



Advisory Board Meeting

Thursday, November 20, 2014
11:30 AM

Wellesley Free Library
530 Washington Street
Wellesley, MA

Attendees (Voting Members)

Michael Rademacher	Arlington	J. R. Greene	Gubernatorial Appt	Lou Taverna	Newton
David Manugian	Ashland	Andy Fisk	Gubernatorial Appt	Bernie Cooper	Norwood
Roy Sorenson	Bedford	Barbara Wyatt	Gubernatorial Appt	Michael Coffey	Quincy
John Sullivan	Boston	Bill Hadley	Lexington	Jeff Zager	Reading
Jay Hersey	Brookline	Amy McHugh	Marblehead	Brendan O'Regan	Saugus
John Sanchez	Burlington	Cassandra Koutalidis	Medford	John DeAmicis	Stoneham
Tim MacDonald	Cambridge	Andy Street	Melrose	Pat Fasanello	Walpole
Andrew DeSantis	Chelsea	Katherine Dunphy	Milton	Walter Woods	Wellesley
Jason Mammone	Dedham	Thom Donahue	Nahant	Jeff Bina	Westwood
Jay Marcotte	Everett	John Cosgrove	Needham	Joe Lobao	Wilmington

Other Attendees

James Donovan	Canton	James Donovan	Weymouth	Phil Jasset	UCANE
Eileen Commane	DWWD	Newton Tedder	EPA	Andreae Downs	WAC
Ernie Lariviere	Everett	David Duest	MWRA	Lexi Dewey	WSCAC
George Burnell	Lexington	Steve Cullen	MWRA	Joseph Favaloro	AB Staff
Penny Antonoglou	Medford	Pam Heidell	MWRA	Matthew Romero	AB Staff
Joe Welch	Norwood	Leo Norton	MWRA	Cornelia Potter	AB Staff
Scott Gustafson	Walpole	David Wu	MWRA	Travis Ahern	AB Staff
Matt Shuman	Watertown	Maret Smolow	MWRA	Marv Ann McClellan	AB Staff
William Shaughnessy	Wellesley				

Fifty-five people were in attendance, including thirty voting members.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 15, 2015 MEETING

A. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2014 MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman Katherine Haynes Dunphy called the MWRA Advisory Board meeting to order at 11:35 a.m. A motion was made **TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2014 MINUTES OF THE MWRA ADVISORY BOARD**. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

A moment of silence was offered in memory of Mary Hadley, mother of Executive Committee member Bill Hadley, and Michael Ralph, former MWRA Director of Public Affairs, who both passed away on November 13.

B. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MWRA Advisory Board Executive Director Joseph Favaloro stated that staff has received positive feedback on the community workshop held in October. If there are topics that people are interested in, city or town-wide, that staff might be able to put together a workshop on, please feel free to contact Advisory Board staff.

The videos from the workshop have been reviewed and will be posted online. Staff is reaching out to local cable companies to be able to distribute the videos for a more public viewing.

As part of the New England Fertilizer Company's (NEFCo) pelletizing process, they make pellets available to cities and towns free of charge. In the past, communities were not taking advantage of these pellets because they came in a paper bag, making it difficult to store. Mr. Favaloro demonstrated a new sturdier plastic bag in which NEFCo will now be package the pellets.

C. DRAFT MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM (MS4) REGULATIONS (STORMWATER REGULATIONS) – Newton Tedder, EPA Region 1

Mr. Favaloro noted that the public hearing process on the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) regulations ended this week. He introduced Newton Tedder of EPA Region 1, to talk about these new regulations.

Mr. Tedder said the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and MA Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) released the latest Massachusetts general permit for MS4 storm systems on September 30. This draft permit replaces the previous two draft permits released in 2010 and once effective will replace the 2003 permit that is currently in effect.

Numerous comments were received from organizations such as the Advisory Board on the two draft permits released in 2010. A decision was made to take the comments received and put them into one draft permit for the entire state to streamline the process and address a lot of the questions and concerns that communities and other environmental organizations had about the permit.

The idea of the permit is to advance stormwater management throughout the Commonwealth and move forward from the 2003 permit, which expired in 2008. EPA has recently formed a group to address stormwater, with a dedicated staff in moving stormwater management forward.

Based on the evolution of the Clean Water Act, EPA now realizes that stormwater is the biggest threat to our rivers, lakes, streams and ponds in the Commonwealth. We have done a nice job cleaning up most of the point sources in stormwater ravines, the biggest cause of concern for water quality.

In order to meet the goals of the Clean Water Act, EPA has to take stormwater management seriously and move forward from the 2003 permit. There are slightly more requirements in this new draft permit, which goes a long way to try to make sure that all the permittees know what they need to do to be in compliance with the permit. A lot of the comments on the 2010 permits were that it was a little too vague on what the different requirements meant, especially on water quality-based requirements.

This new draft permit pushes that forward to try to make permittees aware of what they actually need to do to be in compliance with the permit.

The biggest changes based on comments came in the monitoring section. EPA got a lot of comments on monitoring and staff deleted that item and rolled it into its list detection program so every monitoring piece that is in the permit is specifically related to discharge work that permittees will be doing.

The next biggest thing from the 2010 comments would be the “good housekeeping” requirements. EPA got a lot of comments regarding flexibility for permittees regarding what they were going to implement and when. Staff took those comments to heart and provided flexibility and ratcheted down some of the requirements for street sweeping, in particular, and catch basin cleaning to allow more flexibility.

The last thing is water quality. There were a lot of comments on what meeting water quality standards meant. The permit goes a long way to providing timelines for all the important work that needs to be done and providing timelines for permittees to do them in a conscious manner.

The public hearing was held in Leominster yesterday; however, the public comment period is still open and there is still time for people to comment on the draft permit. The written public comment period closes on December 29. A final permit will hopefully be issued in the next year.

EPA staff is looking for constructive feedback on this permit. We got a lot of comments from organizations and municipalities that basically said please allow more flexibility; these requirements are just not that great. Those comments are meaningless to EPA staff when trying to respond. The purpose of the public comment period is for permittees to help craft the language. This is your part of the process. Any constructive feedback should include what could be done, providing suggestions. Those types of comments will result in a better permit.

Lou Taverna asked if there is a timeframe on when the permit will be implemented. The reason he asked this question is that all of the communities are in the process of budgeting now and will need to budget for something. Mr. Tedder said you will notice in the permit itself that everything is based on the effective date of the permit; that is on purpose. When the permit is final we are looking to extend the effective date at least six months after it goes final. That should put it more closely in line with budget schedules. In a reality sense, it will likely take EPA a year to respond to all of the comments. After that, it will be about six months before it is effective, so it will likely be in the July 2016 timeframe.

A member noted that Mr. Tedder had pointed out that some of the comments had been meaningless; did EPA ask these commenters to reconstruct their comment to make it more meaningful? Mr. Tedder said EPA has held five information sessions across the state over the past month and they have been helpful and have gone about three hours each time. For instance, for the post-construction standard, someone said they did roadway construction and they didn't think the redevelopment piece needed to be changed. EPA staff needs that comment to be taken one step further to say how it can be changed so we can work with it; Mr. Tedder said that would be extremely helpful to him.

Phil Jasset said when you are talking about the roadwork end of it, are there any stipulations in the requirements to make a city or state responsible for its share of the impervious surface. Mr. Tedder said the Department of Transportation (DOT) is getting its own permit so we would remove them from the general permit and they would be getting an individual permit that will make them as equally responsible as each city and town.

Mr. Jasset noted that some cities and towns have highways going through their communities and these highway may be the major pollutant. Mr. Tedder said they are a major contributor and they will be responsible for their roadways going through the cities and towns. Especially when dealing with Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). For instance the Charles River TMDL requires a phosphorus reduction. So a town's share of that phosphorus reduction does not include interstate roadways; we have removed these roadways from each town's share and have given that to the state so they will be held responsible.

Cassandra Koutalidis asked if the Department of Conservation and Recreation's roadways would be excluded as well. Mr. Tedder responded in the affirmative.

Andrew DeSantis asked about structures under the highway system; originally in the 2003 permit, Chelsea had the Tobin Bridge and elevated highway structure and he was told it is a structure, not a highway, so it is not covered by the MS4 permit. Mr. Tedder asked who owns it; Mr. DeSantis said MA DOT now owns it. Mr. Tedder said it would be under MA DOT's permit.

Mr. Taverna said some of us are in the lower Charles basin; can you talk a little bit about TMDL for phosphorus removal; we find that our biggest challenge in trying to meet those TMDLs. Mr. Tedder said those TMDLs are the most prescriptive when it comes to stormwater reduction and they go as far as to allocate different land uses of waste-load allocation for reductions of phosphorus coming off of those land uses. So any NPDES permit that EPA writes needs to include any waste-load allocation given to any point source. Since 1999, stormwater is a point source of pollution so when we are writing this permit we need to include any TMDLs that fall under this allocation.

Staff took a lot of time, especially since 2010 until now, to look at those TMDLs and pull them apart to allocate them fairly and equitably to each town, based on what the TMDL says.

Each town that is part of the lower Charles or upper Charles basin has a particular phosphorus reduction requirement that needs to be met. Staff is now in the process of developing tools and accounting systems so the permittees will know they are complying with the milestones based upon an accounting system. The communities don't have to prove the phosphorus reductions, we are going to take scientific data to show the phosphorus reductions based on a modeling exercise. Permittees will then come up with a plan over the next five years on how they are going to meet the first phase of the phosphorus reduction. We are using a three-phased approach over 20 years to meet the reductions of the TMDL. This will be done in a mindful manner; EPA does not want communities to do anything that they don't have to.

Over the next 20 years, there are three different planning phases to get a certain amount of phosphorus out of the system during each phase and each permittee will prove that they are doing this through tracking and accounting.

Each permit reissuance, hopefully every five years, will look at what is happening in the watershed and will look at water quality to make sure we are meeting the targets and that we are not over-stepping. If we get to a point where we realize that we don't need as much reduction as initially thought, the permit can take that into account at that time.

Mr. DeSantis said as a coastal community, we have sometimes struggled with bacteria being detected at outfalls; was that addressed at all? Mr. Tedder said the state water quality standards have changed for enterococcus, and we are talking about coastal communities, which goes a long way to try to remove those false positives. There is also different screening requirements at outfalls, specifically for those coastal communities that could have tidal influence to try to remove uncertainty for a bacteria hit, whether it is human sources or from the sea. Staff did try to address it but again if you have any comments, we are open to them.

Mr. Jasset asked if there are any financial cost data that would indicate that the federal government still wants the cost-benefit part of this. Mr. Tedder said staff did look at cost implementation of each minimum control measure, as well as the cost of reducing phosphorus from stormwater. Cost did play a part in schedules for the permit, such as the 20-year schedule for implementing the lower Charles River TMDL; cost did come into that equation.

Ms. Koutalidis asked if wet weather sampling is still part of the permit and, if so, can you explain the rationale in terms of finding and fixing illicit connections. Mr. Tedder said wet weather screening is still part of the permit and it is specifically tied to finding illicit

connections. We have tried to limit wet weather screening to those outfalls that have the potential for a wet weather discharge. Through a lot of work done in the communities we have found that wet weather discharges of illicit connections happen all the time. It is not just a dry weather problem. There is a lot of aging infrastructure in the Commonwealth where there are either low spots or slumps in systems that collect stormwater and that would

collect illicit discharges in a pool during the dry weather and you wouldn't see a discharge until the wet weather comes and flushes it out. That is one instance.

There are other instances where things will only get triggered during wet weather, for instance, a sanitary sewer system that you did not know existed until a wet weather discharge. EPA is trying to limit sampling to where there is actually a potential for things of this nature.

Ms. Koutalidis said I can understand a stormwater connection to a sanitary sewer but not the opposite. All outfalls would be wet weather outfalls. If we have 100 outfalls, would they all be a part of the screening program? Mr. Tedder said there are five or six different factors, which he didn't know at that moment. When you have the factors, you would ask yourself does this particular outfall have one of those factors in it. For instance, is it a certain age or older. We are trying to look at different places in the storm sewer system where there is the potential for an illicit connection. When there is the potential for an illicit connection during wet weather, EPA is requiring sampling.

Andreae Downs noted that Mr. Tedder said there were some online tools for estimating phosphorus reductions and also cost-benefit calculations. Are those linked? Mr. Tedder said right now the tool online just allows people to say if I do this, I get this phosphorus reduction. It doesn't do any accounting or compiling. Currently, staff is working on two tools, one for the accounting and compiling of things that people are doing and one for the optimization piece. The optimizer is an Excel-based tool where people can put in their targets and look at a myriad of different options with different costs associated and trying to look for the lowest cost for the biggest phosphorus reduction. These two tools are not currently online but they are in development in-house.

Ms. Downs asked if there are other pollutants besides phosphorus that are cited in this permit. Mr. Tedder said there are. This permit specifically targets phosphorus, nitrogen, bacteria, sediments, chlorides, metals, oil and grease; this is typically what stormwater consists of.

Ms. Downs asked if there are similar tools for the other pollutants. Mr. Tedder said there isn't because phosphorus is the only one with specific load reduction requirements in the permit.

John Sanchez noted that Mr. Tedder said that EPA looked at cost when coming up with these requirements. What is your thought on how much towns should be looking to set aside for the first year's requirements? Mr. Tedder said cost is really a tough thing to nail down because of how varied everybody's system is. Staff believes it will cost between \$70,000 to \$700,000 per year depending on your system and what each community has done in the past. Some communities have 20 outfalls and some have 400. The variables are huge. Staff is working on a tool so that communities can plug their information in to come up with a range of costs; however, that tool is not yet available.

Mr. Sanchez asked if communities have until the end of the year to comment. Mr. Tedder said the comment period ends on December 29. Mr. Sanchez said he would have to comment on the permit before he knows what kind of an impact it is going to have on his community. He would have to go to Town Meeting and say we have to budget between \$70,000 and \$700,000. Mr. Tedder said you should know a little bit more about your system than nothing. Mr. Sanchez said it is more about knowing about the requirements.

Mr. Tedder said EPA is essentially asking for a clean sweep of the system during the next ten years. After that, we feel we can rely on the dry weather stream to see if anything needs changing. The only way to get rid of illicit discharges is by a clean sweep on the system and once that is complete, some of these requirements can be ratcheted down.

D. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee – Katherine Haynes Dunphy

❖ ACTION ITEM: REQUEST FROM THE DEDHAM-WESTWOOD WATER DISTRICT TO INCREASE PURCHASES OF WATER BY 36.5 MILLION GALLONS PER YEAR

Mr. Favaloro noted that Eileen Commane, Director of the Dedham-Westwood Water District (DWWD), and Pam Heidell, the principal MWRA staff person that has been working on this request, are both in attendance. This request is straight-forward.

DWWD joined the system in 2005 receiving 36.5 million gallons of water per year; they are now in need of more water, which the MWRA has available. With the request to double their allowable amount of water, DWWD will also be required to pay an additional entrance fee.

A discussion was triggered between the MWRA and the Advisory Board about having one entrance fee policy and the Advisory Board's recommendation of a 25-year entrance fee payment, with a three-year grace period, with 22 payments, which was adopted by the MWRA Board of Directors.

A motion was made **TO ALLOW THE REQUEST FROM THE DEDHAM-WESTWOOD WATER DISTRICT (DWWD) TO REVISE ITS CONTRACT TO INCREASE THE ALLOWED ANNUAL PURCHASE BY AN ADDITIONAL 36.5 MILLION GALLONS PER YEAR. PURSUANT TO THE EXISTING WATER SUPPLY CONTINUATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN MWRA AND DWWD, AS WELL AS THE ORIGINAL TERMS OF DWWD'S ADMISSION TO MWRA, ANY INCREASE BEYOND TWO MILLION GALLONS ON A DAILY BASIS, AND 36.5 MILLION GALLONS ON AN AVERAGE ANNUAL BASIS, WILL REQUIRE A WRITTEN CONTRACT REVISION AND REVISION TO THE ENTRANCE FEE. DWWD UNDERSTANDS PAYMENT OF A REVISED ENTRANCE FEE AMOUNT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THE ADDITIONAL 36.5 MILLION GALLONS A YEAR REQUESTED. DWWD HAS SATISFIED REQUIREMENTS OF THE MWRA'S REGULATIONS FOR CONTINUATION OF CONTRACT WATER SUPPLY, MWRA #OP.10 ADMISSION TO MWRA WATERWORKS SYSTEM, AND MWRA'S ENABLING ACT. IN 2010, DWWD SUBMITTED A SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO MWRA THAT REFLECTED THE FOLLOWING:**

- 1. DWWD HAS MAINTAINED ALL REASONABLE CONSERVATION MEASURES AND HAS CONTINUED THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ITS WATER CONSERVATION PLAN SUBMITTED TO DEP IN 2005 AS A CONDITION OF ITS MEPA CERTIFICATE FOR ADMISSION TO MWRA.**
- 2. DWWD HAS NOT ABANDONED ANY LOCAL SOURCE AND SUBSTITUTED IT FOR WATER FROM MWRA SOURCES.**
- 3. A LOCAL WATER SUPPLY SOURCE FEASIBLE FOR DEVELOPMENT HAS NOT BEEN IDENTIFIED BY EITHER DWWD OR DEP.**
- 4. A WATER USE SURVEY HAS BEEN COMPLETED THAT IDENTIFIED ALL LARGE WATER USERS.**

THE ABOVE NOTED PLANS AND STATEMENTS REMAIN TRUE. IN ADDITION, ALL REQUIRED REGULATORY REVIEWS ASSOCIATED WITH DWWD'S REQUESTED INCREASE WITHDRAWAL HAVE BEEN COMPLETED, SINCE DWWD HAS OBTAINED A DETERMINATION FROM THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS THAT THE REQUESTED EXPANSION IN WITHDRAWAL IS NOT SUBJECT TO REVIEW UNDER MEPA AND THE SUBMISSION OF A NEW ENF IS NOT REQUIRED. THE WRC PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED IT WOULD NOT TAKE JURISDICTION UNDER THE INTER-BASIN TRANSFER ACT.

DEDHAM-WESTWOOD WATER DISTRICT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THESE TERMS, WILL PAY AN ADDITIONAL ENTRANCE FEE OF \$556,727 TO BE DIVIDED INTO INTEREST-FREE INSTALLMENTS OVER 25 YEARS, WITH A THREE-YEAR GRACE PERIOD (AS IS APPROVED ADVISORY BOARD POLICY). It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

❖ **ACTION ITEM: 2015-2016 LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY**

Mr. Favaloro provided members with the Advisory Board's 2015-2016 Legislative Strategy for the two-year cycle beginning in January 2015.

Staff decided that the goals for the coming session should focus on getting the appropriations that were approved in the Infrastructure Bill that was passed in the last legislative session. This would include interest-free loans and principal forgiveness loans, reimbursements for Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) work, and 50/50 entrance fees.

Additionally, the Advisory Board needs to find a way to have the Commonwealth Sewer Rate Relief Fund (also known as Debt Service Assistance – DSA) permanent, such as the septic tax credit works for septic tank owners. Yesterday, the Governor 9c'd the \$1.1 million in the state's FY15 budget for DSA. Staff will work to try to have permanent statutory language included in the state budget.

Additionally, language will be re-filed in regard to duplicate payments in lieu of taxes (PILOTs) that the MWRA makes to communities in central and western Massachusetts. The MWRA rightfully pays PILOTs (100%) for land it has taken for its reservoirs; however, six communities receive an additional PILOT. This second payment is addressed in the Advisory Board's legislative package.

Additionally, although the Advisory Board is not filing language in regard to Other Post-Employment Benefits, Governor Patrick filed a bill that altered the health care costs for retirees. The current system would have people vested at ten years; the new language would scale the vesting to twenty years. In the event that a bill is sent to the legislature, staff is asking to be able to support that bill. It would save the MWRA and the community assessments about \$70 million.

Further, staff would seek to have the Massachusetts Clean Water Trust (Water Pollution Abatement Trust) funding brought up to \$138 million. It will not be an easy task but will likely be job one for the year ahead.

A motion was made **TO APPROVE THE MWRA ADVISORY BOARD'S 2015-2016 LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY**. It was seconded and passed, with one opposing vote from J.R. Greene.

❖ **PRESENTATION: MWRA ADVISORY BOARD 2014 WATER AND SEWER RETAIL RATE SURVEY – Travis Ahern, Finance and Policy Analyst**

MWRA Advisory Board Finance and Policy Analyst Travis Ahern provided members with a draft version of the *2014 MWRA Advisory Board Water and Sewer Retail Rate Survey*.

The wholesale assessment from 2013 to 2014 was a 3.49% increase. The retail rate increase last year was only 3.1%, less than the wholesale increase. The average MWRA community household charge in last year's document for 61,000 gallons was \$935 and \$1,380 for 90,000 gallons. From FY2003 to FY2013, retail rates increased by 65%.

For this year's document, the MWRA final wholesale assessment increase was 3.4%; similarly, the retail rate increase was also 3.4%, but these are draft results and are subject to change.

The average MWRA household for 61,000 gallons is now \$940 and the 90,000 gallons has increased by 3.4% to \$1,427. Between 2004 and 2014, there was a 60% increase in retail rates.

In the current document, there are a few changes that came out of discussions with the Executive Committee and the Advisory Board last year. On individual pages it would say "an annual cost based on actual community usage," referencing DEP data provided by community and then it would provide the number of gallons. It was also presented with 90,000 gallon usage. Because people had concerns with the words "actual" and "DEP calculated," it has been changed to "annual cost based on local, state and federal data (LSF)." The reader will also be referred to the appendix, which shows the DEP table along with the calculation on how the Advisory Board got to the community's usage in hundred cubic feet (HCF).

The wording in the past was "actual usage," when in reality it was derived from the number reported to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) by communities, then population was being taken from the report filed with DEP, and the average household use was being taken from the U.S. Census. That is how we get to the number of gallons and then that number is converted to HCF.

Because 90,000 gallons is much higher than the actual usage of most MWRA communities, staff received a request that the numbers be calculated at 61,000 gallons, which is used by the MWRA in some of their documents. Staff felt putting it in the document at 90,000 usage, 61,000 usage and LSF usage might confuse people so the numbers will be calculated each year and then made available if anyone would like it. The thought process is that 61,000 gallons is a lot closer to actual community averages than the 90,000 gallons, which is a national benchmark.

There is also an appendix relating to second meters but all it says is that 30 communities are using them and 30 communities aren't. In the 2014 document, the appendix lists who does and does not.

The third addition is stormwater. Since our workshop, stormwater has become more of an issue and we wanted to incorporate that into the document by showing the breakout of how people are recovering stormwater costs. For MWRA communities, tax levy and water rates make up 80% of what communities are doing to recover stormwater costs and three communities (Chicopee, Newton and Reading) have a special assessment, two of which came to the workshop.

On the national level, it is basically the polar opposite; 64% (16 communities) of the 25 communities that we poll on a national level are using special assessments.

Mr. Ahern noted that stormwater will have an appendix in the document, which is new for this year. Staff is looking to build on it and will incorporate it into the document for future years.

The final change this year is that, because it will be an e-document, there will only be a minimal amount of copies printed. All of the MWRA communities have their own page in this document, with expanded information. The survey will be posted to the MWRA Advisory Board's website at www.mwraadvisoryboard.com.

When compared to natural gas on a monthly basis, water and sewer service is higher but it is significantly lower than heating oil. It is in the same ballpark as electricity costs (at 120 HCF) on a monthly basis. Massachusetts and Boston are higher than the national average.

Proofs will be sent to the communities for approval and the document will be finalized thereafter. The final document will be mailed out on a "thumb drive."

A summary Green Sheet video of the Retail Rate Survey and an explanation of the Retail Rate Methodology will be on the Advisory Board's website at <http://mwraadvisoryboard.com/2014/12/december-2014-two-green-sheets/>.

Mr. Favaloro noted that this is the Advisory Board's most requested document.

Operations Committee – Lou Taverna

❖ **UPDATE**

Operations Chair Lou Taverna noted that an Operations Committee meeting was held just prior to the Advisory Board meeting. MWRA staff provided information at the meeting regarding some shut downs that will be occurring at the Deer Island Treatment Plant related to valve and pipeline replacements, which is being planned for the spring/summer timeframe and will last about three years. The shutdowns will occur at night, where essentially, they will shut down the north side of the wastewater system and will use the capacity of the pipes during the night time hours. It is weather dependent as well; they will not be able to do the shut down on rainy days/nights.

E. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 12:39 P.M. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Hadley, Secretary