options to resolve this wastewater capacity problem, and as always, there are pros and cons to each. In simplified form, these options are:

Option 1: replace sections of existing pipe with larger pipe. This is by far the simpler approach, can be built more quickly and easily, is less prone to unknown complications, and is less expensive, but may not provide the better long-term improvement to wastewater carrying capacity.

Option 2: relocate the Longmeadow pump station, and install lengths of new pipe on the east side of RT 7, bypassing the most problematic sections of the existing sewer line on the west side of the road. This is a more complex and costly project, involves questions regarding unknown surface and subsurface conditions that could increase costs significantly, but provides greater long-term improvement to overall wastewater carrying capacity.

As noted in the report, traditional approaches to financing would involve a bond vote, thus likely postponing construction until 2021. If a decision were made soon on a preferred approach, and if it were possible to finance this locally, then it's possible that construction could occur this year.

Regarding financing, the Town's sewer policy states that if a sewer line must be extended to serve new development, then a developer shall pay the cost. Logically, that policy might also apply here. That said, this is a matter of immediate municipal concern for the reasons noted above. Proposed here is a cost-sharing concept to help get the job done as soon as possible, while ensuring that those benefiting from the project help pay the cost. Presuming that the Town can fund the project up front, then a proportional, fair share contribution from each development project within a defined area served by this line would be required.

It could be a simple mathematical computation. As one hypothetical, (not real numbers and purely for illustration), if the project cost \$200,000 to construct, and gained us 4000 gallons per day (GPD) of additional wastewater capacity, then it costs \$50/GPD. If a new development project requires 500 GPD, then the proportional, fair share cost would be \$25,000 if decided it should be funded on that 1:1 basis. Alternatively, if it were determined that the wastewater system itself bears some responsibility to maintain a functional system, then perhaps developments would be charged 50% of their 'fair share' contribution. In the hypothetical case above, then that development would contribute \$12,500 as its wastewater mitigation fee.

Some might suggest that developments should pay full freight; others might suggest it's entirely our own responsibility to solve. No matter where we might fall on that spectrum, the practical reality is that unless and until this capacity problem is resolved, then no new development currently or prospectively proposed of any magnitude can be accommodated, creating a de facto development moratorium in the very part of Town where we want (re)development to occur.

A proportional, fair share contribution as a mitigation fee is an elegant funding solution that is equitable for all users, avoids the dilemma of either the first or last development being responsible for the full cost, and avoids loading the full cost onto the existing user base. Fees paid would be dedicated to this purpose.

Wastewater Superintendent Chris Robinson and professional engineer Wayne Elliot will be with us to help explain the problem and alternative solutions. What we hope for from the Selectboard this evening is conceptual clarity on the following questions:

Is this a problem we should work to solve sooner than later;

Whether option 1 or 2 appears preferable; and

If you agree that a cost sharing approach is appropriate to pursue.

If determined that this is a high priority, and there is a sense of which option to pursue, then we would do the work needed to return to the Board with a complete proposal on May 26 for a decision on a project and funding approach.

Update on other current issues and events

8:15 P.M.

***Amendment to Purchase & Sales Agreement with Pizzagalli Properties/Healthy Living 8:25 P.M.**

As intended pursuant to the joint agreement and funding approved at the 2019 Town Meeting, Pizzagalli Properties/Healthy Living and the Town have done the necessary due diligence, site analyses, and work needed to prepare and submit to the Development Review Board complete preliminary plan applications for review. We await a determination from the DRB if and when it will hear these applications. The goal is to learn whether the prospective Fire/Rescue project can be approved, as part of information needed to present to the community toward a future bond vote.

That bond vote was slated originally for Town Meeting this past March. Due to unanticipated process delays, the vote was postponed by mutual agreement to Election Day this coming November. Now, given questions of timing of DRB review, the RT 7 wastewater capacity matter, and circumstances and uncertainties created by the COVID-19 pandemic, the parties have agreed to hold off until Town Meeting 2021 for the bond vote. We hope that matters small and large will have resolved before then and returned to a new normal, whatever that may be.

Thus, before us is an amendment to the purchase and sales agreement to that effect, agreeing to postpone the bond vote from this November to Town Meeting 2021.

Please note: the version attached here also requires cost estimates for shared infrastructure by August 1. I anticipate that by Tuesday evening, a new date a bit later into the early fall will be offered. August 1 was chosen when we thought we were still headed toward a November bond vote. From our perspective, the goal is to have these cost estimates in hand far enough in advance of the bond vote for full disclosure and public information/discussion about the total cost of the bond (which includes both the agreed-upon purchase price of \$650,000 plus the shared infrastructure costs yet to be determined). I trust we'll find common ground here that meets our need for sufficient lead time while allowing Pizzagalli sufficient time to develop accurate cost estimates. Bob Bouchard and his team have done great work to date throughout this process.

***Late breaking request for a wastewater allocation for 210 GPD for Lot 7 at Kwiniaska Ridge 8:30 P.M.**

This is a routine request as with the three approved at our last meeting. No issues nor concerns noted.

***Adjourn**

8:30 P.M.

* Decision Item

Times allotted to each agenda item are approximate and may vary depending on the discussion.

Reasonable accommodations will be provided upon request to ensure that this meeting is accessible to all individuals