

**MWRA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 20, 2005
BRADLEY ESTATE
2468B WASHINGTON STREET, CANTON, MA
Minutes Approved at the January 19, 2006 Meeting**

Forty-seven people were in attendance, including twenty-five voting members: Don McCabe, ARLINGTON; Peter Castanino, BELMONT; John Sullivan, BOSTON; Charles Barry, BROOKLINE; Ed Sullivan, CANTON; Andrew DeSantis, CHELSEA; Barbara Wyatt, GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEE; William Hadley, LEXINGTON; Bruce Kenerson, LYNNFIELD; Dana Snow, MARBLEHEAD; Doran Crouse, MARLBOROUGH; Don Ouellette, MEDFORD; Katherine Haynes Dunphy, MILTON; John Cosgrove, NEEDHAM; Lou Taverna, NEWTON; Bernie Cooper, NORWOOD; Ted McIntire, READING; Larry Barrett, STOUGHTON; Patrick Fasanella, WALPOLE; Walter Woods, WELLESLEY; Earl Forman, WESTON; Bob Angelo, WESTWOOD; Michael Chiasson, WEYMOUTH; Zig Peret, WILBRAHAM; Michael Woods, WILMINGTON.

Also present: John Carroll, Andrew Pappastergion and Joseph Foti, MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS; Michael Trotta, Canton; Nan Crossland, DEDHAM-WESTWOOD WATER DISTRICT; Dennis Meehan and Barbara Stevens, LEXINGTON; Peter Tassi, READING; Ana Singleton, STOUGHTON; John Gall, CAMP DRESSER & McKEE; Mike Gildesgame, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION & RECREATION; Duane LeVangie, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION; Ed Bretschneider, WAC; Matt Boger and Phil Jasset, UCANE; Michael Hornbrook and Dave Brew, MWRA STAFF; Joe Favaloro, Cornelia Potter, Ryan Ferrara, Andrea Briggs and Mary Ann McClellan, ADVISORY BOARD STAFF.

A. WELCOME

Chairman Katherine Haynes Dunphy called the meeting to order at 11:41 a.m.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 15, 2005

A Motion was made **TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 15, 2005 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

C. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MWRA Advisory Board Executive Director Joseph Favaloro reported that DEP Commissioner Robert Gollodge has rejected the recommended final decision of the judge and reaffirmed the variance for the Blue Hills Covered Storage Project. However, the Friends of Blue Hills have filed a move for reconsideration that will be on the docket for further discussion. As things stand now, the Authority is moving full steam ahead on this project and has already begun draining the Blue Hills Reservoir.

The preliminary work on the 2005 Water & Sewer Retail Rate Survey is nearly done and the proof will be mailed out to communities in the next week or so for final approval.

D. PRESENTATION: DRAFT MASSACHUSETTS WATER CONSERVATION STANDARDS/DRAFT WATER MANAGEMENT ACT PERMIT CHANGES – Mike Gildesgame, Acting Director Office of Water Resources, Department of Conservation and Recreation and Duane LeVangie, Water Management Section Chief, Department of Environmental Protection

Mike Gildesgame, Acting Director of the Office of Water Resources in the Department of Conservation & Recreation (DCR) stated in 1992 the Water Resources Commission (WRC) approved Water Conservation

Standards for the Commonwealth in response to a number of questions, issues and policy directives from the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA) and from various environmental agencies to set goals, objectives and standards for water suppliers and consumers to achieve in terms of water conservation and water use efficiency. Since then various agencies have been using them as guidelines including the Inter-Basin Transfer Act reviews that come before the WRC and the Water Management Act Program at the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

Public input is being sought on the new draft standards at a public hearing being held today in Boston; another public hearing will be held in Worcester on October 27 at DEP. In addition, the standards were on the October 6 WRC agenda and will be on the November or December agenda for a final vote. Staff of the WRC and EOEA will be accepting written comments through November 1.

The Massachusetts Water Policy was developed under Secretary Roy Herzfelder and approved in 2004. One of the points in that policy was to revise these standards and include measurable criteria for use in permitting decisions, grants, awards and loans that could be incorporated into stress framework.

To develop the new draft, EOEA and DCR convened a working group, with a broad representation of interests, in early 2005 and held six meetings that culminated in June. The main agenda was to review the standards, to identify what should stay in from the 1992 version, what should be added and what should be edited. The group looked at the Inter-Basin Transfer Act (ITA) Performance Standards and the Water Management Act (WMA) permitting process to decide if any of those standards should be adopted into the Conservation Standards. The group identified data needs that weren't being met.

Newly added to the outline of the standards are comprehensive planning, water audits, which were added to leak detection, agricultural water conservation and lawn/landscape standards. The standards are achievable, implementable, and practical measures that should be adopted by water suppliers and state agencies. The recommendations should be considered and adopted wherever possible. While the standards are not mandatory by themselves, they will be required by and enforceable through existing regulatory programs such as the WMA permit and the ITA. At this point, it is unclear how the standards will apply to WMA registrations for 2008.

Comprehensive planning will include a drought management plan and an emergency management plan. Water audit guidelines were added on how often leak detection should take place and under what conditions. Meters used to record quantity should be calibrated according to the type and specification in the American Waterworks Association guideline. A set of recommendations for those who can implement the standards is full cost pricing; all the costs of operations, maintenance and capital spending that goes into delivering water should be accounted for in pricing.

All communities should strive for 65 gallons per capita per day (gpcpd) for residential indoor and outdoor water use. If water use in a community is above 65 gpcpd, the community should implement a Comprehensive Residential Conservation Program. Staff knows that older communities' aging infrastructure and some economically disadvantaged communities have a problem with the capital outlay to do this, but the hope is all water suppliers will move in this direction.

For the public sector, indoor and outdoor water audits for both municipal and state buildings are sought to analyze their data for leaks and inefficient uses. Water audits for industrial, commercial and institutional use buildings, especially those using 50,000 gallons per day or more, will focus on efficient use, not only of water but of their process.

Agricultural water use is a new item for the standards, which essentially seeks better management practices for agricultural irrigation. The Lawn & Landscape standards and recommendations were developed and approved by the WRC and adopted by the Commission as part of the overall State Water Conservation Standards and outline increasingly stringent water user restrictions. Restrictions on outdoor water use should be tied to an environmental trigger, whether it is stream flow or groundwater levels, and that would

be part of the community water demand management plan to maximize efficient water use to preserve the resource.

Phil Jasset asked how much the regulators want to reduce the MWRA communities' water use because it is going to affect the cost to the homeowner who will have to pay more per gallon. It seems logical that the MWRA would be treated differently than some areas of the state that have a severe water shortage. Mr. LeVangie said the task force has seen that in a number of communities when efficiency increases, the sales go down and cost per gallon goes up. These standards do not actually address that aspect.

Mike Hornbrook said he could envision a situation where the MWRA is spilling billions of gallons a year at Quabbin Reservoir, yet will have to tell its customers that they have to ratchet down their water consumption to 65 gpcpd; it is not practical and does not interact with the basins health. Is there language in the draft measures that says the MWRA is exempt from those standards? Mr. Gildesgame said no; the question of how these standards apply to MWRA has yet to be determined.

Walter Woods asked what discussions have taken place in your meetings to enforce these standards. Mr. Gildesgame said the standards themselves don't have any legal teeth; these standards could be a permit condition under the WMA or under the Inter-Basin Transfer Act that once approved by the WRC or the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) then has the force of law.

Chairman Dunphy said there was a suggestion that every community be asked to hire a full or part-time Conservation Manager; most communities are having difficulty maintaining current personnel. Mr. Gildesgame said that is why it is a recommendation, where it is practical and feasible, existing staff could be asked to take on that role.

Dana Snow asked if this process qualifies under a provision of local mandates; will communities be receiving money to bring themselves into compliance? Mr. LeVangie said DEP offered a grant last June that gave priority to people going through reviews and in stressed basins to address things that will meet the performance standards. Last year's allotment was \$400,000; it may be available this year too.

Mr. Snow said his community meets a lot of the requirements upfront, but if revenue is cut by 20 to 30% from reducing the volume that can be sold, then there will be a dramatic increase to the cost of water within my own community to support my local program. The MWRA, in the condition that it is in and the amount of water it has, has got to be looked at as an animal that is a have as opposed to a have not.

Mr. Carroll said currently MWRA communities are using 235 MGD and the safe yield is somewhere between 275 and 335 MGD for the Quabbin; why would it apply to MWRA communities? Mr. LeVangie said that decision has not been made; DEP has two years to decide as registrations expire on January 1, 2008. Discussions are just beginning on what to do with the registrations.

Andrew Pappastergion suggested it would be prudent for the regulators to have the answers before a vote is taken. Mr. Gildesgame said that is why we have the public comment period.

Charles Barry noted that the vote is scheduled for the next couple of months and will be enforced in December, yet there are no answers and the information is still being discussed. Mr. Gildesgame said the vote does not have to take place in December. If EOE receives written comments and information from the public comment hearings that there are issues that need to be dealt with before the Commission votes, the vote could be postponed.

Water Management Section Chief Duane LeVangie of the Department of Environmental Protection spoke on the Water Management Program permitting policies that went into place in April 2004, which include performance standards that are required of public water suppliers who are permitted with DEP. DEP has heard feedback from communities on the impacts the implementation of this policy will cause.

In April 2005, DEP convened an internal and external focus group consisting of water suppliers, environmentalists and municipal government personnel to talk about the implementation of this policy.

One policy requirement says at a certain stream flow, a public water supply system would go to water use restrictions that would be applied in high and medium stressed basins only. The designation of what a basin is was determined by the WRC. It was a report based on USGS stream gages across the state; it identified potentially four categories: high-stressed, medium-stressed, low-stressed or unassessed stressed basins.

Chairman Dunphy asked what percentage of basins are high stressed. Are MWRA source waters high, medium or low? Mr. Gall answered, by definition, 25% of basins are highly stressed. Mr. LeVangie said the Nashua Basin as a whole is identified as medium. The Chicopee, which is where the Quabbin is, has different sub-basins because of numerous USGS gages; however, a lot of it is considered medium.

There are 193 permits issued to public water suppliers across the state. The inter-basin transfer performance standards required, beginning in 1999, that 65 gpcpd be met for an inter-basin transfer or a plan be drafted to meet that performance standard; three or four met the 65 gpcpd standard. The inter-basin transfer performance standard for unaccounted for water was 10%; therefore, DEP would often incorporate their performance standards and conditions into its permits.

Prior to 2003, very few had performance standards on unaccounted for water or residential gallons per day. In May 2003, DEP issued the Ipswich River permit. Ten permits were issued and ten permits were appealed. DEP is waiting on trials and decisions on those. For the Ipswich River, DEP introduced a performance standard of 65 gpcpd into those permits. The permittee would meet those standards within two years of receiving the permit; if the performance standards were not met, a penalty was not assessed; however, a list of items on an enhanced plan would be required.

Mr. Cosgrove said DEP issued ten permits and ten permits were appealed; ten for ten seems like an organized opposition. Mr. LeVangie said it was ten for ten by the water suppliers that received the permits. At the same time, the watershed association entered into the process as an intervener and is also involved in the proceedings. Mr. Cosgrove noted 100% of the people that got these permits disagreed. Mr. LeVangie said that is correct.

Mr. Cosgrove said by definition 25% of the water basins are considered highly stressed. Does that mean that 25% came in under a particular number? What is the definition? Mr. Gall said the definition was the lowest 25% are highly stressed. Mr. Gildesgame said it is based on stream flow; the stress basin methodology was developed as an interim preliminary methodology to provide assistance to DEP and water suppliers to understand the condition of their river basin or sub-basin; the methodology is currently under review, getting more data to get a better sense of the stress levels.

Chairman Dunphy asked how many basins are medium-stressed. Mr. Gall said 25 to 75% are medium-stressed basins. Mr. Gildesgame said the information from stream gaging tells us an approximation of this basin is under some sort of hydrologic stress in terms of its ability to supply more water to communities. EOE is getting additional information and more gaging data from USGS and will implement an assessment. The Department of Fish & Game is doing work to look at habitat issues and impacts and that will also go into that analysis. It is an ongoing program.

Mr. LeVangie said nearly the entire coast of Massachusetts, including the Cape and Islands, is unassessed; it is not fair to say that only 25% of the state is low and unassessed.

Mr. Cosgrove said if a quarter is this and a quarter is that, it means nothing. It could be that 50% of the basins are stressed. If the coast and Cape are unassessed, the worst part of the state has not even been taken into consideration. Mr. Gildesgame said stream gaging data was not available and is still being

developed. All the basins designated as highly stressed are done so based on data; it is not a made up number. Mr. Cosgrove said it is a made up number if you assign one-quarter to each category.

To get at non-essential outside water use, a seasonal cap was implemented in the Ipswich permit based on a summer to winter differential. In a comparison of winter and summer water use, DEP estimated that most of the water was being used on lawns. Those who had a summer to winter differential of 1.4% or greater in the summer water use were expected to reduce their summer water use by 50% over their highest summer during the prior three-year window. Nine communities out of the ten permits issued were able to reduce water use by 50% over their highest summer during one of those three years; it was a wet year when everyone was not watering their lawns. The percentage translated into “X” number of gallons per day and that became a condition of their Ipswich permits.

Phil Jasset said the Ipswich River is highly stressed. How can DEP take a highly-stressed basin problem and relate it to the MWRA? It makes no sense. Mr. LeVangie said communities have two years to make that argument. There has been no decision made on how this will apply to the MWRA.

Pat Fasanello said if you are looking at outside watering, most people understand that the water goes back into the Aqueduct. Mr. LeVangie said if you are watering properly, the only water you are putting down is being used by the grass; it does not get back into the ground.

Ms. Crossland said Dedham-Westwood meets the 1.2 summer/winter ratio because it has water restrictions every summer; however, the Town of Franklin cannot meet 1.2 even with a total outside water ban. There are other uses for water in the summer besides lawn watering; people take more showers and do more laundry in the summer.

Mr. LeVangie said offsets are a way to balance the water budget for additional water needs, including stormwater management such as I/I repairs, private well regulations or a feasibility study to see how that additional demand could be mitigated. The baseline was the most recent year of use or the average of the three years prior, whichever of those two numbers were higher.

Mr. Cosgrove asked is there any recognition that in more affluent communities that have lawns and landscaping that enhance property values that people who are paying taxes on that home want to take care of their lawns. Mr. LeVangie said DEP is trying to recognize that and allow some watering.

Mr. LeVangie said DEP has convened work groups to develop some flexibility in high and medium-stressed basins. In response to fire and environmentalist concerns, DEP introduced an enforcement margin for high-stressed basins only that said if the community is below 72 and has an outline of a plan, DEP would not take enforcement. DEP is not going after 67, but rather 95. There is an equity of fairness. Why should a neighboring town be using 95, when someone else is using 64? Mr. Hornbrook replied, because they have it. Mr. Cosgrove said MWRA has a safe yield by a wide margin. Mr. LeVangie said MWRA might have a safe yield, but there is not a safe yield in most of the river basins. Environmentalists were going to appeal every permit DEP issued; everything would be on hold until a safe yield value was developed. This allows DEP to move forward while trying to identify basin safe yield. Mr. Hornbrook said the system must be broken if both the water suppliers and the environmentalists say it is not working.

E. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee – Katherine Haynes Dunphy

ACTION ITEM: APPLICATION OF THE TOWN OF READING TO JOIN THE MWRA WATERWORKS SYSTEM

Mr. Favaloro reported that the Operations Committee and Executive Committee approved the Town of Reading’s application to join the MWRA Waterworks system.

The following Motion was made: **Whereas the Town of Reading meets the admission criteria set forth in MWRA Policy #: OP.10: 'Admission of New Community to Waterworks System' including but not**

limited to the safe yield of the watershed system, on the advice of the Department of Conservation and Recreation, is sufficient; that no existing or potential water supply source for the community has been abandoned; effective demand management measures have been implemented; adoption of a water management plan; and, the proposed expansion provides for no negative impact on the interests of the current forty-seven user communities, water quality, the interests of the watershed communities and achieves economic benefit for existing user communities.

Therefore, the MWRA Advisory Board recommends the application of the Town of Reading to become a member of the MWRA water distribution system be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Reading must continue to protect and maintain all local sources of supply.
2. Reading will continue to maintain all reasonable conservation measures, abide by all applicable conditions as stipulated within the Water Resources Commission approval of Reading's request under the Inter-Basin Transfer Act to join the MWRA Waterworks System and abide by MWRA regulations for leak detection.
3. Payment of an entrance fee will be made to the MWRA consistent with MWRA policies and procedures in the amount of an estimated \$3,285,242.
4. Annual usage will be capped at 219 million gallons.
5. That Reading and the MWRA develop an enforceable water supply agreement stipulating appropriate terms and conditions of service.
6. Upon the acceptance of the Town of Reading application to join the MWRA Waterworks System by the MWRA Advisory Board and the MWRA Board of Directors, Reading will be eligible for funding through the Local Pipeline Assistance Program. Reading is qualified for program funds based on 1) said community's percentage of MWRA water use as a portion of total community use 2) proportional share of total MWRA community based unlined pipe and 3) prorating available funds to the number of years remaining in the program. The provision of interest-free loans through the Local Pipeline Assistance Program shall be in addition to the \$250 million currently allocated within the MWRA Capital Improvement Program. Existing community allocation levels will remain unchanged. The MWRA staff summary seeking approval for Reading to join the MWRA Waterworks system shall include a separate section that establishes the level of funding Reading will be eligible for under the Local Pipeline Assistance Program. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mr. Favaloro reported that the House of Representatives, as part of a supplemental budget, provided a waiver of the Administrative & Finance indirect costs for the Water Supply Protection Trust retroactive to FY05. The language must still get through the Senate, which looks favorable. However, it is likely the Governor will veto the language and the issue will be whether there is enough energy to get an override in the House and Senate.

Advisory Board staff has met with the Mayors, Town Administrators and Members of Boards of Selectmen in 19 communities thus far to re-energize efforts to increase the Sewer Rate Relief Fund (also known as Debt Service Assistance) contribution, which is a formula-driven line item. The Advisory Board's efforts are to refocus the legislators on how much money is necessary to meet the formula. Staff hopes to achieve a minimum of \$25 million for the FY07 budget. These meetings will culminate in a Legislators' Day during the January Advisory Board meeting at the State House. All the Chief Elected Officials staff have met have indicated their full support and desire to participate in the Legislators Day. Shortly after the meeting, House 1 (Governor's) Budget comes out, followed by the House and Senate Budgets.

Chairman Dunphy noted that prior to cuts in Debt Service Assistance funding the MWRA portion was over \$50 million. In order to have an affect on the rates that sewer ratepayers are facing in the next few years, the Advisory Board needs to get the Legislature to add the MWRA to its list of worthy causes.

Finance Committee – Bernard Cooper

STATUS OF FY06 CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET

Cornelia Potter stated by the end of the first quarter (September) of FY06, the Authority has already spent more than budgeted on Direct Expenses due to external sources, most notably energy, chemicals and health insurance. At next month's Board of Directors' meeting, Authority staff will present the first monthly financial report to update the Board on spending to give a clearer idea on what the budget gap will be, currently identified as \$3.5 million; however, there are indicators that this number will go higher.

For the long term, rising rates are the most difficult issue facing the Authority. As the Advisory Board had recommended, the Authority is planning a special offsite meeting on the issue of rates management, particularly over the next five-year period, with 44% rate increases projected during that timeframe, virtually double the increase of the last five years. This discussion will be helpful in shaping the budget over the next several years and for the preparation of the FY07 budget.

Operations Committee – Jay Fink

PRESENTATION: POTENTIAL COMMUNITY IMPACTS DUE TO PLANNED MODIFICATIONS TO THE JOHN J. CARROLL WATER TREATMENT PLANT – Michael Hornbrook, Chief Operating Officer

MWRA Chief Operating Officer Michael Hornbrook stated that the John J. Carroll Water Treatment Plant has been running successfully since the end of July. The plant can process a total capacity of 400 million gallons per day (MGD) and is designed and operated with two independent operational trains. On November 1, the MWRA plans to bring one-half of the plant down to do modifications and improvements, leaving a treatment capacity of 230 MGD. Demand during the time period of November through winter is typically less than 200 MGD. One train will provide all the treatment process needed and the Authority will be in full regulatory compliance.

Upon completion of the modifications, the other half of the plant will be brought down for modifications as well. All modifications will be completed by spring and the plant will once again be at a 400 MGD capacity.

In bringing the plant online, a fatal flaw was discovered in the ozone sampling pump locations. Staff was able to design and implement a temporary sampling pump situation that has been working well, but it is now time to do a permanent sample pump relocation. The modifications will also include installation of influent/effluent channel venting and isolator valves to optimize the performance of the plant. Work is expected to be complete in mid February 2006.

Mr. Hornbrook updated members on a weekend power outage at the Deer Island Wastewater Treatment Plant (DIWTP). Over the weekend the MWRA service area saw between 4 to 6½ inches of rain, on top of a week of rain.

MWRA opened its Emergency Operations Center in the morning, and throughout the day, there were Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs) at a number of locations in the system. Staff is aware of at least nine member communities that also experienced SSOs. From early Saturday morning through Sunday, the DIWTP processed 1.2 billion gallons, setting new records for duration of treatment and pumping. Nut Island was at maximum capacity for over 36 hours as well, also setting a new record for total volume and peak transference through Nut Island.

The MWRA system was filled to the brim. Saturday morning, staff made the decision to open up the Archdale diversion structure and diverted flow from the high level sewer. There were overflows in the north system as well. By Saturday afternoon, the high level sewer, which serves 21 member communities, was

within feet of coming out on streets and was over the floor at the Nut Island headworks. To save the facility, and not cause any additional damage, at 3:00 o'clock staff opened the emergency outfalls on Nut Island for 50 minutes and had a small untreated discharge.

Also on Saturday, unbeknownst to the MWRA, NSTAR was working at the K Street sub-station doing maintenance work and an accident occurred injuring three workers, one critically. At 4:54 p.m., NSTAR shut power off at Deer Island, which was pumping 1.2 billion gallons when the power went off instantaneously. Within minutes, the Authority's combustion turbine generators (CTGs) were activated. Deer Island consumes electricity in an amount equivalent to a small city with 43 sub-stations throughout the island; some of the circuits in the sub-stations had faulted off because of the power outage and staff immediately went to sub-stations and inside the facility to engage breakers. The pumps were on within the first hour and ten minutes. Within another hour and twenty minutes, MWRA was at full capacity, pumping 1.1 billion gallons. The pumps are complex hydraulically and electrically and cannot just be switched on; it is a step by step procedure of bringing one pump up at a time and stabilizing that pump, then bringing the next pump online.

After losing all power, the headworks isolation gates closed while the system was full, within feet of streets. Staff switched to its emergency operation procedure, which is to open all Nut Island outfalls and the emergency spillway and then look for relief in the system anywhere it could be found until full pumping capacity was recovered. As a result, between the first release at 3:00 p.m. and the intense release at 4:54 p.m., the MWRA estimates it discharged 25 million gallons of untreated sewage into the harbor.

In April 2004, MWRA had an NSTAR power outage and it took two hours and forty minutes to activate the pumps. Through some physical modifications and improvements, the Authority was able to have the first pump on this time within one hour and ten minutes. Staff will continue to seek improvements and operational changes to improve those times.

Bernie Cooper asked if NSTAR was doing routine maintenance that perhaps, in the future, could be done during drier weather. Mr. Hornbrook said yes; ordinarily NSTAR notifies the Authority when it needs to do maintenance on the cross harbor cable, which brings power to Deer Island. MWRA brings up its CTGs and synchronizes MWRA power with NSTAR's power, allowing NSTAR to turn their power off without interrupting power to Deer Island. NSTAR did not tell MWRA it would be doing maintenance work at the K Street sub-station on Saturday. Since the incident, NSTAR has told the Authority contract employees were doing the work, but did not explain why they were doing it on a windy, rain-soaked Saturday evening. If the Authority had been told in advance, MWRA could have gotten its power running and gotten off of NSTAR's power seamlessly.

STATUS OF THE DEDHAM-WESTWOOD WATER DISTRICT'S APPLICATION TO JOIN THE MWRA WATERWORKS SYSTEM

Mr. Favaloro stated that the Dedham-Westwood Water District will likely be before the Advisory Board next month for a vote to join the MWRA Waterworks System to purchase 36 million gallons of water during the summer. An entrance fee of approximately \$500,000 is expected. Dedham-Westwood will be at the next Operations Committee meeting as well.

F. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 1:41 P.M. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Sullivan, Secretary