



Executive Committee Meeting

Friday, January 13, 2017
8:30AM

Advisory Board Conference Room
100 1st Avenue, Building 39-4
Boston, MA 02129

Attendees

Michael Rademacher	Arlington	John DeAmicis	Stoneham
David Manugian	Bedford	Carol Antonelli	Wakefield
John Sanchez	Burlington	Andrew Pappastergion	MWRA Board of Directors
Jeremy Marsette	Natick	Joseph Favaloro	Advisory Board Staff
Lou Taverna	Newton	Matthew Romero	Advisory Board Staff
Nicholas Rystrom	Revere	James Guidod	Advisory Board Staff
Brendan O'Regan	Saugus	Lenna Ostrodka	Advisory Board Staff
Robert King	Somerville		

DRAFT MINUTES

Approval of the November 10, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Taverna opened the meeting at 8:35 a.m. with a request to approve the minutes of the previous meeting of the Executive Committee on November 10, 2016. A motion was made and seconded; the minutes were approved unanimously.

Action Items:

Expansion of Eligible I/I Projects: Mr. Favaloro opened the discussion noting that at the November Operations Committee meeting there was a healthy discussion on expansion of the I/I Program. Working with the Authority staff, the Advisory Board staff had come up with highlights of community requests regarding their I/I projects. These materials have been included for the Executive Committee in today's meeting packet, for the members' convenience. The more summarized version could serve to broaden discussion with Authority staff which may result in improved, or broader, project options. The list currently has eight areas, or topics, for discussion.

In response to a question from Mr. DeAmicis regarding the process for developing this list, Mr. Favaloro noted that the I/I Program is now in round eight of grant/loan distributions for what have been eligible projects. Expansion of the list of eligible projects would create more flexibility for the types of I/I projects the funding could be used for. The process for developing an expanded list of eligible projects started with the draft listing from staff used to guide discussion at the November meeting of the Operations Committee just prior to the Advisory Board meeting that month. Mr. Sanchez, the chair of the Operations Committee, observed that there had not been an official vote but a sense of the meeting was developed (including a sense of the level of support for each type of the eight projects on the list). Support for different project types also varied according to the location of a community in each section of the sewer system. Members also raised the issue of how the success of the program is assessed and reported.

In moving toward developing a list of recommended projects for the full Advisory Board at the next week's meeting, Mr. Favaloro noted that "the world has changed." Originally, the program was created to provide relief for flows to Deer Island and the determination of how much capacity would have to be provided. But with the

current attention on stormwater, there are tools that would help serve the SSO control goals as well as other emerging goals. In response to an additional question regarding whether there are blockages downstream, Mr. Sanchez clarified that the issue was more increased surcharging. The issue is not really capacity, but infiltration and inflow.

Returning to the list, the chairman highlighted each topic, starting with the purchase of permanent flow monitoring equipment (purchase, not necessarily the maintenance of the equipment, though it could include costs of installation of the equipment and of associated computer hardware and software). About half the attendees at the earlier Operations Committee supported this topic. Item number 1 was approved for the inclusion on the list of eligible projects.

The second topic was the sewer cleaning equipment that is currently specifically excluded from eligible items. The Operations Committee chairman noted that there had been low support for this topic. Attendees voted not to support this topic.

The third topic was the sewer inspection equipment. It includes the cost of the purchase of sewer inspection equipment which may include (but is not limited to) smoke testing, dyed water testing, closed-circuit TV testing, sonar technologies, zoom cameral technologies, air testing, vacuum testing, etc. The major of the attendees at the Operations Committee supported this topic. This topic was supported and will be included on the list for further consideration.

The fourth topic was building inspections, smoke testing, and/or dye testing. It was noted that this topic was already considered eligible. Further clarification noted: "including but not limited to sewer lateral connections, downspout connections, sump pump connections, sewer/storm drain cross connections, etc." This topic was also supported and will be included on the list for further consideration.

The fifth topic involved planning and development of written procedures, development and distribution of public education outreach materials, assessment and priority ranking of sewer/storm catchment areas, engineering design, etc. for identification and elimination of stormwater (illicit) connections to the sewer system and/or sewer (illicit) connections to the storm system. This topic was approved without further discussion.

The sixth topic addressed database development and mapping of connections to public utilities including global positioning system locating of system components and GIS mapping. The majority of the attendees at the earlier Operations Committee supported this topic. Attendees at this Executive Committee supported this topic.

The seventh item was sewer/storm system and outfall sampling and data analysis to help locate potential direct and/or indirect connections between the systems and/or other illicit connections. There had been low support for this topic because it is all stormwater related. This item did not achieve support from the Committee.

The eighth item was the purchase of lining equipment was viewed with skepticism by the members. The item was voted down.

The recommendations of the Executive Committee (with the Chairman abstaining on the individual votes) will be forwarded to the full Advisory Board for members' consideration. Explanations for each item will be included. In the future, the Authority staff will be asked to report on how many communities had tapped into the expanded list of eligible projects and what the impact may be on flow data. The updated list is expected to be submitted to the Board of Directors with implementation in a few months following.

Further Discussion and Reaffirmation of Water System Redundancy Recommendations:

Mr. Favaloro opened the discussion noting that the workshop in December at Boston College was well-attended and provided, thanks to the MWRA staff, a very concise and very informative set of presentations. Mayor McCarthy was able to bring home the local impacts piece of the project (impacts of local, surface construction versus the tunnel options). There was a good question and answer period, with a lot of tough questions being posed, including questions from UCANE (the contractors' association) which was interested in more surface work versus deep rock tunnels. At the end of the meeting, the Chairman asked the committee if they were ready to endorse some recommendations to which some communities expressed a preference for additional time to consult with their community CEOs.

So, for today, an update of the recommendations that had previously been developed by the Executive Committee, reflecting further discussion with interested designees, including in Medford. The updated list would go to the full Advisory Board in January, and then to the Board of Directors for further action sometime in the spring. When these recommendations would be acted upon is still some time off, but a vote on the list is expected this spring in time for the Advisory Board's approval of its comments on the proposed Capital Improvement Program and Budget for FY 2018. Recommendations could provide some guidance for scheduling by supporting multiple starts for selected contracts rather than sequential schedules. For example, starting the North section at the same time as the South, so that progress is simultaneous. Such a concurrent approach would result in completion of the program faster than an phased approach and save an estimated \$250 million and allows project completion seven years earlier than the phased approach.

Mr. Favaloro reviewed the five points that have been under discussion:

1. Use a Program Management Division (PMD) similar to the Boston Harbor Project.
2. Select deep rock tunnel versus surface piping alternative.
3. Support the MWRA's recommendation for a dual tunnel approach, north and south.
4. Recommend that MWRA construct both tunnels concurrently, rather than in a phased manner.
5. Pursue strategies that dedicate revenue from non-typical sources to help fund the Metropolitan Tunnel Redundancy program

Discussion also included questions about more budget details available about subsets of the estimated \$1.4 billion program. Staff noted that some of these details on elements of the proposed Capital Improvement Program for FY 2018 will be presented at next week's meeting of the Advisory Board.

The recommendations list was approved by the Executive Committee unanimously (with Mr. Marsette and the Chairman abstaining) and is scheduled to be on the agenda for the full Advisory Board at the January 19 meeting in Canton.

Clinton Permit Update

Mr. Favaloro noted that the final permit for the Clinton Wastewater Treatment Plant was issued on December 21. The plant services the Town of Clinton and portions of the Town of Lancaster in central Massachusetts. The Advisory Board has worked tirelessly to shape the permit language during this multi-year period process. Particular attention has been given to the issue of Co-permittees; though Clinton and Lancaster are part of this permit, the concern has been how does one define what is an MWRA responsibility vs. a Clinton responsibility? While this is

not an issue so much for this permit, it could set a precedent for a new draft for the Deer Island Plant. With all the stormwater ramifications, there should be as much definition of what individual community responsibilities are versus the MWRA's, because ambiguity often works in favor of the EPA. The Advisory Board's recommendation to EPA and DEP has been that those responsibilities should be laid out in detail (although EPA and DEP didn't think that was what they were going to do). However, there has been a good dialogue, and each edit of the language has been passed through the Advisory Board, to which the reply has been, "it's better, but not good enough." It went through about seven different iterations and finally it was agreed that this is about as far as it could go at the time. When we get to the Deer Island permit, we will spend more time on it. Subsequently, DEP called the Advisory Board office, because going forward, DEP can sign off on a new draft permit, or not be involved. They did not want to sign off on the new Clinton permit until they were assured that he would be OK with it. Mr. Favaloro noted that he is not advocating appeal of this (five-year) permit. He did note that he does expect to write comments for the record which will speak to a couple points: if you are going to have Clinton and Lancaster on a permit that lays out responsibilities for their communities, they should sign the permit. The only signature called for in the permit is the MWRA's. Also, the permit must reflect a much better job of delineating MWRA's responsibilities versus the communities' resulting in an unambiguous situation. Advisory Board comments will also include comments that are developed by the MWRA as an attachment.

Legislative Strategy Update

Mr. Favaloro opened the discussion by noting a flurry of activity. In the past 60 days we have been able to get the North Reading legislation (for a water connection) passed. Crescent Ridge, a highly regarded dairy farm, is applying to tie into the system through Stoughton with a decision anticipated for the spring. The whole North Reading process is moving forward. Recently, Mr. Laskey met with the South Shore Chamber of Commerce. With regard to TriTown, the conversations have not materialized into anything substantive. The status of the Ashland application is unclear. There is also question about Hopkinton's drawing down water without coming into the system. Another example is Cherry Hill that takes water out of the Worcester system. If Worcester is taking its water from the MWRA because its reservoir is low, is Cherry Hill really getting water from the MWRA? These may sound like insignificant questions (and represent small amounts of water), but once the precedent is set, then what?

Debt Service Assistance funding for FY 2017 (for \$500,000) has been 9C'd by the governor. The Legislature is now looking at restoring the amount next month. The Governor's budget for FY 2018 comes out later this month; we are guessing that it will probably reflect not a loss in Debt Service Assistance but rather a number that coincides with the number that he 9C'd.

Watershed Protection and Mountain Biking

Mr. Favaloro noted that the Advisory Board has been talking about watershed protection and mountain biking and writing editorials and working to differentiate watershed lands in contrast to park lands among the public. There have been Freedom of Information Act requests that have been responded to. The rhetoric has been getting more aggressive. The Advisory Board has published an editorial in News and Notes and distributed a slightly revised version to local news outlets. Our job is to advocate as well as to educate. In that context we have created a video in the *Just the FAQs* series addressing frequently asked questions to educate audiences about the role of watershed protection. Mr. Pappastergion noted that the MWRA has spent hundreds of millions of dollars to purchase the watershed lands to protect the water. If the state wants to take it for recreational purposes then pay us back all the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been spent. We will be needing it to build a filtration plant when the

quality of the watershed goes down the tube. (An early draft of the video was shown to the Executive Committee.) An edited version of the video will be shown to the full Advisory Board on January 19, and there will be a presentation by Mr. Yeo from the state's Division of Watershed Management; also expected to be in attendance will be his bosses.

In answer to a question regarding the origin of the belief that people can use the watershed for off-road biking, Mr. Favaloro noted that it is related to the history of land acquisition in central Massachusetts for the reservoirs (although payments in lieu of taxes [PILOTs] have been made over the years to offset the impact of the loss of the land to other uses in the area). Following the release of the video, the next step in the outreach program is to educate all stakeholders. If there have to be additional resources committed to the preserving the watersheds, there will need to be a review of all recreational uses in the area.

Although we have not been able to work through these issues, it is felt that we should be able to get there.

Approval of Advisory Board Meeting Agenda for January 19, 2017

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded; the motion carried.

Adjournment

A motion was made **TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:03 A.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Rademacher, Secretary