OLD COLONY PLANNING COUNCIL

Rebecca Coletta, President | Mary Waldron, Executive Director

(508) 583-1833 | 70 School Street, Brockton, MA 02301 | www.oldcolonyplanning.org

Regional Water Plan
Steering Committee Meeting
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Tuesday, April 23, 2024, 9:00am

Location: Old Colony Planning Council, 70 School St, Brockton, MA 02301

Attendees:

Steering Committee	
Organization	**Name**
Town of Abington	Liz Shea
Town of Avon	Jonathan Beder
Town of Bridgewater	Shane O'Brien
CPCWDC	Art Edgerton
CPCWDC	Kimberly Groff
East Bridgewater	John Haines
Easton Department of Public Works	Greg Swan
EPA	Margherita Pryor (via Zoom)
Town of Kingston	Val Massard
MA Department of Conservation and Recreation	Jason Duff
MAPC	Martin Pillsbury (via Zoom)
MassDEP	Duane LeVangie
MassDEP	Jon Hobill (via Zoom)
Pembroke Water Department	Dan Sullivan
OCPC	Joanne Zygmunt
Town of Plympton	Gavin Murphy (via Zoom)
Town of Plympton	Brian Vasa (via Zoom)
Town of Stoughton	Phil McNulty
Watershed Associations	Pine duBois
Watershed Associations	Jimmy Powell (via Zoom)

Observers	
Organization	**Name**
South Shore Chamber of Commerce	Peter Forman (via Zoom)
OCPC	Bill Napolitano

Consultants	
Organization	**Name**
CDM Smith	Al LeBlanc
CDM Smith	Kirk Westphal
CDM Smith	Amara Regehr
CDM Smith	Grace Inman
CDM Smith	Kara Rozycki
Regina Villa Associates	Kyle Olsen

Minutes:

1. Call to Order, introductions
2. Public Comment – none
3. PFAS
    a. Presentation by Al LeBlanc, followed by Q&A:
    b. Is reactivating carbon an option versus disposal? Cost difference? ~$2/pound for carbon to purchase but ~$4/pound for carbon to purchase and reactivate. Carbon life can range from 3-6 months to 3 years
    c. Is there a market for shipping carbon out for reactivation? Yes, likely.
    d. How are removed materials treated after removal from water? Incinerate or landfill
    e. Home treatment for private wells? These systems are expensive. Would need to a call a provider to get system and operating cost, including cost of carbon disposal.
    f. Source of PFAS in rural areas? Soil does not seem to stop it, still gets into the groundwater. Source can range from septic systems to agricultural, etc.
    g. Movement to control use of PFAS in consumer products? Yes, but potentially still have toxic replacement compounds.
    h. Are consumer systems worth it? Up to individual consumer. There is guidance from EPA on point of use systems. Need to use reputable provider for systems.
    i. Future regulations for other contaminants? Likely, but could be years away. PFAS treatment has additional benefits for removal of other contaminants. For example, Reverse Osmosis can help with pharmaceuticals (less so with Granular Activated Carbon).
    j. Operator difficulty for PFAS treatment systems? GAC easier to manage than RO
    k. Has DEP considered re-classification of operators? Unsure.
    l. Bottled water regulated? Less regulated than municipal water systems
    m. Long range housing initiatives and future of PFAS treatment? Potentially more centralized treatment facilities instead of many smaller systems

n. Faucet filters? Home water systems have failed with misuse on consumer end
o. Can private wells be regulated? Typically they are not, but Board of Health could require testing at time of sale, similar to Title 5 septic systems.
p. GAC contact time required? ~10 minutes, which is why refrigerator filters are not effective in removing PFAS

4. Metrics Examples

    a. Metrics to be created for each objective. Reviewed examples, prioritizing quantitative metrics where feasible.

5. Metrics Discussion

    a. Breakout Group D Metrics Discussed:

        i. Encourage sustainable water use to meet the needs for housing and economic prosperity.

            1. One metric for private well households: permitting for well re-digging. Track this on a regional scale to understand if there is no longer sustainable water supply
            2. Another metric: additional water supply potential for economic development
            3. May have limited data availability for this, would require measuring groundwater levels and surface water levels.
            4. Ideas came up about how to incorporate recommendations for final water plan
            5. Look at per capita water use- good indicator for if there is additional water
            6. Unaccounted for water (UAW)- trends for this
            7. Housing density efficiencies for water use – no specific metric mentioned
            8. Conserved land that is left for water recharge
            9. Public private partnerships
            10. Peak demand may not be a good metric to understand “cushion” for economic development
            11. High cost of water as a consideration for reclaimed water
            12. Drought restrictions could be an indicator for some communities while others go under drought restrictions every year so would not be a useful
            13. We also mentioned having some understanding of what is meant by sustainable supply

    b. Breakout Group C Metrics Discussed:

        i. Consider innovative and alternative solutions such as stormwater capture, wastewater reuse and water use efficiency.
            1. Consensus that water use efficiency is the most useful
            2. RGPCD is a measure of efficiencies
            3. UAW is a measure of efficiency

4. Seasonal water use- to understand how much is being used for landscaping and nonessential uses
5. Cost of solutions
6. Ranking efficiency (efficiency = 4/5, traditional source (e.g. MWRA) = 2/3, wastewater reuse = 1)
7. Stormwater was considered as the least likely alternative- lowest on priorities

ii. Prioritize alternatives with high cost-benefit value.
1. Efficiency would be considered highest cost benefit value
2. Potential benefits from regional alternatives for high cost benefit value
3. Wastewater reuse isn't cost effective
4. Potential metric $/ gallon in efficiency or $/gallon in water sourced, applied to different uses

c. Breakout Group B Metrics Discussed:
i. Promote equity by incorporating affordability, accessibility and distribution of infrastructure impacts.
1. Equal access to goods= clean drinking water
2. Impacts of infrastructure don't impact more communities than others
3. Affordability- making sure that one community isn't paying significantly more than another community. But each community is it's own separate system
4. Potentially use something like Household Burden Index – evaluate the cost of water compared to income
5. Difference between regional and local equity- equity between communities versus within the same community
6. If there are going to be groups of projects that are going to benefit the region as a whole, where are those projects going to take place?
7. Potential to assess comparing gaps between supply and demand- but difficult due to interconnections
8. Potentially look at RGPCD
9. Try to ensure federal and state government funding can be spread throughout the region
10. Consider the equity issue between private well owners and public water supply users

ii. Meet current and future safe drinking water quality.
1. Scale (low) = not meeting required water quality standards, medium = meeting required drinking water quality standards, high = exceeding required water quality standards

d. Breakout Group A Metrics Discussed:
i. Meet all current and future peak water demands with climate resilient supply side and demand side strategies.
1. Only focusing on the end user of the water supply: delivering water as a percent of demand for the region
2. Resiliency within that supply on a regional scale- built in capacity – based on a specific goal to be determined- example of 20% buffer for climate resiliency

ii. Improve ecosystem health.
    1. Groundwater levels
    2. Streamflows
    3. Connectivity of different water bodies
    4. Fish migration patterns
    5. We are probably below what we should be for a healthy ecosystem. Should use different parameters to have an ecosystem index. Track over time, and have metrics based off of positive trend on ecosystem index. May be able to use MA state data related to this, or set for our own region

6. Metrics Finalization
    a. Reviewed discussions from breakout sessions. Metrics discussions will be continued at next workshop.
7. Annotated Bibliography
    a. Annotated Bibliography was distributed via email. Each community/association is requested to review their section and respond to questions at the end of their section. Send responses via email to Kara Rozycki (RozyckiKM@cdmsmith.com).
8. Regional Schematic
    a. Review of Sankey Diagram
        i. Overview of diagram provided
        ii. CDM Smith will review the diagram with MassDEP to clarify values
        iii. SC requested more details and description
    b. Review of schematic map
        i. SC requested more details and description. Clarify between water source and pipe interconnections.
9. Demand Projections
    a. To be discussed in upcoming workshops
10. Next Workshop
    a. 5/20/2024

Action Items:

Assigned to	Action Item
Steering Committee members	Review annotated bibliographies and respond to questions
Kara Rozycki	Email Annotated Bibliography questions to each steering committee member
CDM Smith	Review Sankey figure diagrams with MassDEP

Attachments:

1. Meeting Presentation Slides

Prepared by CDM Smith.