

**MWRA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING / PUBLIC HEARING
MARCH 15, 2012
WELLESLEY FREE LIBRARY
530 WASHINGTON STREET, WELLESLEY, MA – 11:30 A.M.
MINUTES APPROVED AT THE MAY 17, 2012 MEETING**

Forty-nine people were in attendance, including twenty-six voting members: Mike Rademacher, ARLINGTON; E. A. Maguire, ASHLAND; Richard Warrington, BEDFORD; Peter Castanino, BELMONT; Jay Hersey, BROOKLINE; John Sanchez, BURLINGTON; Andrew DeSantis, CHELSEA; J. R. Greene, Barbara Wyatt and Andrew Fisk, GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEES; Edmund Demko, HINGHAM; Charles McCollum, MARBLEHEAD; Katherine Haynes Dunphy, MILTON; Wiff Peterson, NATICK; John Cosgrove, NEEDHAM; Lou Taverna, NEWTON; Bernie Cooper, NORWOOD; Michael Coffey, QUINCY; Jeff Zager, READING; Nick Rystrom, REVERE; John DeAmicis, STONEHAM; Patrick Fasanello, WALPOLE; Walter Woods, WELLESLEY; Jeff Bina, WEYMOUTH; Zig Peret, WILBRAHAM; Joe Lobao, WILMINGTON.

Also present: John Carroll, Andrew Pappastergion and Joseph Foti, MWRA BOARD OF DIRECTORS; George Burnell and Erik Gitschier, LEXINGTON; Joe Welch, NORWOOD; Jack Mitchell, STOUGHTON; Robert O'Brien, WALPOLE; Katherine Babson and William Shaughnessy, WELLESLEY; Carolyn Dykema, LEGISLATURE; Don Rose, COLER-COLANTONIO; Phil Jasset, UCANE; Lexi Dewey, WSCAC; Stephen Estes-Smargiassi, Kathy Soni, Dave Whelan, Pam Heidell, MWRA STAFF; Joe Favaloro, Matthew Romero, Magda Atanasov, Mary Ann McClellan and Cornelia Potter, MWRA ADVISORY BOARD STAFF.

ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC HEARING ON MWRA'S PROPOSED FY13 CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET

**ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC HEARING ON
MWRA'S PROPOSED FY13 CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET**

Chairman Katherine Haynes Dunphy called the Public Hearing to order at 11:37 a.m.

For the record, Secretary Lou Taverna read the official notice of the public hearing: The MWRA Advisory Board will hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 15, 2012 at the Wellesley Free Library, 530 Washington Street, Wellesley, MA at 11:30 a.m. on the components of the Authority's proposed \$639.9 million FY13 Current Expense Budget. The Authority must adopt the proposed budget on or before June 30, 2012. The Advisory Board is empowered by statute to make comments and recommendations on the proposed budget. Copies can be examined at the offices of the Authority at 100 First Avenue in Charlestown. Written comments received at the office of the MWRA Advisory Board, 100 First Avenue, Building 39-4, Boston, MA 02129-2043, no later than May 7, 2012, will also be considered.

*A Motion was made **TO RECESS THE PUBLIC HEARING** at 11:39 a.m. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.*

The public hearing resumed at 11:41 a.m. with a presentation by MWRA Advisory Board Manager of Policy & Finance Review Matthew Romero on the MWRA's Proposed FY13 Current Expense Budget (CEB).

The CEB expenses for the MWRA total \$639.9 million. Total expenses increase by 3.5% but the rate revenue requirement increase, which is what impacts ratepayers, is actually 3.9%. This proposed

budget begins the sharp ascent that is projected over the next 20 years. For the current year, FY12, the rate revenue requirement was \$589.7 million; in five years, the rate revenue requirement is projected to increase by 36% to over \$800 million.

Mr. Favaloro said in addition to the Advisory Board's public hearing, the MWRA will also hold a hearing on April 3 at 6:30 p.m. at Boston City Hall.

*Hearing no comments from members of the public, Chairman Dunphy **CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 11:45 A.M.** The Motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.*

Advisory Board Meeting

A. WELCOME

Chairman Katherine Haynes Dunphy called the Advisory Board meeting to order at 11:46 a.m. and introduced Wellesley Selectwoman Katherine Babson who welcomed everyone to Wellesley. Ms. Babson acknowledged the efforts of Walter Woods, who has served as a member of the Advisory Board representing Wellesley since 1984.

Chairman Dunphy welcomed new Advisory Board member, Andy Fisk, who was appointed by Governor Deval Patrick to represent Environmental Protection.

B. "DIRECTORS' CORNER" – John Carroll, Andrew Pappastergion, Joseph Foti

MWRA Board Member John Carroll stated that there are three Advisory Board representatives elected by members to serve on the MWRA Board of Directors. Andrew Pappastergion and Joseph Foti also serve with Mr. Carroll as representatives of the Advisory Board.

The Board held its meeting the preceding day at the Chestnut Hill Reservoir. About 20 years ago the building at the reservoir, owned by the MWRA, was falling apart and had a leaking roof. Mr. Carroll said that he and Mr. Pappastergion had joined staff members at the facility to discuss what could be done about it. At that time, Mr. Carroll said that the MWRA needed to get rid of the building because it was just a "monster" with all of these pumps and valves. Bill Brutsch, who was the Director of the Water Division, said the MWRA couldn't get rid of the building because the valving is set up at this facility; if the MWRA were to lose the Hultman Aqueduct, the Chestnut Hill Reservoir would have to be used and the valving arrangement still works. Mr. Pappastergion said "why don't we consider putting the valving outside underground and then we can abandon the building?" Mr. Carroll said it was a great idea. The cost was \$7 to \$8 million for a structure to be built underground. The MWRA spent the money and was able to turn the building over to Division of Capital Asset Management and today it is a spectacular waterworks museum.

Another thing discussed by the Board yesterday was a law that attempts to give more openness to government that says "each state authority that receives a total amount of appropriations from the Commonwealth equal to or in excess of \$500,000 in any fiscal year shall on an annual basis conduct an audit of those funds. Each such audit shall be conducted by an independent auditor and should be filed with the State Auditor's for examination, review and comment. Each state authority shall establish an audit committee that shall meet independently of management at least once per calendar year, retain an independent auditor, and compare the results at the end of the audit. Each state authority shall establish a compensation committee that shall meet independently of management at least once per calendar year and shall evaluate and establish executive compensation and additional items."

The Board had two discussions on the topic above. MWRA's General Counsel said that management cannot sit in on the meeting when the Board discusses their compensation. That is not a bad idea but it has to be an open meeting; it can't be in executive session. There can be 50 people in the audience while the Board discusses Fred Laskey's salary but Fred can't be there. There was some disagreement

on this topic. Mr. Carroll said that he hoped that the final determination is when the Board meets independently to talk about management salaries that it would be in executive session.

The Board approved contracts yesterday that have been ratified by the union already for two groups: Unit 2 – Laborers and Unit 3 – Skilled Trades. In FY11 they got 0%; in FY12 they got 2%; in FY13 they will get a 1½ % split / 1½% split, July 1 and January 1 and FY14 will be 2%. MWRA benefited from the negotiations on drug testing and health benefits. Generally speaking, it is in line with what is going on across the state.

About four years ago, a DCR contractor was supposed to do some selective cutting of trees, but actually did selective cutting of acres. Ian Bowles, who was then the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, stopped any more selective cutting and requested that a study be done by a group of volunteers that was chaired by a Professor Barten of U-Mass. The study has been delayed quite a while. In the meantime, an environmental group wrote a letter to all the cities and towns and said the forests around Quabbin are being destroyed and we have to make sure the Governor stops all cutting. Mr. Carroll said there should be selective cutting. Everyone is waiting for Professor Barten's report.

**C. PRESENTATION: WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE COMMISSION
RECOMMENDATIONS – The Honorable Carolyn Dykema, State Representative**

Chairman Dunphy introduced State Representative Carolyn Dykema who, along with Senator James Eldridge, co-chaired the Water Infrastructure Finance Commission (WIFC). These legislators put funding in the budget in 2009 to look at water issues.

Rep. Dykema said the WIFC was established to look at the financial state of the infrastructure in Massachusetts and also to lay out a roadmap and make recommendations on how to get cities and towns where they need to be in terms of their water and sewer infrastructure.

The commission went through a two-phased process to put the report together. The first part was information gathering and the second part was putting together the recommendations.

For the first phase, four state-wide hearings were held. The WIFC invited anyone in the region, particularly municipalities, to discuss and explain the state of their infrastructure and what their current and future concerns were. Meetings were held in Cape Cod, Springfield, Boston and Westborough. Presentations were made by experts in a range of fields, including design engineering, planners and environmentalists.

The commission is finishing up the report and pulling everything together in a format that the 15-member commission could agree upon and receive a majority vote. The members consisted of engineers, environmental groups, municipalities, legislators and a whole range of stakeholders that in the past have had challenging relationships because of different needs and concerns with respect to water and investments. The Associated Industries of Massachusetts was a participant on the commission as well. They did not end up supporting the commission's report but it was related to secondary issues rather than the core findings of the report, which is that Massachusetts is, and has been for quite some time, under investing in water infrastructure.

The primary conclusion that the WIFC came to was that there is a gap in what needs to be spent and what is being spent for water infrastructure. The timeframe that was established in the legislation that was passed was a 20-year window. The WIFC said tell us what we need to spend over the next 20 years to put water infrastructure, statewide, in a state of good repair. The study examined drinking water, wastewater and stormwater. Stormwater will be an increasingly large share of our investment and require a lot of attention when we manage water resources. There is a \$10.4 billion gap over 20 years for drinking water; an \$11.4 billion gap over 20 years for wastewater; and, using some less solid numbers but looking at what the EPA is looking to come out with around stormwater regulations, there is possibly

an additional \$18 billion in stormwater investments over the next 20 years. The numbers are staggering; however, they are not inconsistent with what the Transportation Finance Commission found in 2007. It was an almost identical number around what is needed in Massachusetts to invest in transportation infrastructure.

Starting with that number, another charge for the commission was to try to match that number up with solutions. There were three specific recommendations, one of which is to provide an additional \$200 million in funding at the state level that would be directed specifically to water infrastructure. The commission proposes that 40% of that \$200 million would be spent on direct grants; 40% would be spent similar to the State Revolving Fund (SRF) program now, which is leveraged loans; and 20% would go directly back to communities allowing them to make investments in their local water infrastructure.

Secondary to that, the commission looked at rates and ratepayers. Depending on the community, ratepayers are likely to play a significant role in this solution as well. A survey was conducted that looked at a median household income standard for what is affordable; what do we consider affordable for the average household to be able to pay in rates; that is not to say that is how much they should pay, but to really set a standard to say that anything below this level is reasonably affordable for people and anything above this level needs to be prioritized for subsidization from the state with the SRF funding.

After looking at federal guidelines and guidelines that the state of Pennsylvania came up with, the WIFC decided to use a 1.25% of median household income, which would be the affordability ceiling for communities. If your community is investing and has set its rates at that 1.25% affordability measure, the community would get priority when it comes to the state for funding out of that pool of grants and loans.

There is an amazing diversity of the rates across the Commonwealth. Some are extremely low; some are already above that 1.25% median household income. The idea was to recognize communities that are investing in their own infrastructure to get additional support from the state.

Lastly, and probably the thing that will be of greatest concern to the Advisory Board, is the debt service situation. There is recognition, especially with the MWRA, that we need to deal with this debt. We can't allow it to continue to consume the operational dollars that it does today. One of the recommendations is that the state resume contributing to the rate relief fund (also known as Debt Service Assistance [DSA]), which it contributed to for many years. Because of the down turn, last year DSA was only \$500,000, of which MWRA received \$350,000 and it had been substantial in the past. At one point DSA had reached \$60 million in a single year.

The WIFC has made a recommendation, at least until we get a handle around the debt situation, that the legislature commit to putting \$50 to \$60 million per year in that rate relief line item and also to recognize that those dollars need to be dedicated to eliminating debt with the idea that at some point it will be able to be phased out and the operations themselves will be sustainable from that point on.

The commission also had a number of other areas that it looked at including education of the public. Water infrastructure unfortunately is a hidden infrastructure. With roads and bridges, the public can see that they are in a state of disrepair. With water infrastructure, people don't think about it until there is a crisis; when there is a crisis, long-term planning is the last thing people think about.

One of the primary objectives of this commission was to put forth a long-term plan and to set the public expectation for what it means to invest in water infrastructure. Access to water is critical in dealing with fires. In the 495 belt, there are a tremendous amount of life sciences and biotech firms that are heavily water reliant. For these communities, it is an economic imperative in order to grow beyond what we have today for those companies. The WIFC put in a number of recommendations about education, one of which is to continue the commission as the next phase of this group to make sure that this report is not the end of this conversation and that the momentum continues.

In addition to maintaining our current infrastructure, there are questions about what the infrastructure of tomorrow might look like. How are we going to phase into some of the new innovative products that might be environmentally better or result in lower maintenance over time? Rep. Dykema said we need to be open to looking at new technologies and recognizing that the need to integrate them into our current systems where appropriate.

There has been reluctance from municipalities to try new technologies for stormwater management because they don't want to take the risk. WIFC has been looking at ways to do demonstration projects to minimize the risk on the part of the group or municipality adopting these new technologies. If for some reason the technology does not pan out, the municipality will not be left "holding the bag" for trying to be innovative and then not having something work out. Rep. Dykema said she would love to see underwriters' laboratories programs where if a new technology passes a type of vetting, it would allow that technology to be more readily adopted by the private sector.

Another exciting thing is the economic potential of innovative water jobs. There will be a symposium in about two months that is being worked on by the administration to look at the issue of global water need and management. One of the catch phrases being used is that "water is the new oil." Different countries or different parts of the United States have to manage water more efficiently and in a smarter way. It is going to be the wave of the future, which is exciting from a water management perspective and jobs creation perspective. Massachusetts has so many tremendous institutes of higher learning that focus on innovation. Why not marry the need with the resources and talent we have here to create new opportunities? The symposium will bring stakeholders together to discuss ways to create jobs and prosperity for Massachusetts.

Wiff Peterson said if there is \$40 billion in needs and the legislature is going to set aside \$200 million to help, that represents about 10% of the need. Strategically if the legislature looks at water and wastewater needs throughout the Commonwealth, is it your sense that the state should contribute about 10% and the other 90% should be at the municipal level? Rep. Dykema said when looking at total need, she is not quite as comfortable with the stormwater number of \$18 billion; that is dependent on the regulatory situation as it folds out. Setting that aside and just looking at the \$21 billion that is water and wastewater, the commission did calculations and sensitivity analysis on how to close this gap. The \$200 million per year over 20 years, combined with each municipality in the Commonwealth increasing its rates by 5% a year up to that 1.25% cap, closes the gap in 20 years.

Depending on where your community is now and how close your community would be to that 1.25% would depend on how much the state would contribute versus how much the town would need to increase rates. There is a general recognition that rates are going to play a big part in the solution. Rather than doing a broad-based tax increase to pay the majority of that spending, you are saying to people that most of what they are going to be spending for water is going to stay in their own town and they can see it work for them. The state piece is recognition that there are some communities, especially the smaller or lower-income communities that are going to have a hard time. Even if they meet that 1.25%, there is still no way that they are going to be able to meet their water needs and that is why this funding will be able to be directed to those communities. That is what the commission came up with.

An Advisory Board member asked if the 1.25% is water, wastewater and stormwater combined. Rep. Dykema said it is 1.25% each. Combined, the federal government (EPA) has said they have set an affordability index at 2.5%, which is for water and wastewater. The commission felt comfortable with 1.25% for water and 1.25% for wastewater, with 2.5% total. Pennsylvania set its affordability index at 2% each.

John DeAmicis asked if there is a regional variation in the condition of the infrastructure or is it uniformly bad everywhere. Rep. Dykema said the WIFC relied primarily on the local water commissioners to provide information on their infrastructure. The common refrain was that they are in a difficult position because they politically go to their locals and say we are not investing enough. There are increasing

regulatory requirements with a fixed pot of money. Maintenance is suffering because of these other increasing needs. The bottom line is there is trouble ahead if we don't start addressing this issue.

There is an assumption, if a community is going to have state funding, it needs to do certain things like capital planning and use an enterprise fund, along with setting aside funds to help put those plans together to get up to standard; in the long, the community would have a more sustainable system. A lot of communities don't put money aside, they pay as they go, and when they have to make a capital investment they go to their town leaders and say we need this huge rate increase because we have to do this major project. If we assume a position of regular, steady, predictable increases, such that the public understands and expects that they are going to come, and some of that money is set aside for future planning, would be the best case scenario all around.

Andrew DeSantis said he checked out the Mass.gov website and couldn't find the commission's report but was able to find the draft report on the Advisory Board's website. Rep. Dykema said the report is still in draft form and will be finalized and out by next week.

Mr. Favaloro said I agree with everything that you have said but help us tickle a few people if you could. The only game in town right now is the SRF. We can try to do all of these other pieces but the SRF hasn't done an issuance in more than a year; it becomes very disheartening for communities that are ready to do projects. The MWRA has a line item ready to make its payments for SRF loans and the money sits there because there are no SRF loans.

Mr. Favaloro said in regard to economic development, I applaud the WIFC for including that piece. Economic development is going to be one of the major initiatives recommended by the Advisory Board. MWRA has an abundance of water and there are communities in the state that are hard-pressed to meet their local needs. Staff has begun to work the argument to the legislature for help. Mr. Favaloro said he personally believes that Rep. Dykema's district is an area where more water would be helpful in the future economic growth for the Commonwealth. Tri-Town, North Reading and Ashland could use the MWRA's water, but it is expensive to get there. As part of the economic development projects, if MWRA could get \$20 to \$30 to \$50 million, capitalized over a long period, to help get that long trunk line to the MetroWest area or to North Reading or to Tri-Town, it becomes a win-win situation. The state gets extra money in economic development and taxes and the MWRA gets new customers, which helps broaden the base, which helps all of the communities.

Mr. Peterson said that is a good point because there has been a cumulative effect of years and years of capital investment that has been absorbed by the MWRA such that well over 50% of the user rate is capital cost recovery. Because the state hasn't been contributing, it makes it harder for the MWRA to provide inexpensive water to communities that need it. MWRA has a tremendous resource available but the financials that have accumulated over the years make it difficult to distribute that resource to areas that need it for economic development. Rep. Dykema said that is exactly right and that is why the WIFC noted in its report that the rate relief line item is critical, the idea being to use it to chip away at that old debt.

Mr. Peterson said this is a case where the Commonwealth's investment will pay off to benefit the state, as well as all of the municipalities. Rep. Dykema said the \$200 million and the \$50 to \$60 million would help; however, the "elephant in the room" is where those funds are going to come from, especially given the current economic condition. Is the political will there to find the income to be able to address those needs? This question will come up early next year. Rep. Dykema said she has been trying to make it understood that it is not just a transportation infrastructure question, it is an infrastructure question.

Rep. Dykema noted that looking forward ten to 15 years, as water issues become more and more challenging, as a state, that could be the Commonwealth's competitive advantage. The state can sell to companies that have been moving to North Carolina that need water. This is the time that we need to be having this conversation.

D. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee – Katherine Haynes Dunphy

❖ **ACTION ITEM: TO APPROVE AN EXPANSION REQUEST UNDER MWRA POLICY # OP.11, REQUESTS FOR SEWER SERVICE TO LOCATIONS OUTSIDE THE MWRA SEWER SERVICE AREA, SUBJECT TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE GOVERNOR AND GENERAL COURT, AT THE REQUEST OF FOXROCK RESEARCH REALTY, LLC TO INCREASE THE SEWER FLOW FROM 2,025 GALLONS PER DAY (GPD) TO 5,336 GPD ON A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONNECTION FROM A 2” FORCE MAIN IN HINGHAM CONNECTING TO THE SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM IN THE TOWN OF WEYMOUTH.**

A Motion was made **TO APPROVE AN EXPANSION REQUEST UNDER MWRA POLICY # OP.11, REQUESTS FOR SEWER SERVICE TO LOCATIONS OUTSIDE THE MWRA SEWER SERVICE AREA, SUBJECT TO FINAL APPROVAL OF THE GOVERNOR AND GENERAL COURT, AT THE REQUEST OF FOXROCK RESEARCH REALTY, LLC TO INCREASE THE SEWER FLOW FROM 2,025 GALLONS PER DAY (GPD) TO 5,336 GPD ON A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONNECTION FROM A 2” FORCE MAIN IN HINGHAM CONNECTING TO THE SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM IN THE TOWN OF WEYMOUTH. CONSISTENT WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF MWRA POLICY # OP.11, THE APPLICANT WILL REMOVE A FOUR TO ONE REDUCTION OF INFLOW FROM THE LOCAL WEYMOUTH WASTEWATER SYSTEM (13,244 GPD) THROUGH THE REMOVAL OF 12 SUMP PUMPS FROM THE LOCAL WEYMOUTH SEWER SYSTEM. THE APPLICANT WILL PAY AN ADDITIONAL CONNECTION FEE OF \$12,750, CONSISTENT WITH THE GUIDELINES SET FORTH IN MWRA POLICY # OP.11.** It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

❖ **STATUS: QUABBIN FORESTRY PROGRAM**

Chairman Dunphy stated there has been concern from people in the western part of the state on forestry. MWRA still believes that the best way to maintain the water quality at Quabbin is to have appropriate forest management. EPA and DEP allowed the MWRA to avoid building a filtration plant because it had forest management. Chairman Dunphy said it would be a shame if what has worked for Quabbin for 50 years will be stopped in its tracks forever. The Secretary of Environmental Affairs told the Board yesterday that his office has not received the Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) report. It is concerning that the Trustees for the Water Supply Protection Trust don't have a report to work with. When the report is received, there will be public meetings and comments will be received in writing. This program needs to get back on track to have a quality forest management program.

❖ **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Mr. Favaloro stated that meetings have begun with the legislative delegation. Last week staff met with House Majority Leader Ron Mariano and there were no surprises in the fact that there will not be a lot of money designated to the Debt Service Assistance (DSA) line item for FY13. However, the goal for the short term is to keep the DSA line item alive until the economy gets better and hopefully with the efforts of Rep. Dykema et al, that number will grow. There is a formal commitment that there will be DSA in the budget to keep the line item alive, most likely in the \$500,000 range.

Staff has begun discussions about economic development to try to have the state help pay for the infrastructure and as the economy grows because of growth in business then maybe it will help to get DSA to increase.

Finance Committee – Bernard Cooper

❖ **EMERGING ADVISORY BOARD COMMENTS ON MWRA'S PROPOSED FY13 CIP/CEB**

Manager of Policy and Finance Review Matthew Romero said there is nothing new to report since last month's presentation where staff had outlined the major policy areas that it intends to focus on. Staff is

continuing budget briefings all throughout this month to get more detail on the Current Expense Budget and with all the various departments. Next month staff expects to have a more detailed presentation regarding policy recommendations.

Operations Committee – Jay Fink

- ❖ **UPDATE ON THE ANNUAL CONSUMER CONFIDENCE REPORT** – Stephen Estes-Smargiassi, Director of Planning

MWRA Director of Planning Stephen Estes-Smargiassi said staff is in the midst of doing the Annual Water Quality Report, also called the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR), required by federal law. Every community has been contacted by MWRA staff to provide information for their community letter. MWRA is on the same schedule it has been for previous years. Staff will try to get the community letters done over the next few weeks and will turn it into document format for each community's review. The entire document will be submitted to the printers during June.

Mr. Favalaro said Mayor Christenson of Malden has asked if there is any opportunity, within federal requirements, to move away from the mailing of the brochure and to have it sent by electronic means. Mr. Estes-Smargiassi said there are two separate activities going on along those lines. There is a bill in Congress, which might add some flexibility. It is not clear that it is actually workable the way it is currently drafted but the idea would be to acknowledge that 15 to 18 year-old requirements for mailing reports doesn't match up with new technologies. EPA just opened a national stakeholder comment process about whether, within the existing law, they could add some flexibility. Staff is not sure how it would work for the MWRA because a copy could be mailed or emailed but it would mean having to find email addresses and having to separate those two piles, which might mean that the Authority would have to mail some first class. Staff has sat through the comment periods and has sent in ideas that could be workable.

The Authority pays 20+ cents for printing and postage so it is already at half the cost of a first class stamp for both printing and mailing. It is expensive, but on an individual household basis, it is not that expensive. On the other hand, if a postcard could be mailed to people and tell them they can call the MWRA for a copy or go to its website and download it that might work. Staff is pushing for the postcard mechanism as a way to address both paper waste and cost.

E. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION WAS MADE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 12:43 P.M. It was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Lou Taverna, Secretary