Select Board
Town Of Hinesburg
10632 Route 116 Hinesburg VT 05461
802.482.2281 | hinesburg.org

Meeting Minutes - February 9, 2015
- Approved 2/23/15 -

Attending The Meeting: Jon Trefry, Phil Pouech, Mike Bissonette, Tom Ayer, Andrea Morgante, Trevor Lashua, Rocky Martin, Erik Bailey and attached list.

Meeting called to order at 6:45 p.m.

Executive Session – 1 V.S.A. § 313 (a) (1) (A)

Executive session is necessary to discuss negotiating strategy with regards to the possible connection of four residences west of the new wells to Town water and sewer (to improve overall system capacity and broaden the source protection area).

Phil moved the Board vote to find that the premature general public disclosure of the proposed terms of connection to water and wastewater for the owners of the four residences along Shelburne Falls Road west of the site of the new wells would place the municipality at a substantial disadvantage in negotiating those agreements. Second by Mike B and approved with 5 yes votes.

Phil moved the Board consider a motion to enter executive session, to include the Town Administrator, the Director of Buildings and Facilities, and the Water/Wastewater Superintendent, under the provisions of 1 V.S.A. § 313 (a) (1) (A). Second by Andrea and approved with 5 yes votes.

At 7:00 p.m. the public meeting began.

Public comments; Jon commented on the extra work exceeding his job description done by Rocky Martin with the water project and being short staffed. He presented Rocky with a gift in appreciation of this work.

Attached is a document Karl Novak asked to be included in the minutes of the meeting.

There were no changes to the agenda.

Presentation of Preferred Water Treatment Method and Discussion on Water Treatment

Joe Duncan of Aldrich and Elliot and Scott Shumway of ISI (manufacturer of the nanofiltration system proposed) reviewed how the system the water committee preferred and answered questions from those in attendance.

Phil asked about other towns using this type system. Joe D said there are none in the New England area on a municipal level. The closet ones are Ohio (from 1998) and Wisconsin (2007).

Asked about maintenance needed, Joe said the membranes will need replacing about every 8 years.

Andrea said the Select Board would expect to be made aware if there are any changes to the methods of cleaning them.

Bob Thiefels asked if sodium hydroxide is what is used to correct the PH Joe replied it is. Bob then asked if it could be a constant additive to the water and Joe said it could be. Bob stated the claim is that sodium hydroxide is benign but it might not be.

Asked if pieces of a deteriorating membrane could show up in the water.

The system will be off line when cleaned. It will be completely cleaned and washed before being back on line.

Scott also noted regarding the deterioration question that the materials used meets the safety standard that is set.

George said he is glad the Board is pursuing treatment.

Dan Jacobs asked why we don't see more of this type of treatment embraced in the northeast. Joe said there is not the same need for treatment as much in this area.

Dan asked Scott if he had any information regarding aluminum getting into the water. Scott said he is not familiar with any issues and there is no metal in the membranes we will be using.

Andrea wanted to be sure the treatment building will be energy efficient.

Alan Norris asked about sizing the building. Joe said it is being designed to allow for expansion.

Dan asked if the plan is to hook on Lyman Meadows to the new system. Jon said yes but not in the immediate future.

Future discussion around fluoridation was brought up.

Andrea said she would still like to survey the users to see if they are in favor of treatment, the nanofiltration system and yes or no to fluoride.

The Board took no action and agreed to publish all current information on the treatment proposal to allow for citizen input. They will take this up at the next meeting as an action item.

Consider Adopting a Resolution of Support for LWCF Grant (Bissonette Fields Project)

Jon read the proposed resolution of support.

The grant application is for Federal funds passed through the State of Vermont for recreation and conservation projects such as the Bissonette Fields.

Part of the application process is that the local legislative body certify by resolution that applicable matching funds are and will be available in the event of a grant award. The resolution breaks the available "funds" down by type:

- $231,118.49 in investment income, fundraising, and municipal funds
- $50,502.23 spent to date on the project
- $150,000 in land value

Phil moved the Board vote to adopt the resolution, and to authorize the Town of Hinesburg to apply for grant funds from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. Second by Tom and approved with Mike B abstaining.

Consider Approving The 2015 Certificate Of Highway Mileage

This is the annual filing of the certificate of highway mileage. The certificate is used to determine State aid payments and informs the "official" map created by VTrans. The Board noted that the roads in the Thistle Hill development as well as Weed Road need to be included.

Andrea also said the Town needs to have a list of the 4 rod roads.

Mike B moved the Board vote to approve the 2015 Certificate of Highway Mileage. Second by Andrea and approved with 5 yes votes.

Review And Discuss Town Meeting Budget Assignments

Board members discussed the order of the presentation of reports and taking questions at Town Meeting.

Town Administrator's Report

a. **Water/Wastewater Infrastructure and Development in the Village –** Given the feedback from Tuesday night's DRB discussion, it sounds as though this is as conversation to be scheduled for an upcoming meeting.
b. **FY14 Audit –** The final version was distributed to Board members.
c. **Road Salt Supply** – Highlighted by a recent story on Rutland City's salt woes, the supply of road salt (and winter sand) may become an issue. VLCT is looking into the challenges that may be percolating with regards to salt availability. Most municipalities (including Hinesburg) do not have the facilities to store an entire winter's supply of salt, hence the need to resupply during winter.
d. **Creekside Community Association Stormwater Agreement** – The developer (Milot/Grabowski) has transferred ownership of the detention pond to the association. Creation and execution of an agreement between the association and the Town related to responsibilities for discharge (and associated State permit fees), maintenance, and liability has long been the intended next step. Town Attorney Bud Allen is reviewing the agreement and drafting an easement. The Town has paid its portion of the permit charges ($32.80). The Creekside Community Association Executive Board has been scheduled to attend the 2/23 meeting to discuss the agreement.
e. **Stormwater Regulations –** Stormwater regulations forwarded to the Select Board by the Planning Commission will need to be addressed prior to the 7/23/15 "deadline." The memo from Alex (dated 11/05/14) sums up the process succinctly. The materials in the meeting folder were provided in December as well. From a timing perspective, this will likely be on the Board's docket for the first meeting after Town Meeting.
f. **Hannaford Update –** Mediation, involving representatives of Hannaford, Hinesburg Responsible Growth, and the Town Attorney, was held in Burlington on 2/02/15. It does not sound like the attempt to mediate proved fruitful on that snowy Monday. A status conference is scheduled amongst the involved parties for 2/09/15.
g. **Rutland Town Solar Facility Siting Guidelines –** Rutland Town's solar facility siting standards are in the folder for this week's meeting, along with a VT Digger article from March 2014 on a similar discussion occurring last year in the Statehouse. The article helps highlight the push/pull between achieving statewide goals related to renewable energy and local involvement (and even desired deference) in the permitting process.

h. **Engineering Analysis for VT Route 116/Charlotte Road/Lantman's Intersection –** Alex was able to find an engineering quote related to the project. That quote, from last year, is included in the meeting folder.

Select Board Items

Tom asked what information regarding Hannaford's can be shared with citizens. He feels citizens asking should know what the costs to the Town are such as Town fees and time Alex has put in. Trevor will check what information sent to the Board can be shared.

Jon thanked the Fire Department for the outstanding efforts dealing with the fire in the Village.

Warrants

Mike B moved the Board vote to approve the warrants, including payroll warrants, as submitted by the Town Treasurer. Second by Phil and approved with 5 yes votes.

Minutes

Andrea moved the Board vote to approve the minutes of 1/26/15 as corrected. Second by Phil and approved with 5 yes votes.

Andrea moved the Board vote to approve the minutes of 1/30/15 as submitted. Second by Mike B and approved with 4 yes votes and Phil abstaining.

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Valerie Spadaccini, secretary

Hinesburg
VERMONT

Selectboard Meeting
Sign-in Sheet
February 9, 2015

1. Dorothy Pellett
2. Steve Knowlden
3. [illegible]
4. Scott Shumway
5. Bob Thirfils
6. Dan Jacobs
7. [illegible]
8. Judy Laberge
9. Erik Bailey
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
26.

Dear Selectboard:

Project Censored has been reporting the real news that the corporate media refuses to cover for 37 years. Nanotech was addressed on Oct. 2, 2010. I think you will find the following paragraphs to be interesting.

Nano materials are so poorly understood that scientists are unable to predict how they will behave and are unsure of how to check their safety. Over one thousand consumer products made with nanoparticles, which can be one hundred times smaller than a virus, are already on the market, despite almost complete lack of knowledge of the dangers they pose to human health and the environment. And while these atomic-sized particles may be beneficial in certain medical applications, scientists and environmentalists are calling for more studies.

Unfortunately, regulatory agencies have been slow to contend with the rapid emergence of nanotechnology in the work place and in the home, as well as in the environment in a broader sense, resulting in a dizzying catch-up game in which the applications of nanotechnology continue to multiply while the regulatory playing field has still not been established. Current debate centers on whether safety data is sufficient for nanoparticles containing products or whether further assessment of the impacts on human and environmental health need to be performed.

The past century provides numerous examples of chemicals - lead, dichlorodiphenyitrichloroethane (DDT) and polychlorinated bipheyls (PCBs) to name a few - that were considered to be a great boon initially, but were later shown to have adverse effects on human or environmental health that outweighed their benefits.

Rocky Martin has stated that the two new wells are "high yield" wells. He also said that "high yield wells" have to be "redeveloped" after a few years to maintain their output, usually through hydro-fracturing or chemical methods. During a nano research, I learned that high yield wells can experience "biofouling" of the veins in the rock and that this is part of what causes a drawdown of the water over time. This biofouling has to get cleared out before the high capacity of the wells is restored.

In the future, will nanotechnology be proposed as a cheap solution to clogging and biofouling in the process of redevelopment of our high yield wells?

With the market for nanotechnology ever expanding, there is reasonable

probability that an inexpensive nano-particle filter membrane will appear in the near future. Considering the downside of this technology, will the Selectboard warn the public before thinking of including nano-particles in the Hinesburg water system?

Karl Novak