

# Greenville Town Board

P. O. BOX 100  
GREENVILLE, INDIANA 47124  
812-923-5649

Sept. 11, 1980  
Town Hall

The regular monthly meeting of the Greenville Town Board was opened by President Jack Sprigler. All board members were present, in addition to Gary Getrost and Janice Gibson. Also in attendance were Bob Gibson, Max Mason, Dave Eberanze, Dan Cristiani, Hugh Hudgens and Mr. and Mrs. Geswein.

Minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved. Financial statements were presented to the board.

The following approvals were made by the board:

Charge off of accounts (attached), motion by Mr. Miller seconded by Mr. Spears.

User Contract and Agreement, motion by Mr. Spears seconded by Mr. Miller.

Purchase of Chain Saw, Mr. Spears seconding the motion made by Mr. Miller.

Part time office help, five days per week at hour 3:30 AM to 4:30 PM at minimum wage, in town's factory at end of six months then wage increase of .30 per hour. Motion made by Mr. Spears seconded by Mr. Miller.

Adjustments on Water Bills when a leak occurs, the customer will pay the average of his last three months bill plus our cost on the excess amount,--after it is verified as a leak by the water Superintendent. Motion by Mr. Spears seconded by Mr. Miller.

On Mr. Geswein, he will pay Mr. Bickel for assessment. If Dan Cristiani does the work the water Utility will pay Mr. Cristiani and then Mr. Geswein will pay us for Mr. Cristiani's work plus \$350.00 for meter. Mr. Geswein will take the least estimate.

Payment of the following:

Bob Isgrig Assoc.	1657.20
Dave Snyder Backho Co.	2124.34
Dan Cristiani	3990.00
Environmental Consultants	1200.00
Environmental Consultants	1670.00

Motion by Mr. Miller seconded by Mr. Spears.

Recommendation by Volunteer Marshall Doug Kinsler for a Full time Paid Marshall be hired as soon as possible, because of the many benefits available to the town.

# Greenville Town Board

P. O. BOX 188

GREENVILLE, INDIANA 47124

812-923-5649

Page 2  
9/11/00

Town Attorney Max Mason advised a meeting to be scheduled with Environmental Consultants and Dave Snyder Backhoe because of easement problems and some construction problems. The meeting is scheduled for September 17, 2000.

No other business brought before the board, President Sprigler motioned for adjournment seconded by Mr. Spiers.

Respectfully submitted

*Grace Martin*  
Grace Martin  
Clerk - Treasurer

*Jack Sprigler*  
Jack Sprigler  
President

# STATE OF INDIANA



INDIANAPOLIS

STATE BOARD OF HEALTH  
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Address Reply to:  
Indiana State Board of Health  
1330 West Michigan Street  
P. O. Box 1964  
Indianapolis, IN 46206

September 10, 1980

Mr. Carl E. Barnett  
Midwestern Engineers, Inc.  
P.O. Box 295  
Loogootee, IN 47553

Dear Mr. Barnett:

Re: Facilities Plan  
C180571 01, Greenville

The subject document was submitted to this office in March, 1979. Subsequently, there was an understanding that the Georgetown project was to include evaluation of a Greenville regionalization alternative. The Georgetown Facility Plan has been received and does not include this cost-effective analysis. However, the Georgetown consultant and this office concur that such a project is not practical.

The Greenville Facility Plan is being returned to you on the basis of the attached comments; two copies are enclosed. Although a number of comments are offered, the primary reasons for returning the Facility Plan are to conduct analysis of PRM 78-9, provide proof of pollution, reduce monthly billing and provide an entity structure for implementing proposals outside the corporate limits. Several guidelines are enclosed for your consideration.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mr. Jack E. Hoskins at AC 317/633-0784.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth A. Lee  
Senior Construction Grants Manager  
Division of Water Pollution Control

JEH/ds  
Attachment and Enclosures  
cc: Town of Greenville

Attachment  
Comments on Greenville Facility Plan

1. Refer to pages 11 and 12, the NPDES Permit may have been interpreted to mandate the construction of a centralized treatment plant and sewer system. However, small towns may find this too expensive. Based on page 68, the monthly charges will be over \$25/month (at 4000 gal/mo). The intent of the permit is to control pollution regardless of the chosen alternative for doing so. PRM 78-9 must be addressed in more detail and more extensive proof of pollution provided. Refer to enclosed EPA Guidance of June 12, 1980. This could lead to a less costly solution.

Since your original Step 1 Plan of Study did not include the entire PRM 78-9 scope, an amendemnt could be considered to cover additional costs. PRM 78-9 guidelines are enclosed.

2. Assuming the need for the project is shown, the major cost of the project as proposed is for the collection system. PRM 78-9 alternatives other than a gravity system should be considered. Pressure and vacuum systems should be evaluated as well as individual and clustered systems. Systems operating satisfactorily after years of use need not be connected with new facilities proposed as part of an "alternative" project.
3. A problem of project implementation is created by the installation of systems outside corporate limits. Either incorporation or an RSD could be considered. Provide implementation narrative. State law permits extension of sewers outside corporate limits, however, there must be an entity to provide bonding during construction and assure connection, bill collection, etc.
4. Refer to the Federal Regulation - Appendix A where towns of 5000 or less are suggested (only suggested rather than mandated since Step 1 prior to September 31, 1978), to design for water usage as 65-70 gallons per capita per day. This could reduce the treatment system size and costs. Please note using 79 gpcd, 3.4 persons per household, a 30-day month, and the reported \$6.28/1000 gallons, an average monthly bill would be \$44.84. Please reevaluate the 4000 gallon/month/household reported average.
5. The cost-effective analysis did not include an alternative for Galena having its own waste treatment system. Please evaluate this alternative or provide narrative keeping in mind the need for a Greenville/Galena Agreement.
6. Please note the following comments from our Planning Section:
  - A. The 201 Planning Area for Greenville has been modified to include sections of 19, 20 and 21. Please add these sections to the area previously considered. Floyd Central Junior-Senior High School will be included in the Greenville 201 Planning Area (See attachment).

B. The 201-208 population projections for Greenville are as follows:

<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>
852	969	1057	1117	1168

7. A copy of our partially completed checklist for Facility Plan Review is also enclosed for your reference.