

**MWRA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 21, 1999
WILMINGTON TOWN HALL
121 GLEN ROAD, WILMINGTON, MA**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE MARCH 18, 1999 MEETING

Twenty-two members were present: Ed Maguire, ASHLAND; Peter Churchill, BEDFORD; Timothy MacDonald, CAMBRIDGE; Andrew DeSantis, CHELSEA; Al Renzi, FRAMINGHAM; Bill Hadley, LEXINGTON; Bruce Kenerson, LYNNFIELD; Dana Snow, MARBLEHEAD; Peter Hersey, MELROSE; Katherine Haynes Dunphy, MILTON; Stanley Stanzin, NEEDHAM; Jay Fink, NEWTON; Bernard Cooper, NORWOOD; Ed Nelson, QUINCY; Ted McIntire, READING; Rod Granese, REVERE; Joe Foti, SOMERVILLE; Stephen Casazza, WAKEFIELD; Walter Woods, WELLESLEY; Tim Walsh, WESTWOOD; Michael Woods, WILMINGTON; J. R. Greene, GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEE.

Also present: Andrew Pappastergion, MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS; Martin Feeney, Rick Neely and John Cronin, MILTON; John Corey, WOBURN; Tom Powers, Rick Mills, Mike Hornbrook and Stephen Estes-Smargiassi, MWRA STAFF; Joe Favaloro, Cornelia Potter, Ryan Ferrara, Ann Chamberlin LaBelle, Craig Sanderson and Mary Ann McClellan, MWRA ADVISORY BOARD STAFF.

A. WELCOME

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Joe Foti who introduced Michael Woods of Wilmington. Mr. Woods welcomed everyone to the Town of Wilmington.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 19, 1998

A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE NOVEMBER 19, 1998 ADVISORY BOARD MEETING. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

C. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Joe Favaloro introduced the Advisory Board's newest staff member, Craig Sanderson, and officially welcomed him. Craig has taken the position of Finance and Policy Analyst.

D. PRESENTATION - FORE RIVER STAGING AREA PELLETIZING PLANT FIRE - Rick Mills, MWRA Director - Residuals Management

Rick Mills, the Director of Residuals Management, gave an update on an incident that occurred at the FRSA Pelletizing Plant in Quincy. Mr. Mills reported that on December 16, 1998 at 10:45 a.m., the plant, operated by the New England Fertilizer Co. (NEFCo), had a fire caused by a 24-inch diameter, stainless-steel cold air purge duct falling ten feet from the area where it was suspended onto a 4-inch cast-iron gas pipeline. Gas flowed and ignited immediately. A jet of flame entered the pelletizing room floor.

The operators of NEFCo immediately moved to shut down equipment, evacuate the building and shut off the gas, which took approximately three to five minutes. The Quincy Fire Department responded quickly and the fire was extinguished. As a result, the end plates of two RTOs, railings and some other associated equipment sustained extreme heat rendering the RTOs inoperable.

The Fire Department allowed people to reenter the building about one hour after the incident. The production of sludge cake resumed at 4 p.m., but pellet production was not possible because there was no gas to fire the driers. Sludge cake was moved into rail cars and shipped to the back-up landfill in Utah. The Authority viewed this incident as an opportunity to check their back-up plan for disposal and found that it was successful, with one exception. On December 23, Conrail ran out of rail cars. During that 24-hour period, 17 trailer trucks were filled with sludge cake and shipped to a Maine landfill. On December 24, normal operations resumed when rail cars became available.

CDM was contracted to review operations and construction at the plant to determine whether there are any other significant issues. The review indicated that additional support of duct work and gas piping was needed and the work is underway.

The best estimate for the cost of this incident for direct damage from the fire is approximately \$250,000 to \$300,000, including the CDM review. A letter has been sent by the Law Division to the contractor indicating that the MWRA is holding them responsible for the damages and that reimbursement is expected. A major impact on the budget is not anticipated from this incident.

Staff Analysis has shown that shipment of sludge cake to landfills is more expensive than pelletizing. Pelletization costs about \$310 a dry ton; shipping sludge cake to a landfill is about \$323 to \$340 per ton, depending on the percentage of moisture in the cake. Ed Nelson asked, "Could you break out the cost of shipping to Utah as opposed to Maine?" Mr. Mills responded, "The cost to ship cake to Maine is significantly more expensive by truck. It is over \$100 a wet ton. The cost to ship to Utah by rail is \$85 a wet ton." Mr. Nelson stated, "There are so many other landfills closer than Utah, why do we still depend on Utah for the longshot?" Mr. Mills replied that it was a competitively bid item and Utah was the lowest cost respondent. MWRA has shipped to a landfill in Virginia, but it was more expensive. In addition, the Authority commits to the communities surrounding the plant to ship by rail instead of by truck, except for emergencies. There are a limited number of landfills in the United States that are directly rail accessible.

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

Cornelia Potter asked, "How do you decide when to transport the sludge instead of storing at a storage facility?" Mr. Mills responded that staff decided to maintain the liquid sludge storage, both at Deer Island (8 ½ days) and Fore River (2 to 4 days), and keep it as a "storage of last resort". The decision to ship was made because MWRA was already in a compromised processing situation and did not know when the storage would be needed. Mrs. Potter asked, "Are there other arrangements that can be made with Conrail so that the holiday situation won't happen again?" Mr. Mills replied, "Probably not, due to Union Work Agreements and Federal Rail Transportation Agreements, our best bet is to find ways to anticipate those situations and plan around it."

Andrew DeSantis asked, "How does it break down between transportation and tipping costs?" Mr. Mills stated that he did not have a break down of the costs. The \$85 per wet ton covers the cost of transportation and tipping at the landfill. Mr. DeSantis asked, "Did MWRA solicit other prices for the trucking?" Mr. Mills replied, "No, MWRA maintains an emergency preparedness plan. It is a list of trucking companies and landfills where we have remained permitted. Staff called the closest accessible landfill that had hours to accommodate us and a trucking company with trucks available."

Mrs. Potter asked, "The budget was set tight for residuals, can you tell us how you review the greater than budgeted spending?" Mr. Mills responded, "During the summer and fall months of this year, sludge shipments received from Deer Island were significantly higher than had been anticipated in the budget. In part because more material is produced during warm weather, and Deer Island was in the process of transitioning out of the digester module for maintenance. There was an increase in shipments during the fall period in order to empty that digester."

Walter Woods asked, "In your contract do you guarantee a certain minimum weight?" Mr. Mills stated, "We do guarantee a minimum limit of 30 dry tons a day, we are close to 100 dry tons a day." Mr. Woods asked, "When you have a minimum, you are really guaranteeing the contractor work?" Mr. Mills replied, "Correct."

Ed Nelson asked, "The dry ton figure for FY98 was 21,500 tons and we have a projection of 37,595 tons, or a 75% increase in tonnage. Why is there only a 7% increase in the budget?" Mr. Mills replied, "We have a sliding scale for pelletization and are in the highest quantity bracket, which is the lowest price per ton."

E. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee - Joe Foti

ACTION ITEM: DISCUSSION - MILTON'S REQUEST FOR FUNDS FOR A SURCHARGING SEWER RELIEF PROJECT - Katherine Haynes Dunphy, Milton Board of Selectmen

Katherine Haynes Dunphy, Secretary - Milton Board of Selectmen, thanked the Advisory Board for the opportunity to speak regarding Milton's plan to submit a request for funding from the MWRA for a Surcharging Sewer Relief Project. Milton is seeking the support of the Advisory Board communities. In attendance with Ms. Dunphy were Rick Neely, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, John Cronin, Town Administrator and Martin Feeney, DPW Director.

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

Ms. Dunphy stated Milton has had flooding along the interceptor that passes through the Town. These interceptors are the High Level Sewer, which was built through Milton in 1902, and the Neponset Valley Sewer, which extends to Walpole.

There are a large number of homes that experience back ups during wet weather in the Brook Road area, where the high level sewer is approximately 7 ½ feet under the street. The sewer is frequently full as it comes into Milton, and it is surcharged to a level within six feet of the street. In 1998 back ups occurred in January, February, March, May and June, and on some occasions loss of service and back ups lasted as many as ten days. It is not something that people can live with.

In addition, along the Neponset Valley Sewer there are similar circumstances. Since 1902, there has been a lot of growth throughout the district, including sewer extensions going to the western and southern suburbs along with additional Inflow and Infiltration.

A Task Force of neighbors, MWRA personnel, DPW personnel and Milton consultant group, CDM, devised a group of practical projects that will provide a permanent solution to the problem. The proposal is to build sewer lines in the Brook Road area that would shut off connections which have been there since 1910 to 1930 and build a gravity sewer line, and put a larger pump at the pump station to accommodate the flow. In the other area it is proposed to site a small pump station and divert flow to another connection. Milton is not asking for operating costs, just the capital costs. Because 95% of the sewage that passes from Milton into Quincy comes from 14 upstream communities, Milton believes this is a regional problem.

Stanley Stanzin of Needham stated, “Wouldn’t it be good to have written guidelines on what basis a community can ask for a grant to do infrastructure work?” Ms. Dunphy replied, “We are asking for help only with neighborhoods adjacent to the interceptors. In my opinion, we could shut down the entire town of Milton and we would still have so much sewage going through our town that would impact these homes because this is a regional problem.”

Joe Favaloro stated that Milton has already met criteria at some level because the MWRA has begun improvements further down the same sewer line in the Archdale section of Boston. Mike Hornbrook added that the repairs were to an MWRA pipe which drains into a local system.

Mr. DeSantis stated that he would urge support of Milton’s request for relief, as he felt that the problem is primarily related to the High Level Sewer. In addition, he agreed with Mr. Stanzin that there should be a standard set of guidelines.

Ed Nelson asked, “If this corrects the problem, does that now end up in Quincy’s system?” Ms. Dunphy responded, “The amount that is backing up into people’s basements is not large. The Authority owns Pumping Stations in Quincy that serve only Quincy, which we support by providing \$19 million to upgrade those.”

Dana Snow of Marblehead and Ed Nelson of Quincy indicated their support for the Town of Milton’s funding request.

Bill Hadley of Lexington asked, “Would Milton be receptive to a grant/loan for I/I?” Ms. Dunphy responded, “I still believe this is a regional problem. We cannot reduce the flows.”

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

Rick Neely, Chairman of the Milton Board of Selectmen, stated that the population of the town has not grown in 35 years and sewage went into the system before without a problem. Growth in surrounding areas has occurred, creating a regional issue.

Stanley Stanzin asked, "If this is an MWRA problem, why doesn't the MWRA take care of it?" Ms. Dunphy said MWRA has been aware of this problem and they have been helpful. They have not put Milton's problem in the Capital Budget, but have put in Archdale.

Mr. Hornbrook said, "The Authority does not have the capital costs in its program for Milton's problem. In general, we were anticipating the opening of Nut Island Headworks, which would increase our ability to transport flows to the high level sewer. That, with the I/I reduction program, has been our overall strategy for reducing flows. With the Nut Island Headworks online, there has been significant improvement of flows into the high level sewer, transporting more flow to Deer Island for treatment. All but one of our southern communities are involved in I/I reduction programs."

Walter Woods asked, "What is the Authority's time table to manage the flows in the Southern System which seem to be impacting Milton? Not having any plans, we have no idea what is being done."

Bernie Cooper stated his support of Milton's request and made **A MOTION TO APPROVE MILTON'S REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR A SURCHARGING SYSTEM**. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Stanley Stanzin made **A MOTION TO FORM A COMMITTEE TO DEVELOP GUIDELINES FOR PROVIDING FUNDING FOR LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEMS**. Joe Favaloro suggested **INCORPORATING THIS FUNCTION TO THE OPERATIONS COMMITTEE**. It was agreed and the revised motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

UPDATE: LOCAL PIPELINE TASK FORCE - Steve Casazza, Chairman - Local Pipeline Task Force

Steve Casazza, Chairman of the Local Pipeline Task Force (LPTF), reported that a task force has been formed to devise criteria and a mission statement for the Local Pipeline Assistance Program. The LPTF is working to put together a plan on how to distribute zero interest loans, developing criteria to evaluate projects and creating a list of baseline requirements. Substantial dollars will be available in the future with a \$60 million contribution from the Authority and \$75 million from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Finance Committee - Phil Farrington/Katherine Haynes Dunphy

DISCUSSION: Advisory Board Capital Improvement Plan Review Process

Cornelia Potter reported that the Capital Budget review process has begun, starting the first week of January and continuing through to the February 25th meeting, at which draft comments will be reviewed and approved.

Informational mailings will be sent every Friday beginning January 8th with an overview of the Authority's proposed budget, including a copy of their staff summary which they submitted to the Board of Directors in December as part of their transmittal of the capital budget to the

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

Advisory Board. On January 15th, a follow up on the Boston Harbor Project (BHP) and the wastewater group of capital projects was sent. The third mailing will be on the waterworks program and will include information on the transmittal of a capital budget contingency amendment. The Authority has informed the Advisory Board that they expect that for all the capital projects, other than the BHP, the level of authorized spending or funding won't carry them through June 30. A contingency fund amendment request would increase the authorized level to approximately \$17 million. Authority staff has indicated that BHP may not have enough funds in the Harbor Project to carry into this fiscal year.

Joe Favaloro stated a major component of the Capital Budget, which grows larger every budget cycle, has been the Combined Sewer Overflows (CSO). Cornelia Potter said CSOs are now over \$550 million, growing from \$380 million, which was the amount only two years ago. The CSO Program will be nearly a quarter of all capital spending.

PRESENTATION: COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW PROJECTS - Mike Hornbrook, MWRA Program Director - Sewerage Facilities

Mike Hornbrook, Program Director of Sewerage Facilities, reported on the history and future projected costs of the CSO Plans. Five or six years ago, certain projects were recommended, but we did not know project alignments, locations or design flows. On a conceptual basis, we knew what type of projects we wanted to build and the general location with a projected cost of \$396 million.

In FY97, we adjusted for inflation rates which were tallied too high and we saw a reduction in cost. In FY98, we saw increases from our draft facility plan through to our final facility plan as more information on site and project specifics became available.

In the Proposed FY00-02 budget, there is a \$50 million increase based on 75% of our projects in the preliminary design phase. For projections beyond FY00, we are now seeing a leveling off of the project cost of the overall program, assuming the scope of the program remains the same. We now have detailed site information, actual unit quantities and take off estimates, and have a lot more confidence with the cost figure.

As we develop these projects from conceptual, through planning into detailed design, the costs shift up or down or projects get eliminated. MWRA currently has three "budget busters": 1) North Dorchester Bay Reserve Channel - by far the largest project on the list, has increased significantly from conceptual to currently at 50% design. 2) Upgrade Existing CSO Facilities - increased \$10 million. 3) Cambridge Sewer Separation - \$51 million is the latest cost estimate.

The reasons for increases in capital cost estimates for North Dorchester Bay include soft ground tunneling, sub-surface investigation on material and conditions, modifications to the tunnel design and development of design for the Pump Station and Treatment Facility for this tunnel. In addition, project additions such as odor control facilities were not in the conceptual plan and had to be added as the project went to the design phase. The main channel conduits were increased by 1,000 feet in length because the turning radius was too tight and put the Authority at too high a risk as far as claims by the contractor.

Initial production rates were estimated at 54 feet per day tunneling. A more conservative cost estimate was taken based on advice from a technical review advisory team (consultants from around the United States and Europe), with input from the designers, and the production rate was

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

reduced to 33 feet per day. With the North Dorchester Bay Project, the one message I want to leave with you is that we feel now at 50% design that our costs on this project have leveled out and we expect a slightly reduced cost as we move forward, although there are still some outstanding issues.

One issue is siting. MWRA has proposed a pump station at a site in South Boston where a neighborhood working group is strongly opposed. If we had to move the site, we have estimated an increase in capital cost of \$30 million to \$40 million. The existing pump station site is located on designated public park land. Legislation to get title to that parcel will be needed and we anticipate further opposition from the state representative and senator from that area. Staff recommendation is to stay on that site.

The cost for the CSO program to upgrade four facilities has increased by \$10 million from conceptual design through final planning stages. The project increased by \$3.5 million as a result of the proposed NPDES permit requirements to do extensive sampling and chlorination and dechlorination of these facilities. After getting the NPDES requirements, the sophistication of the instrumentation to monitor the flow from these facilities went up considerably.

The second largest increase of \$1.4 million is for the CSO upgrade of four facilities for safety and operation improvements. MWRA identified a number of worker safety issues, code violations and operational improvements that have to be done that are not directly related to CSO upgrades, but it is more cost effective to have the contractor make these improvements during this phase.

There are two areas of Cambridge that discharge into the Alewife area. MWRA proposed the sewer separation to reduce and eliminate CSO discharge into the Alewife Brook. A cost estimate and conceptual planning was based upon plans provided for us by the City of Cambridge. Based upon Cambridge's maps, we took a quantity take off on what would have to be done for sewer separation and developing costs. We then signed an MOU with Cambridge to proceed.

Cambridge did field work to support their design and have indicated that the system shown on their record drawings is inaccurate. Many of the streets that they had indicated as being separate, are not. Within a given street, if it shows a drain line and a sewer line, if you pop the manholes on both of them on a dry day, the flow is the same level in both. There is extensive interconnection between the systems and the extent of separation that has to occur in some areas is much greater than was anticipated. Cambridge has gone back out into the field to verify in more detail what it would take to do the sewer separation. They have recently submitted a preliminary design with an estimated cost of over \$48 million. MWRA budget was estimated at \$21 million. Staff are taking that information and evaluating to see if that is an accurate cost, and is it still the right project to do.

During the field work in Cambridge, they discovered a previously unidentified CSO outfall which shows there is another CSO area tributary to Alewife Brook, which is not indicated on the drawings. Cambridge has not estimated the detail costs of that outfall, but they have indicated that could be up to another \$20 million.

Cornelia Potter asked, "Is there a chance that the Authority will relook at the North Dorchester Bay Project?" It is staff's opinion that we do not have a viable, cost effective alternative for the North Dorchester Bay Project. The cornerstone of the State and Federal Policy is protection of sensitive areas, and was also the cornerstone of our CSO policy. In developing a successful plan, we keyed in on sensitive areas to spend more money so that we can get complete elimination of

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

CSO discharges in public beach and shellfish areas. There is no other project that can be developed in total elimination of CSO discharges to the beach areas, other than relocation. Even if we were to do closed sewer separation in a South Boston neighborhood, we would still have CSO discharges onto the beach area.

Mrs. Potter asked, "Have you thought about rethinking the overall schedule for North Dorchester Bay?" Mr. Hornbrook stated, "When the court schedule was established, DEP and EPA keyed in and wanted construction to start in the North Dorchester area first.

An Advisory Board member asked, "What do you think will happen in Cambridge in terms of a time line?" Mr. Hornbrook responded, "Cambridge has three construction contracts on sewer separation underway, of a total of nine contracts. To meet the court order, we are required to do more field work, and have chosen to put the other six contracts on hold. We recently received a report outlining the severity of the problem, and we have two to four weeks to see if we conclude with it. Several months of negotiations and evaluations will follow, and we will then go back to the Board. The time line will probably be three to four months."

Operations Committee - Andy DeSantis

Andy DeSantis noted that the Operations Committee met on January 5th and voted to bring forward Milton's request.

Bill Hadley asked, "Has the subject of Y2K been discussed by the Operations Committee?" and stated that he would need a letter stating that Deer Island would be in compliance. Mr. DeSantis replied, "No, the subject has not been discussed at Operations and said it would be a good idea."

DISCUSSION: Water Quality Consumer Confidence Reporting

Stephen Estes-Smargiassi, Director - Waterworks Planning, stated that under an amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) that was passed in 1986, water suppliers are required to publish an Annual Water Quality Report. The Authority sees this as an opportunity to communicate with every household in the service area with a message about water quality. MWRA and the Operations Committee have been trying to determine the most effective way to ensure that the money and effort put in actually pays off in terms of consumers feeling that they have information that is useful to them in evaluating whether they want to drink the water or not. EPA has requirements for the report, but also encourages communities to talk about local issues.

The general schedule is the first report needs to be out this October, and thereafter, have to be published by the first of July on the previous calendar year's data. Staff is planning to have something out this September.

The general consensus opinion is that MWRA offers the communities a master document which will be information about all the communities with some variations. It would not make sense to have each community take the data and generate their own report. Communities have requested the opportunity to insert customized language, which is optional. MWRA would provide the language necessary to meet the law. Perhaps a letter from your Board of Selectmen or a letter from the Water Commissioners talking about local programs.

MWRA would do the production and printing, and it would probably be cheaper and more effective for the MWRA to arrange mailing for each individual community. Since regulations require that it be delivered to every customer, we are encouraged to try to reach every consumer,

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

and feel it would be cheaper to go with postal patron, addressed to Dear Resident. Where you have multi-families or the owner doesn't live at the house, the actual consumer of water would get the information.

The Advisory Board and the MWRA will get a letter out to every Community Water Superintendent and Advisory Board member providing information regarding a schedule and providing contacts in our organizations. We will then call the communities asking if you want to customize and what kind of information you want to put in. We are hoping every community will identify a single point of contact that we can work with, someone who has the authority to actually decide if the insert that was suggested is the one you want to mail. We anticipate more meetings with the Operations Committee on this issue.

STATUS: Court Filings for Water Treatment Decision

Tom Powers, Deputy Director of the MWRA, gave an update regarding the water treatment decision. In late October, the MWRA Board of Directors voted to submit to DEP a request for a waiver of filtration. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) initiated a court filing to require filtration and a hearing is scheduled for March 4, 1999 in Federal District Court to determine whether or not MWRA's failure to meet waiver criteria in 1991 is the end of the discussion. Our defense is that doesn't make much sense. More recent data should be looked at, including improvements that have been made since then and make a judgement based on current data. If we don't lose there, it goes to a trial on merit, which happens later during 1999.

Recent developments are unfortunate occurrences of weather and birds that happened at Wachusett Reservoir. One of the key criteria for a waiver is that your source water meets a criterion set by EPA, which is essentially that five days a week we take a sample. If that sample for fecal coliform measures more than 20 CFU per 100 ml, that's an exceedence. Over the course of a running six month average, you can get 10% or 13 instances over 20 CFU per 100 ml. The combination of ponds freezing elsewhere, before the Wachusett freezes, means a lot of birds come to roost on the Wachusett. This year, due to warmer temperatures than normal and prevailing winds, the harassment has not been as effective. As of January 21, MWRA has had 11 exceedences of a possible 13. It is not clear what happens when the the number reaches 14. There is no question it makes the court case more difficult. At the very least, we expect the DEP to say your plan doesn't look sufficient what else are you going to do to improve your source water protection. We need to have an answer to that.

Joe Favaloro asked, "How will you answer the fact that in DEP's issuance of a waiver, it specifically states if you violate any of the criteria, you would not be eligible for a waiver? This is not a small obstacle, it is a real consideration." Mr. Powers replied, "I don't know the solution."

Andy DeSantis stated, "I find it surprising that the Authority hasn't looked at a what if scenario prior to this." Mr. Powers responded, "All the historical levels went well, it was reasonable to expect that they would continue. Nobody thinks about what if until you get close to it."

Mr. Stanzin asked "How many exceedences did you have in 1998?" Mr. Estes-Smargiassi answered, "Eleven. Every winter we have between two and eight. This year MWRA has done a lot more harassment to scare the birds away, however, because we have had a longer ice off than we typically have, and had more winds from the southwest and west, which move the bacteria from where the gulls roost toward the intake at a rate which is faster than the bacteria die off."

MWRA Advisory Board Minutes - January 21, 1999

Steve Estes-Smargiassi stated testing techniques that EPA did not have in 1987 and 1989 when they finalized the rule are available now. My view is “Can we look at the reservoir now and say do we see pathogens of human concern?” And, “Can we look at the water being delivered to customers and say do we see pathogens of human concern in the water?” If you can answer those two questions in the negative, then I think the answer is I’m providing an adequate system.

Joe Favaloro asked, “How many communities are going to stand with the MWRA when they say although the fecal coliform level is almost 2 ½ times the level its supposed to be, the water is good to drink? Since January 1, you are averaging 44 CFU/100 ml on a requirement of 20, but don’t worry 44 is okay.” Mr. Estes-Smargiassi said, “Yes, essentially, because it is irrelevant.” Joe Favaloro stated it may be irrelevant, but it is one of the Federal criteria that our system must be in compliance with.

F. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

No questions or comments.

G. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:30 P.M. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Sullivan, Secretary