Mystic River Watershed Municipal Subcommittee
Thursday, September 22, 2011, 10:00 am – 11:30 am
Keverian Room, Everett City Hall, 3rd Floor
484 Broadway, Everett, MA

Agreement Points

- Next meeting date – November 15th in Lexington

Introduction and Announcements

- Winchester, Woburn, Reading and Burlington got a grant to design stormwater infrastructure and generate ideas for cities
- The Town of Reading has smoke tested most of the town and found 20 or so homes that were on septic that should have been on the sewer. They will be spending $400+k on I&I in the next year. This includes a lot of testing and sealing joints. Some stormceptors will be installed around the town.
- All 21 communities in this Subcommittee are MWRA communities - either completely or partially. The MWRA I&I program is on phase 7 right now. There isn't a lot of interest in funding phase 8, 9, and 10.
- Chelsea relies on the I&I program as well. This committee should encourage MWRA to fund the later phases of the program.
- This issue has been discussed at the advisory board meetings.
- MWRA has talked about providing assistance
- Sewer funding is a 60/40 grant/loan. The water version – pipeline assistance and LPAP. There are a lot of limitations so some municipalities don't take advantage of it. This is due to expire 2013. The LPAP might allow for greater usability. This is a no-interest loan. You have up to 10 years. This is all on the MWRA website (http://www.mwra.state.ma.us/comsupport/lpap/lpapprogram.html)
- LWSAP funds are available for tank work and GIS mapping. There are restrictions of how much pipe is lined and other minor requirements must be met.
- If 40% of the pipe is lined, then you can use an equal amount of the funds.
- There are some requirements you have to meet – you have to check a box that says you do directional flushing.
- Andy – MA legislature did recognize the lack of funding for stormwater to meet MS4 requirements. The final report is due in November. The preliminary report can be found here: http://www.senatoreldridge.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/June-29-Final-Initial-Report-as-voted-by-Water-Infrastructure-Commission.pdf
- MWRA put out an RFP for North System Optimization Study to address chronic SSO problems and capacity issues. Bids are already in, hopefully will award the contract soon. Looking to find low-hanging fruit in the north system to improve water quality. They won't be implementing the findings, but it will at least identify some potential

- George – at the next meeting we should share some BMPs for minimum measures that we use for various projects.

Stormwater Management Topics and Next Steps

- IDDE: Hold a roundtable with engineers/DPW's to share successes and challenges;
- Infiltration and Inflow Removal Programs: Provide training on compliance;
- Stormwater - Provide assistance with minimum measures and compliance around the time the NOI is due;
- Stormwater Water Quality Sampling Techniques/Toolbox - Hold a workshop (EPA & MyRWA)

- WQ group is meeting in October – are prepared to help put on some of these trainings and how they can be supportive with moving forward.
- George – it would be interesting to have a workshop on fertilizer.
- Lexington – has done their own sampling in the Shawsheen River because of the TMDL. Would like more information from EPA on ammonia and surfactants.
- Lynne – the lab and inspectors might have time to do some kind of information working session in October – spring. What would be the best timing to do this over the next six months so that we can go back and try to draft up an agenda.
- Lexington – went out yesterday to sample, it was hard work. The stream walks in the winter are a lot easier and you can see a lot. It could tie into when the permits are going to go out. Early December before it snows is a really good time.
- There are different things getting done in winter – if it isn't snowing, we have a lot of time to do things like this.
- A true hands-on workshop would be great, where we could go outside. Before snow, early December would be helpful.
- We could pick a day and do it with the next meeting. Lexington is hosting. The date will be fluid. Specifically speaking to ammonia and surfactants would be helpful.
- When it was done – 2-3 hours in the morning and then a few hours in the field in the afternoon. If they can't stay the whole time, people could leave.
- Will EPA provide information on costs? Yes – in a round table we have some good data where we can provide what our sense of the most effective suite and what the costs would be.
- Lexington is interested in the hard numbers. In the test strips you can use a colorimeter. EPA is cautioning them because of things being cost prohibitive.
- Are there opportunities for MyRWA or other organizations to hold equipment for towns to check out and use/share.
    - Patrick – it really depends on what comes out in the final permit.
- With the permit – there are hard numbers. So the strips are meant for screening and if you get a hit on the strip, you would need to send it out for more testing. Todd can speak more to this.

- Can Todd talk about the order of how you would apply a test kit.
- It will be good to get some people to feed in some questions to MyRWA and EPA so we can plan something.
- George – if we are looking at a few hours for presentation/discussion and we can put the field trip in that day, we could do the field trip in the late winter/spring before it is really wet or hot.
- Could we film this and then put on the web in cause people can't make it.
- Are we looking at it from the point of view to do the sampling well enough so that you don't have to defer to a consultant team. Want to make sure this is worth the effort.
- Do they want to do this work in house or send it out to a contractor?
    - George – there are a lot of communities that might initially contract it out, but if you do it, you could find the time to send someone to go out with them and do it. It isn't that difficult to do. You need someone to teach you how to do it. If you're out there and have a contract with a consultant do services as requested. As long as you can find the time to get someone to go and do it, you can pull it in-house.
- The biggest concern if you bring a consultant on early on is that if you don't even know what to ask them to do then you'll end up spending a lot of money.
- In George's RFP – put in downtown area, where there will be most problems, have least info on, where town will have the less amount of time to do themselves.
- Lexington – there is institutional knowledge that is really effective. This isn't going to be a one-solution fits all. Medford and Lexington are incredible different. Then Chelsea and Everett are different too.
- Wet weather vs. dry weather are different too – you can do dry weather, but wet weather you need to be able to activate the consultant very quickly. It is very difficult to get the wet weather samples in time.
- Woburn W&S – All the people mobilize and work for a few hours and then go home.
- Reading – communities cannot fund the overtime to go wet weather sampling, so it will only be when it happens to rain during a work day.

- I&I – get communities together to identify idea sharing about what works and how to get into homes, doing smoke tests,
- Communities can get together to discuss, if it's a big need and meet without EPA/DEP
- There seems to be a lot to be shared on IDDE.
- This sounds good, but makes sense to do it after the permit is finalized.
- Towns have town meeting coming up in March/May.
- MMA is asking about the permit as well – answer out of Thelma is that the sequence will be – NH first, then North Coastal, then South Coastal.
- Once you see NH, you know North Coastal is next. Hopeful by the end of the year. There are 150 comments. Thelma is about 1/5 through the comments.
- There is no good time of year to have this roll out.

- Would be good to identify clarification about why wet weather is so important and what are the benefits. If they could work on in stream and dry weather, could focus on discharges.

- Most towns have fall/spring town meeting. Spring is the budget cycle and starts around mid-April. The articles need to be closed and go out to print, etc.
- For a mid-April town meeting date, the warrant closes in mid-February. After it closes, you can't get anything more in there.
- There is a minimum length of time that things need to be done and it is at least a month.
- The public education requirement that will be in the permit. Things seem to be moving in a manner where MMA is lobbying for social marketing to have consistency across the board. They want to create a template for every town to pop in information for their specific town. There is a benefit to having a consistent message across the board, so MMA will be looking to take a leadership role when the next permit comes out. This looks promising.
- MWRA consumer confidence report is put out by MWRA but each town can put a letter in with their package.
- If it comes up soon enough so you know what kind of money you need to spend and get it on the warrant then the deadlines in the permit are 90 days and 120 days don't fit at all with the funding scheme. If the permit comes out Jan 1 or Feb 1, a lot of communities won't be through town meeting before they need to put the NOI together and won't have funding in place by the 120 days if they need a plan. The timing seems to be problematic. The better thing to do is to get the permit ready and say what it is, and then make it effective in 6 months. That way, the towns can be prepared.

Nutrients Next Steps/Update

- P in Turf Fertilizer Initiative to Reduce P (contractors, businesses, homeowners, parks & recreation) –
    - Need examples and guidance;
    - Group would like to discuss working together on efforts to reduce P in turf fertilizers;

- Six New England states are still pursuing a voluntary initiative. Want to pull together a summit with distributers and want to put out a guideline straw based on VT, NJ, MD. Not looking for a law, but they want to get meeting. We have given technical support to Rep. Fernandez who introduced a bill banning phosphorus in fertilizer.
- You all seemed very interested in things you can do in your communities, educating people, working with landscapers. If you are interested in these topics,

EPA and the state and others can pitch in and develop and support what you want to do in this area. This is a low-hanging fruit to get at P reductions.

- MMA has endorsed the Fernandez Bill.
- Roger – this is so important because of cyanobacteria blooms and pond scum. Yesterday, went out to 8 mystic ponds and found cyanobacteria in all of them. They were all over the DPH safe limits for cyanobacteria.
- University of Michigan had been sampling for 5 years and then Ann Arbor approached the University to continue to sample after law went into effect and they got a very good result that is statistically valid. This deviates by watershed and what the landscape looks like. They got a 20-30% reduction based on this bill. We could send out the technical document that EPA shared with Rep. Fernandez.
- There is information about the environmental benefits, but also the money you'd save if your treatment plants need to control for P. A ban on fertilizer is almost no cost to communities.
- The manufacturers need lead time and consistency, but they can do this if you are all interested in.
- George, it would be good to get this information and discuss more at the next meeting.
- The state law, DEP would need to work to put a state law on the books. EPA typically has not regulated non-point source and historically we haven't had authority or command and control approach. In the Chesapeake the states took the action and EPA supported it.
- Patrick – there was zero enforcement in the Ann Arbor program. The way that the ordinance was enforced was through education and outreach
- George – if EPA made a regulation, then EPA could regulate at the manufacture level. As a result, will make the towns enforce it.
- Patrick – in the towns, none of them enforced it and yet it was still very successful.
- Lexington is 90-95% P free now.
- Reading and Lexington will find out the price difference between fertilizers with P and fertilizers without P.
- It is easier to control if you do it yourself instead of by contract.
- Lexington – is there anything in place right now for watershed groups to provide data to the town if they are sampling in the town?
    - MyRWA – it takes time to get results back from the lab, but we take samples from 10 pipes throughout the watershed monthly. If there is a huge hit, the towns are notified immediately.
- Town really would like to get data back so they can use it in their permit. Can they use it to help prioritize the work they do?
    - We can talk to Todd at the meeting we'll hold in November/December.

Utilities and Regional Approaches

- Work to share resources and costs across Mystic communities; Invite Upper Charles communities in for a presentation and discussion.

- The upper Charles Report was released. It is on the web. It is not Mystic oriented, but the data inside, seemed really good. There was information about cost. It covered the R.D. and came to conclusion that the 10-year time frame is too fast. The financial forecast study thought that 20-25 years was a more realistic timeframe to meet P goals. It is not realistic.
    - Report can be found here:
        - http://www.epa.gov/region1/npdes/charlesriver/pdfs/20110930-SWUtilityReport.pdf
- Over 20 years, it was $200-$250M. There are a number of ways they did it.
- It isn't completely relevant, but we can send the link out. It would be worth looking through.
- Jay and George are really interested in the utility discussion. The WQ group can bring any information we need.
- The utility idea is good, but it is not without cost. You have to assess residents/property owners. This is hard to get passed in a tax adverse environment.
- There is a lot of reluctance for another tax or fee. They don't really get anything from it. Reading charges residents $40/year.
- There is a lot of pushback from residents. People don't want to pay for a service that they don't get anything from
- Winchester has been contemplating it for years.
- Even a true water enterprise system took years to get done.

Follow-ups and Wrap Up

- Has this group thought about a field trip to the NH Stormwater center? Or to go out into your towns to look at?
- Or water facilities or green street developments to look at?
- Porous pavements – George, using it for tree wells. It is not cheap, a little more than double.
- Lexington has porous pavement in their parking lot. It is still taking water, but is still pretty new. They sweep it. Unsure of the maintenance. Not in the travel part.
- There are sites throughout New England we could look at and it's at the NH Stormwater Center. It would be good to get all the data and find out where it works well and what types are cheaper. If communities got together and there was a bigger need, maybe you could get a bigger price.
- Doug – you can pull in whoever you would like to come in here to give demonstrations on some projects. You could extend an invitation to whoever to come in and talk to you collectively and then EPA can make a call and apply the pressure to get them to the meeting.
    - Could bring in APWA to the next meeting
- If you have any ideas of people or places you'd like to see or show off, please let us know and we'll make some calls.

Agenda items for future meetings

- share some BMPs for minimum measures that we use for various projects.
- Invite Upper Charles communities in for a presentation and discussion.
- Set up a field trip to the NH Stormwater Center
- Set up an all day workshop to learn about water quality monitoring of outfalls

Attendance List:

Name	Organization	Email
Andrew DeSantis	Chelsea DPW	Adesantis@chelseama.gov
Cassandra Koutalidis	Medford – Engineering	ckoutalidis@medford.org
Roger Frymire		ramjet@alum.mit.edu
David Pavlik	Town of Lexington	pavlik@lexingtonma.gov
Pete Lento	Town of Arlington	plento@town.arlington.ma.us
Carey Duques	City of Medford	cduquez@medford.org
Chris Busch	City of Boston	Chris.busch@city ofboston.gov
Nick Rystrom	City of Revere – Engineering	nrystrom@revere.org
George Zambouras	Town of Reading	gzambouras@ci.reading.ma.us
Doug Gutro	EPA	Gutro.doug@epa.gov
Patrick Herron	MyRWA	Patrick@mysticriver.org
Marzie Galazka	City of Everett	Marzie.galazka@ci.everett.ma.us
Fara Albano	City of Everett	Fara.albano@ci.everett.ma.us
Joe Lobao	Wilmington	jlobao@townofwilmington.ma.com
Caitlyn Whittle	EPA	Whittle.caitlyn@epa.gov
Lynne Hamjian	EPA	Hamjian.lynne@epa.gov
David Elmer	Weston B. Sampson/City of Woburn	elmerd@wscinc.com
Matt Shuman	Winchester Engineering	mshuman@winchester.us
Karen Simpson	EPA	Simpson.karen@epa.gov