TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES
PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
Town Hall Council Chambers
May 25, 2006 – Thursday

Present:	Arthur Mathews, Chairperson Susan Kay Gregory Shanahan Michael Smart
Not Present:	Thomas J. Lacey
Also Present:	Terry Fancher, South Shore Tri-Town Development Corporation Jack Henderson, Rizzo Associates
Recording Secretary:	Christine Callbeck

Chairman Arthur Mathews called the Public Works Committee Meeting to order at 7:00PM.

Chairman Mathews advised the committee that Councilor Shanahan spoke with him earlier in the evening and advised him that he will be joining us late due to another meeting that he is attending this evening.

Water/Sewer Presentation as Related to South Weymouth Naval Air Station

Mr. Terry Fancher stated that the issue of water supply and containment has come up a number of times in the past. Mr. Fancher stated that he appreciated the opportunity to have Mr. Jack Henderson give the presentation to the Public Works Committee. Mr. Fancher further stated that the presentation was being taped so that all Weymouth residents will have an opportunity to see the presentation. This presents Rizzo Association with a good opportunity to make sure that the residents understand what the sources might be, what kind of timelines we are looking at, what the preferred alternative is, and what action has to take place or not take place in a DEIR as we move through that process. Mr. Fancher turned the presentation over to Mr. Jack Henderson, Water Program Director, Rizzo Associates.

Mr. Jack Henderson stated that he will talk about what the water supply alternatives are for the redevelopment of the South Weymouth Naval Air Station. Mr. Henderson further stated that he would like to review where Rizzo Associates are in the water supply alternative's analysis, take the council back through some of the history and take a look at some of the things Rizzo Associates has looked at to supply water to the base. Also to be reviewed tonight; an evaluation of all of the environmental and engineering aspects of the alternatives and identify the preferred option, which at this time is the MWRA with the dedicated pipeline connecting to the MWRA system near the Blue Hills Reservoir in Quincy. An update will also be given on the status of irrigation water and the preferred

alternative that Rizzo Associates has developed to date. This would be to use the on sight well as an interim well for irrigation until such time as we can generate enough waste water from the development to treat that for reuse quality standards and then use that water for irrigation. Current water demands are estimated to be 1.4 million gallons per day on an average day basis, with a peaking factor of 1.3, which would then give a max day demand of 1.8 million gallons per day. In preliminary screening analysis Rizzo Association evaluated approximately 11 different potential water supply options. From this analysis, two major water supply options were selected. The two water supply alternatives that were selected are, MWRA Supply Alternative and Brockton Supply Alternative. Both Preliminary Screening Transmission Alternatives were viewed using 4 Pipeline alternatives (Route 3/Route 18 MWRA; Route 37 MWRA; MBTA Rail MWRA; and Brockton), both using direct connection alternatives and Wheeling alternatives. Cost Estimates were given using both 12 inch pipeline and 16 inch pipeline for MWRA and Brockton. The 12 inch pipe with a pump station is approximately $3,000,000 less than the 16 inch pipeline. The Brockton line is $12,700,000. for 2 inch pipeline with a booster station verses $21,300,000. for MWRA. However, MWRA wholesale rate for water is $1.82 and Brockton is $6.20 per thousand. An Impact Analysis was viewed including donor basins, receiving basins, construction impacts (dedicated pipelines). Irrigation Water – Pump Test Operations were reviewed, well reading began on February 17th and ended on March 10th. The Production well was pumped for 6 days at 195 gallons per minute and never reached stabilization. The use of the well for potable water supply is not economical. Stabilization will be a required element for use as a potable water supply. Mr. Henderson further stated that when you look at the cost of purchasing the water plus the capital costs that is where the MWRA water becomes significantly more cost effective than the least expensive Brockton water. From a cost perspective, the MWRA option is the preferred option.

Chairman Mathews thanked Mr. Henderson for his presentation. Chairman Mathews further asked the Councilors if they had any questions.

Councilor Smart also thanked Mr. Henderson for his presentation. Councilor Smart further stated that he is happy to see that wheeling is not being suggested because Weymouth infrastructure is aging and he would not want to see the Town of Weymouth have to go back to Tri-Town with regards to every leak. Also, Councilor Smart would like to see MWRA and keep costs as low as possible for future residents. Councilor Smart further stated that the information Mr. Henderson provided regarding MWRA validates what Representative Mariano and he had done approximately 2 ½ years ago when they asked the executive director of MWRA, Mr. Laskey, to provide the safe yield, which, at the time, was in the range of 70-75,000,000 gallons of safe yield per day.

Councilor Kay asked Mr. Henderson to explain to Weymouth residents in lay terms the following terms: EIR, safe yield, and wheeling.

Mr. Fancher stated that wheeling uses existing pipes with meters at the entrance and exit of the pipes and measures exactly how much water is actually wheeled through the town. A safe yield is the amount of water that you can suck down to and allow to recharge so

that the water level actually doesn't go down. At the pump test the water level never actually reached stabilization (meaning the water never actually came back up). Mr. Fancher further stated that an EIR is an Environmental Impact Report which is required by the state. Mr. Fancher stated that an EIR is an environmental process that looks at 15 different areas that might be impacted by the project that we are proposing to build. Water supply is one of the 15 different areas as well as our source for the sewage treatment.

Councilor Kay stated that it would appear that direct hook-up to MWRA is your preferred option, is that correct?

Mr. Fancher stated that is correct. Mr. Francher stated that Mr. Henderson earlier spoke of the four options: Route 3/Route 18; Route 37; MBTA Rail; and Brockton. Route 37 is the option most open to us.

Councilor Kay asked to have the slide that is in connection with Route 37 put back up on display for the residents at home. In addition, Councilor Kay asked to have pointed out some areas on the map for reference for the residents.

Chairman Mathews asked Mr. Henderson to elaborate on the route, street names and where it will start and end.

Councilor Kay asked to also trace the route from Route 37.

Mr. Henderson displayed the map and showed the screening alternative water supply line.

Councilor Kay asked to confirm that the line is completely new and not interfering with any other line.

Mr. Henderson stated that is correct.

Chairman Mathews wanted to review Weymouth's current municipal system and how it relates to the Phase I Waiver. Chairman Mathews further stated under the Phase I Waiver the requirements are to take 150,000 gallons of water per day and 120,000 of sewerage. Chairman Mathews wanted to clarify for the residents at home that once the permanent line is installed at the base, the intentions of South Shore Tri-Town is to totally be off of Weymouth's system in the future.

Mr. Fancher stated that is correct. Mr. Fancher further stated that another Councilor raised the issue before and which was to guarantee that the water supply coming on to the base gets capped at a certain point.

Chairman Mathews asked Mr. Henderson does the $21,000,000. cost include any mitigation costs for the towns of Weymouth and Braintree for the roads that will be torn up and also what about construction of new infrastructure on the base itself.

Mr. Henderson stated that it does not include the cost of a distribution system on the base. It does include the cost of the storage and transmission facility. The new 1,000,000 gallon storage tank and the new 250,000 elevated storage tank are included in the cost. The pipe network, hydrants, service connections to supply, individual buildings on the base are not included in that cost – that is included in the development costs for the developer. The costs totaling $21,000,000 is for all of the facilities that would be required to get water on to the base, to store it, and have it available to be used with a municipal system. Mr. Henderson stated that the mitigation costs have not been priced specifically as of this date. Mr. Henderson further stated that Rizzo Associates has spoken with each community to understand what they would be looking for in terms of re-pavement, sidewalks repairs, etc. Because this is a conceptual level plan Rizzo Associates has thrown in cost contingencies for the unknowing specifics.

Chairman Mathews stated that like Councilor Smart, he too is pleased to read the draft Environmental Report and to know that it is all but signed off on the wheeling project not being an option.

Councilor Kay stated that she would not be a proponent of wheeling. Councilor Kay further stated that she would like to see a mitigation of at least consideration of a no-cost-emergency hook-up for the towns that will be bothered by the traffic and road construction.

Mr. Henderson stated that emergency hook-up is standard practice. Should there be an emergency of one Town's supply, they would open up a valve and get water from a neighboring community. Mr. Henderson further stated that Rizzo Associates fully anticipates that there will be emergency interconnections between Braintree and Weymouth.

Councilor Kay stated she would be looking for a no cost hook-up. Councilor Kay further stated that emergency hook-ups can be extremely costly.

Mr. Henderson agreed that emergency hook-ups can be costly. Mr. Henderson further stated that he is certain it will be a no cost feature that would be covered as part of the mitigation cost included in the cost estimates.

Councilor Smart stated that he benefits by having seen the pump test presentation before at a different meeting. Councilor Smart further stated he would like to have the extra day of the pump test explained, water storage for irrigation, and waste water treatment plant.

Mr. Henderson stated that the standard pump test approach required by DEP for a new public potable water supply well is a 5-day pump test. The intent of this test is to pump the well at the rate close to anticipated yield of the permanent well. Typically in areas that are good for development as a potable water supply you will reach that stabilization point within a 5-day period. Then after stabilization, generally the DEP is asked to come down and shut down the pump test and it is monitored coming back. This is the data that you use for your computer model. In cases where the yield of the aquifer is insufficient

to get the water to the well that you are pumping out you will not see the stabilization and you will continue to see the water table dropping further and further. Mr. Henderson further stated that when Rizzo Associates had not seen stabilization happen after 6 days, 20% longer than a standard test requirement is, Rizzo Associates went to DEP. They stated that it was not stabilizing and the analysis that we have indicates that stabilization doesn't appear to be happening.

Mr. Henderson stated in the Spring or Summer, when there is good rainfall, Rizzo Associates is able to pump 280,000 gallons per day out of that well. The golf course needs 300,000 gallons per day, but they don't use it day in and day out. They only use it sporadically. What Rizzo Associates would be doing is pumping water out of the well into an irrigation pond that would have storage capacity in it so that they could meet their peaking factors and minimize and stabilize the pumping use of that well. This gives you the ability to pump out, store the water, and use it for irrigation and manage your water resources in a way that is most environmentally sensitive. Once the waste water treatment plant is online and is producing highly treated and usable water for irrigation that water will be going into that irrigation pond. Any water that does not go to the irrigation pond will go to a ground water discharge, which is essentially replenishing that source of water that the well is drawing from.

Chairman Mathews asked Mr. Fancher for a summary of the waste water analysis, what the preferred alternative was, and how Weymouth was considered as an alternative but essentially ruled out.

Mr. Fancher stated that the preferred alternative is in Abington.

Mr. Henderson stated that the water quality coming out of the treatment plant will be treated to a reuse standard for irrigation water which is a quality that the DEP allows for direct recharge into an aquifer that is supplying a community its public water supply. It is not at a quality to drink, but with additional natural treatment through the aquifer system plus whatever treatment the municipality has in their own water supply system is acceptable for drinking water.

Chairman Mathews stated that the preferred alternative that was mentioned in the draft environmental impact report is to build a treatment plant on site to treat the waste water there and not to use Weymouth storage system after the Phase I Waiver.

Mr. Henderson stated that Chairman Mathews is correct. Mr. Henderson further stated that it will be built in phases.

Councilor Kay asked to confirm that the waste water treatment plant will be built in Abington. Councilor Kay further questioned what type of waste water treatment plant is being considered and what is the method of filtration.

Mr. Henderson stated that the idea of a waste water treatment plant is still under evaluation but a couple of different processes are being considered. All of them are

considered biological. Membrane Bio-Reactors (MBR) is one process being looked at. Mr. Henderson further stated that all of the considered processes are highly efficient and effective waste water treatment systems that are considered tertiary level treatment, which is not what your standard waste water treatment plant that you see in a municipal treatment plan. Most municipal waste water treatment plants, in the State of Massachusetts, treat to secondary standards.

Chairman Mathews stated that this facility would absolutely have to be approved by the DEP, EPA and signed off by local conservation boards as well, going through a thorough review process.

Mr. Fancher stated that this actual facility, if you were to build the building, would be approximately two thirds the size of Weymouth Town Hall and it is only about two stories tall.

Chairman Mathews thanked Mr. Fancher and Mr. Henderson for the presentation and for letting the residents at home see what is going on as far as the air base water preferred alternative is.

Councilor Kay stated that she would like to ask the residents at home to contact the Council Office or go online to clarify any questions they might have.

Mr. Fancher offered his e-mail address to residents that might wish to contact him. fancher@ssttdc.com

Chairman Mathews stated that the residents can contact any of the Councilors.

Councilor Smart gave a point of order. This is a public meeting not a public hearing, there is certainly an opportunity for the residents to come and speak or they can contact Councilors to ask a question.

Chairman Mathews asked Mr. Fancher if during the draft environmental impact report process, will there be public hearings given for the public to speak.

Mr. Fancher stated yes. Mr. Fancher further stated that he believes that there has been a misconception when we go through a public consultation on the notes of project change. Some people think the public consultation is a public hearing – it is not. A public consultation is designed for questions to be raised so that a notice of project change and a certificate could be issued. When we get into the draft environmental impact report there is a period of time, after the public has commented, that we as the proponent have to respond in writing within a 90 day period of time. That is why there a timeframe difference between the draft environmental impact report and the final, so that the public has adequate time verbally or in writing to be able to comment.

Adjournment

At 8:10PM, there being no further business, a MOTION to adjourn was made by Councilor Smart, and seconded by Councilor Shanahan. UNANIMOUSLY VOTED.

Approved by:_____
Arthur Mathews, Chairman