GUILFORD SPECIAL TOWN BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2024, AT 7:00 PM
TOWN HALL, GUILFORD CENTER
STATE OF NEW YORK

Town Board present: Councilmember Jordan Fleming
Councilmember Terence Ives
Councilmember Thomas Ives
Councilmember Matthew Retz
Supervisor Susan McIntyre

Officials present: Town Clerk Jodie Ives

I CALL TO ORDER

Supervisor McIntyre called the special meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Councilmember Jordan Fleming led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

SUPERVISOR MCINTYRE REPORTED THE FOLLOWING:
This meeting was called at the request of the Town Board. This Special Board Meeting was called for the purpose of meeting with Design Engineer, Brendon Becker of Lamont Engineering to review the Guilford Water System upgrades. Also in attendance, Jeff Fuller, Guilford Water Superintendent and David Gorman of Chenango County Department of Environmental Health.

This meeting was designed for the Board to ask questions of the engineer and design team. The public was asked to write any questions they had on cards. These questions and answers will be consolidated, and a response will be provided in a well-researched manner.

BRENDON BECKER REPORTED THE FOLLOWING:
Historically the current water source is Guilford Lake. The current surface water treatment plant is compromised. Also, the backup well on Furnace Hill Road is compromised with arsenic and can no longer serve its purpose. The town is seeking options for an alternative new ground water source.
A well drilled years ago on Gospel Hill did not produce; a well on County 35 (Young's) has good volume but contains sulfur. Three wells were drilled on County Road 38 (Flemings): two of these wells are adjacent to the water tank. The pump tests on these showed these wells did not produce good volume, but they do have good water quality. The third well, adjacent to Dexheimer property, failed.

QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS:

Supervisor McIntyre – "Brendon you mentioned costs to tie in the Fleming wells would be minimal".
B. Becker - minimal in the sense of the main water piping is close to the existing pipes and there are telemetry devices already at the tank which can be used for these wells.

Councilmember Retz – what is the cost of a second chlorination building?
B. Becker – estimated cost of $500,000

Councilmember Retz – what is the consumption (gallons used) per day?
J. Fuller - our system's daily demand is averaging 12,000 gallons per day with additional reserve needed for emergency services.

B. Becker -the Youngs well meets the demand. Adding a second well at this location will be required and these will be easy to connect to the system.

Councilmember Retz - what would be done on the Youngs property for the building being in the flood plain?
B. Becker – The pump house will be built 3-foot above grade. The wells will include a pit-less adapter with a flood proof vent and self-closing valve.

Jeff Fuller – The sulfur issue at the Youngs well is treatable with chlorination.

Councilmember Fleming – What is the additional cost for chlorination treatment?
B. Becker – this cost would be negligible.

Councilmember Retz: Clarify the timeline issues. The Town has been looking for wells since 2013. The filter plant is at the end of its serviceable life. Replacing the current filter plant is not feasible and would require additional funding.
B. Becker - Grant funding expires in October 2024. Most delays associated with this project have been easement negotiations. If the Town moves forward with the design to connect the Youngs well this will show movement in the Grant.

Councilmember Fleming - asks about Grant extensions.
Supervisor McIntyre -the grant has been extended three times to date with a current expiration of October 2024.

Dave Gorman – Describes back up water requirements. The current system specification is approximately 24,0000 gallons per day. If the primary well demand is 20,000/day, the back up well is also required to meet 20,000/day.

Councilmember Retz – We understand that the location of the Young's wells is being questioned in regard to being downstream of septic systems or a future wastewater treatment plant, are there concerns?
B. Becker – A treatment plant is required to be at least 200 feet away from where the wells are.
Dave Gorman agrees 200 feet is the proper distance. The tests completed on the Youngs well show no E. coli and no nitrate.

Councilmember Retz – Sulfur is not our first choice; can you explain additional treatments?
B. Becker - Aeration is usually an option, however this will not work at our site due to site restrictions. The water can be pumped into a clear well (storage) tank and misted with spray nozzles to aerate or a mixer can be added to the tank. All municipal systems are required to be treated with chlorination and most of the time this will address the situation. Peroxide is a great option for sulfur treatment. However, we would then need to install a carbon filter to strip the peroxide from the water which will counteract the chlorine making peroxide not practical. An additional recommendation would be for the Town to install a green sand filter which will pull out any particulates.

Councilmember Retz – is a sulfur treating system costly at the residential level?
B. Becker – not recommended and not cost efficient.

Supervisor McIntyre - would it be valuable to test for sulfur specifically?
B. Becker – not recommended as results are not accurate. Suggest trying a pilot study to be more useful.
McIntyre-Will our project stay within funding sources if we add a pilot study?
B. Becker – Recommend proceeding with the design, add the well control building and include space for the green sand filters to be added later.

Councilmember Retz – What are maintenance and costs annually for a backwash system?
B. Becker – There would be one filter backwashing daily at approximately 200 gallons per day. The filters would be replaced approximately every 5 years, costing $2,000 - $3,000.

Councilmember Terry Ives - What type of septic system is required for a backwash system.
B. Becker – a raised bed system because we do not have percable soil at the site.

Supervisor McIntyre – The wells on County Road 38, currently there are two wells and at least a 3rd well would need to be drilled to meet requirements. If we had a well field with multiple wells tied together, these would feed into a chlorination building. Does this building require a septic system?
B. Becker - This system will require a dry well for grey water at approximately 20 gallons per day.

Councilmember Retz - If we drill 2-3 more wells on County Road 38, what is the likelihood of being in the same aquifer?
B. Becker - So far, all wells are independent.

Supervisor McIntyre – we need to drill 2-3 more wells at the County Road 38 site. We need access to each of these wells and each of these wells will need to be tied into the water system and chlorination building. The town currently does not have an easement agreement for this property and the easement would be required with an allowance for expansion.

The Town's purpose is to provide adequate quality drinking water for our residents in the Guilford water district.

B. Becker - Chlorination buildings at either site have similar costs. The Young's building is slightly larger to allow for additional filtration and a septic system. The Youngs site will also incur the costs of tying the wells to the building and the connection of the wells to the main system, approximately 3,000 feet.
Costs on County Road 38 include additional wells, drilling costs and roads to each well site.

Councilmember Retz – what is the timeline for drilling 3 more wells on County Road 38?
B. Becker – getting a well driller to the site has been the greatest struggle. LaFever Well Drilling is lined up to drill the next well once we know where it is going.

Supervisor McIntyre - The Youngs location is set for the second well to be drilled.
B. Becker - County Road 38 additional well locations are not determined at this time.

Supervisor McIntyre – Is a pump test of the well at the Fleming farm feasible?
B. Becker – would not recommend this. You can reach out 10 feet and have no supply with the well producing 50 gallons for example.

Supervisor McIntyre - Are there any concerns to where the new system is tied in?
Dave Gorman - as long as it is treated before it enters the system and there is no opportunity for cross contamination and there is clear delineation between treated and untreated.

B. Becker- A benefit to tie in the wells on County Road 38; would require a smaller well pump, and less head pressure.

B. Becker brought new water samples from the Youngs well. One is raw and one is treated with chlorination.

Councilmember Fleming asked for a total cost comparison between sites. Is it more cost effective to drill more wells on County 38 than development at the Youngs property?
B. Becker – If the Youngs site is developed there will be the additional cost to connect to the main water line and provide a power source 2,000-3,000 feet.
The Fleming site will require additional wells to be drilled, access roads to each well site, piping to connect each well and a land easement.

Supervisor McIntyre – There are noted concerns regarding a landfill on County Road 38. DEC has installed 3 well monitors for the old dump on the corner of Drachler Road and County Road 38 but these test results are not available currently.
B. Becker noted that the groundwater test show nothing found.

Jeff Fuller – The current water plant was upgraded in 2000-2001 the valves used are now obsolete. The entire building would need to be replumbed. The intake line from the lake to the plant was installed in the 1930's and is terribly corroded causing flow rates to be 30-35 gallons per minute which was once 70 gallons per minute.

FROM THE FLOOR:

Q. Speaker 1 asked what are the costs to the water user? A. Supervisor McIntyre replied that the water district users pay for the project, not the Town as a whole. There are reserve funds for this project, grant funds of $1.5 million and loan funds of $470,000. Water funding sources are made up from two sources; usage fees, water bills every 6 months as well as a water tax. If we stay within budget there could be very little change to what a water user is paying. The Board's obligation is to provide reliable, safe, drinkable and inexpensive water.

Q. Speaker 2 asked do all users pay the same water tax? A. Supervisor McIntyre answers that the tax rate is $2.38 per thousand assessed value for the 2024 tax. You will pay relative to the value of your home.

Speaker 3 Owns property in Sidney and Bainbridge. Taxes in Guilford are significantly higher, and residents are sensitive to costs and the financial implications.

Q. Speaker 4 asks will there be water meters and who pays for the installation? A. Supervisor McIntyre answers that the project funding requires meters to be installed. The meters and the installation are part of the grant funding. Billing in the future will be based on actual usage.

Q. Speaker 5 asks why not have an individual well? A. A community member answered that due to the density of housing in the hamlet you cannot put enough distance between your water and your septic systems.

Speaker 6 A similar project he manages has provided a rate case study for every well location including every advantage and disadvantage for each site. Suggests that Guilford provides similar information to the water users.

Supervisor McIntyre asked that any further questions be emailed to the Supervisor by Monday, April 1st. A complete question and answer list will be published.

III ADJOURNMENT

Being no further business, Councilmember Terry Ives moved to adjourn at 8:02 p.m. Seconded by Councilmember Tom Ives. Ayes: Councilmember Jordan Fleming, Terry Ives, Tom Ives, and Matt Retz. Noes: None. Motion carries.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jodie M. Ives, Town Clerk