

**Town of Woodstock
Special Selectboard Meeting
October 31st, 2025
10:30 AM
Town Hall & Zoom
Minutes**

Draft minutes are subject to approval.

Present: Chair Ray Bourgeois, Laura Powell, Greg Fullerton, Vice Chair Susan Ford, Keri Cole

Staff: Eric Duffy, Cody Parkhurst, Alex Beloin

Public: Lauren Rim, Tess Buss, Keri Bristow, Molly Fryer, Kirstin DiPietro, Patrick McLee, Jon Ollin,

Call to order

1. Chair Ray Bourgeois called the Selectboard meeting of October 31st to order at 10:30 AM

A. Additions to & deletions from posted agenda

Many Thanks to Greg Fullerton!

B. Citizen's Comments

Lauren Rim, from the Family Place, inquired whether nonprofits should present information to be added to the budget for appropriations or submit petitions with signatures. Ray Bourgeois advised that petitions with signatures would be the appropriate approach.

Tessa Bus, from the Woodstock Community Trust, spoke about a potential federal grant to increase access to the national park. She requested that the Selectboard consider adding education to their list of priorities when planning for the community's future.

Keri Bristow noted that on November 18th, the Senate Committee for Education would be visiting Woodstock Union High School from 10 AM to 4 PM to assess the state of education and facilities. The public is invited to speak from 3-4 PM at the high school auditorium, and six senators (representing both Republican and Democratic parties) would be present.

Molly Fryer asked the Town to recognize the middle and high school as vital infrastructure. She expressed concern about the state's redistricting process, noting that a recently released map would split up the district, potentially eliminating the high school in Woodstock. She urged the board to commit to working with the school board to ensure the school's continuation, emphasizing that families are economic drivers for the Town.

Ray Bourgeois thanked everyone for their participation and feedback.

Many Thanks to Greg Fullerton

Eric Duffy thanked Greg Fullerton for all his work as a Selectboard member, today is his last day as a Selectboard member he starts as the DPW Director on Monday.

C. Discussion

Hoyle Tanner Presentation and Analysis on ASG Wastewater Plant bid

Kirstin DiPietro from Hoyle Tanner presented an analysis of the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the pre-selection of a biological treatment system for the Woodstock Main Wastewater Treatment Facility. She reported that on October 14th, they received two bids for Aerobic Granular Sludge (AGS) systems:

-Aqua Aerobics' Aqua Norita AGS system (with an alternative bid for a densification process)

-Parkson Corporation's Granite AGS system

Patrick McLee, a professional engineer who is part of the design team, explained the difference between densified sludge and aerobic granular sludge, noting that AGS produces flocks above 200 micrometers, providing benefits including simultaneous nitrification/denitrification, resistance to shock loads and cold wastewater, increased settling, and reduced footprint requirements.

Kirstin DiPietro clarified that the Aqua Aerobics Norita process is a true aerobic granular sludge process, while Parkson's Granite system is actually a densified sludge process, despite their marketing.

The presentation detailed nine weighted criteria used to evaluate the proposals:

- Capital costs
- Construction costs for concrete tanks
- Adherence to design criteria
- Project understanding and local experience
- Life cycle costs
- Aftermarket support
- References from prior installations
- Reported performance
- Commitment to design schedule

Key findings from the evaluation included:

1. Capital Cost:

- Aqua Aerobics: \$2 million
- Parkson: \$1.6 million (about 30% less)

2. Tankage Footprint and Cost:

- Parkson's design required larger tanks in most categories
- Aqua Aerobics' constructed tankage cost was lower than Parkson's by approximately 17%

3. Design Criteria Adherence:

- Aqua Aerobics met design requirements and provided data from installations showing consistent granular sludge operation
- Parkson met requirements on paper but couldn't provide data showing consistent granular sludge or installations operating at the required mixed liquid levels
- Aqua Aerobics offered a 24-month performance guarantee versus Parkson's 12-month guarantee

4. Project Understanding:

- Aqua Aerobics has local experience in Vermont, including the South Woodstock Wastewater Treatment Facility
- Parkson has only one installation in New England (an SVR system in Jackson River)

5. Operations & Maintenance Costs:

- Annual electricity consumption: Aqua Aerobics 141,000 kWh vs. Parkson 203,000 kWh
- Annual O&M costs: Aqua Aerobics \$79,000 vs. Parkson \$104,000
- 20-year present worth value: Aqua Aerobics \$5.5 million vs. Parkson \$5.8 million

6. Aftermarket Service:

- Both offer 24/7 technical support
- Aqua Aerobics has field specialists approximately 4 hours away
- Parkson's closest field specialists are in Florida and Alabama

7. References:

- Both manufacturers received positive feedback from reference installations
- However, Parkson does not have an installed patented AGS system in the country

8. Performance Data:

- Aqua Aerobics provided data from five installations performing phosphorus and nitrogen removal in cold climates
- Parkson provided references but none were branded as their AGS process or operating under conditions similar to the RFP requirements

9. Design Schedule Commitment:

- Parkson scored higher as Aqua Aerobics requires a non-disclosure agreement that could potentially delay the process

The overall weighted scoring resulted in Aqua Aerobics receiving 9.45 points and Parkson receiving 8.5 points.

Kirstin DiPietro noted that Vermont DEC's Water Investment Division had reviewed the recommendation and supported the selection of Aqua Aerobics' Aqua Norita process, confirming it would be eligible for Clean Water SRF loan funding.

When asked about their experience with Aqua Aerobics at the South Woodstock plant, Cody Parkhurst and Alex Beloin stated they've had great customer service, responsiveness, and helpful support.

D. Proposed Executive Session 1 V.S.A 313

Motion: by Susan Ford to enter executive session to discuss a contract matter under 1 V.S.A. 313(a)(1)(A) to discuss a potential contract that, after making a specific finding that premature general public knowledge would clearly place the public body or a person involved at a substantial disadvantage – and that Kirstin DiPietro can come into the room (11:13 AM)

Seconded: by Greg Fullerton

Vote: 5-0-0, passed

Motion: by Susan Ford to exit executive Session (11:18 AM)

Seconded: by Greg Fullerton

Vote: 5-0-0, passed

E. Vote

Selection of ASG bid award

Following the executive session, the Board returned to open meeting to vote on the bid award.

Motion: To accept the bid from Aqua Aerobics and instruct Hoyle Tanner to proceed with them with the understanding that both Hoyle Tanner and the town will be signing an NDA in the future.

Motion: by Susan Ford to accept the bid from Aqua Aerobics and instruct Hoyle Tanner to proceed with them with the understanding that both Hoyle Tanner and the town will be signing a NDA in the future.
(11:19 AM)

Seconded: by Keri Cole

Vote: 4-0-0, passed (Greg Fullerton did not vote)

F. Other Business -None

G. Adjournment

Motion: by Greg Fulleton to adjourn the meeting(11:20AM)

Seconded: by Keri Cole

Vote: 5-0-0, passed

Respectfully submitted,

Kitty Mears Koar