



APPROVED
2.28.17

Town of Carver, North Carver Water District Commission

Posted in accordance with the Provisions of M.G.L. Chapter 30A, Section 20B

Meeting minutes for February 14, 2017. The North Carver Water District Commissioners met, today, at the Carver Town Hall, meeting Room # 3, 108 Main Street, Carver, Massachusetts.

Attendees: Kevin Tracey, Chairman; William Sinclair, Commissioner; Stephen Romano, Commissioner
Marlene McCollem, Director, Planning and Community Development

Also present: Mr. Trumbull, Small Water Systems; John Woods, Superintendent DPW; Michael Milanoski
(arrived at 5:50PM)

Absent: Michael Ohi, Comprehensive Environmental Inc., Mike Woollam, SWSS

Meeting called to order at 5:01 PM, by Mr. Tracey

Privilege fee for 3 Braddock Way - Confirm land area and betterment is based on ANR lot, not the parent parcel:

Ms. McCollem – They are not questioning the privilege fee. They are clear on all of that. The packet of info I sent you; they had a traumatic experience when they purchased. They indicated that the first plan is a 1985 plan that shows it as one lot. The 1997 plan carved out the front piece which is the dog mall. Bev Boyer was conveying both at the same time, Dog Mall and Sheraton Home Builders. They sold, accidentally, the entire property to the Dog Mall and then had to sell it back to redistribute. Sheraton wants confirmation from the board that the privilege fee is for just 18-18-D.

Spreadsheet for betterments is clearly noted as 18-18-D, 90,827 sq. ft. The other parcel I am not sure it was accounted for when conveyed to Dog Mall. Mr. Tracey believes it is 18-18 – B, or 174 Plymouth Street (Conveyed to Dog Mall). Mr. Romano – What is their question? Ms. McCollem – They are asking if the privilege fee is only on 18-18 - D or does it include the other lot. Mr. Romano – Can't we just show the equation? Do the equation both ways to show him the difference. Ms. McCollem – its based on a theoretical 500 Gals and they want to make sure its not tied to 18-18 - B. Mr. Tracey – It is all 18 -18 D. 18-18 - B has its own assessment. Ms. McCollem – they understand but want to verify as the conveyancing was so difficult. They want to make sure its only for the 90,827 sq. ft. lot.

The board is in agreement that this privilege fee is correct and is based solely on 18-18 - D. Ms. McCollem will convey this to the attorney tomorrow.

SWS Operator's Contract ends June 30, 2017:

Mr. Romano – Do this need to go out to bid. Mr. Sinclair – I don't believe we need to; SWS has been extremely good to us. Mr. Romano - They have been with us for five years so it is not required. This is for a two-year extension. SWS works for us and we will need to do negotiations with SWS. Mr. Tracey – we have an inter-municipal agreement. Ms. McCollem – Would we have to renew the inter-municipal agreement? Mr. Tracey – I am not sure. Ms. McCollem - If you come back with significantly higher rates, that will need to be discussed. Mr. Romano – SWS will need to provide us with info for the March meeting. Mr. Romano – What do you (SWS) do for other communities for contract length? Mr. Trumbull - It varies but mostly 3 years. Mr. Romano – I would suggest we move forward for three years

Motion to authorize chairman to work with SWS to come up with agreement for our March Meeting: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Romano

Approved: Unanimous

New source and Middleboro:

Ms. McCollem – Mike Ohl and I spoke yesterday about having a formal agreement with Middleboro in preparation form if/when we need to come off line for repairs. I understand that there is a gentlemen's agreement right now, but we need to formalize it. Mike indicated that DEP will look upon this favorably; it would be good insurance. I have put in a call to Joe Silver. We need to move forward 1) the DEP and 2) we've had problems with the well pumps. For major repairs, it would ensure us that we have an agreement that would buy time to make repairs but we would still have access to another source. We should start planning for being offline once or twice a year for maintenance. It would be better to plan these things than make emergency repairs. Mr. Trumbull – Decas is moving out so this would make it easier due to chlorinated water from Middleboro. Middleboro also has higher pressure. Ms.

McCollem – I spoke with Mike about a capital expense to install a pressure reducer and metering the connection. Mr. Trumbull – Middleboro has a bigger system and higher elevation which requires more pressure. Ms. McCollem – There will need to be some things that would need to be worked out. We will need to figure out how to make it automatic. Mr. Romano – Will Middleboro notice when we come on in Middleboro? Mr. Trumbull - Yes, they will notice things like sediment getting stirred up. it does. Ms. McCollem - I want to understand what capacity they have and how much time it would buy us for repairs, etc. Mr. Romano – If I were their water Commissioner, I would want to know when we were coming onto their system. Ms. McCollem – We would know and would let them know pretty quickly. Mr. Trumbull – We don't drain the wells too quickly so we would have time. If Decas or Indian Head are taking, they would drain us quicker. Ms. McCollem – we need to understand Middleboro's rate structure so we can determine if its appropriate to continue supplying Decas and Indian Head when we are using Middleboro. Ms. McCollem – If this is going to be a DEP approved redundancy, it should be a more formal. Mr. Sinclair – My concern is that we are not relying on Middleboro instead of looking to get a new source in the future? Ms. McCollem - No, that is not the intention.

New Source – Ms. McCollem – We've got a partner in Audubon and conservation. There is discrepancy on the drinking water parcel – In some places it says its under control with Board of Selectmen; other places say Water Commission. A good portion of parcel is wetlands. Mike Ohl will take out wetlands. He will take out areas to control zone 1. Then we will ask Conservation Commission for permission to explore. We need to retest existing wells.

- The first step would be to identify areas
- Then 2 ½" diameter test well for yield and quality. Existing wells (only the 2 that were tested) are 7 parts iron, Mike Ohl is looking for no more than 1-part iron. If you find promising wells then go to a 4" diameter test. We may need to bring in the water if quality water is found from farther away.

Ms. McCollem – If we get in the same type/quality of water, then don't do another well. I will talk with Middleboro to handle the interim. Mr. Romano – Can we access and begin the process on the wells in this weather? Mr. Trumbull - Yes, they prefer better weather but it is doable. Mr. Romano – Can we take an existing well to bedrock? Mr. Trumbull - Yes. We would set swell casing and keep drilling until we find it. Mr. Romano – shouldn't we just do that? More cost productive? Mr. Trumbull - We could explore this, but Mike Ohl would need to provide input as it's outside my scope. Ms. McCollem – Mike has said that the Bedrock wells may provide better water for a year or two but there is a much bigger variable with them. Mr. Trumbull – You have lots of property and would probably not be influenced by other neighbors. Ms. McCollem – We need to know our options. Mike Ohl will be here at the March Meeting. Mr. Romano –Can our existing wells be used as back up? Mr. Trumbull – Yes we absolutely can. Ms. McCollem – For DEP permitting, if you put another well within so many feet, it's not as a big of a deal with abandonment. Mr. Trumbull – You are in a pretty good position; I would suggest you leave them open. Mr. Sinclair – What if Conservation Commission says no? Ms. McCollem – We have to show them the pictures of the pumps and the costs associated and that there is no other option. This step is needed.

February commitment for Decas and Indian Head:

Mr. Romano – How Much has Decas dropped off? Mr. Trumbull – They have reduced from 5 days to 3 days. But now we have Indian Head who took 29,000 gals this month. Their numbers will increase in the summer.

Motion to authorize Indian Head and Decas commitment: Mr. Romano

Second: MR. Sinclair

Approved: Unanimous

FY18 Draft Budget:

Ms. McCollem – We spoke last time about difficulties with using your budget. I have been thinking about this and have gone through all the invoices since I've been here. I've looked at what you've actually been spending your money on? My biggest issue is that you are doing too much capital work from and operating budget. You have a very unique set up here. Your regular maintenance on your wells is very unusual. Mike Ohl's work will help you organize this. Things are getting bigger and things will happen. We need to anticipate issues and formalize them outside of your operating budget. I've reviewed your operating and right on top is your well maintenance. Right now it is at \$9000. When a transducer failed, you had more than \$13000 of expenses associated with that repair. Just that one time would have blown this line. We are running them hard but we have to start planning regularly for that failure and budgeting for it instead of a surprise. \$9000 will get you one set of pumps. Mr. Romano – What about a line item for "unforeseen expenses"? Ms. McCollem – I have indicated a line item at the bottom for Emergency Reserves. The next line – Facility / Equipment Repairs is for smaller repairs (switches, etc.). Your phone and your SCADA is what it is. Generator Service and maintenance - we know you've spent a lot on this generator. This includes your regular maintenance contract and the extra calls that were needed. Your electricity line is being restructured to your contract minimum with Solare for next fiscal year. Those are the bills that you paid to Solare. At the bottom of the page; New revenue line - you should put the credits in the revenue line. Your propane is based on the actual bill – obviously they vary depending on temperature. Insurance has gone down since you got rid of your truck. Legal budget reduced as you reduced betterments. Mr. Tracey – Re: Weston / Sampson - The auditors say that we owe them \$50,000. We need to leave the legal budget as is, if we need to defend for the next two years. Ms. McCollem – What dollar amount is appropriate to carry in the legal line? Mr. Romano – every time they come it costs money. Mr. Tracey – Not really, the fees have been minimal so far. Mr. Sinclair – In two years, the worry should end due to statute of limitations. They probably will not move on this until next year. Mr. Romano – We should leave it at \$5000. Mr. Milanoski – I think what Ms. McCollem is looking for is what your normal operating legal budget would be? After discussion, the board has agreed to drop budget to \$1500, for this budget. Commissioner's Salary is what it is. Recording Secretary is what it is. Billing Support includes UBS, sales Neptune reader which is expensive; we need to use Ellen every time we do water billing so I'd like to shift that cost and have Ellen bill the board directly for time used. Indirect Costs – Ms. McCollem I didn't put this on. Mr. Tracey – it's required and will need to be put on. Small Waters Base Contract is based on this current contract and may/may not change. Emergence Call outs – this is something that we should have and need to watch; it is our clue to oncoming problems. If we are having a year with a lot of callouts, then we need to look at them and the cause for them. Fees and Dues – you have random bills from state, that are essentially fees, that need to be differentiated. Meters –

prices fluctuate. I need a better way to determine the actual costs. The prices change. Mr. Milanoski -The copper prices change the meter prices. Mr. Romano – can we do a revolving account? Mr. Milanoski – we have an article going to the town meeting and Ms. McCollem is asking about this so we can add if necessary. Ms. McCollem - We need to mark boxes with price as they come in then I will know what to bill. Mr. Trumbull – that line item needs to be expanded – Meter replacement program is not on the budget yet. We will discuss when we are better able to handle it. Mr. Trumbull – normally you supply the meter; when there is an issue, we replace. Large volume customers are different. We need to talk about compound meters (3" and bigger) for large volume customers – these catch low volume use. Mr. Milanoski – would it be easier just to set a fee and then we would be covered for fluctuation? Ms. McCollem – it's on the fee schedule as actual cost. Currently set as \$300 for meter and installation. Let's begin utilizing dual/compound meters as soon as possible. Mr. Milanoski – if Mikes replacing a meter is it in the contract? Yes. How many meters are from Middleboro? Mr. Sinclair – about 70 meters. Mr. Trumbull – If you replace 10-15 per year, it manageable. This will keep them staggered and it would be built in. Mr. Milanoski – Do all meters' breakdown over time? Are the brands better? Mr. Trumbull - Neptune is good, which is what we have. Mr. Sinclair – Every commercial meter that we purchase, we charge them and install those meters. If they are \$5000 each, what do we charge the customer? Ms. McCollem – They reimburse the cost of the meter. SWS how many do we have? Not many. Sinclair – any commercial entity should pay cost plus the cost of 4 residential meters. This will build up the meter replacement fund. Mr. Romano – Can we do it? Mr. Sinclair – Middleboro did it for years. Ms. McCollem - I think you would have to revise your rules and regulations. Mr. Sinclair – this would be a fee and go to a specific line item. Mr. Milanoski – You have a fund, the stabilization fund. This would not be a bad thing to tap into and would generate additional revenue to buy new meters. Mr. Romano – Send a letter to all users and let them know that they will be needing to replace the meter every 7 years. Mr. Milanoski – why should the residential user pay for the replacement. If you put it in to your policy that problem is solved. Ms. McCollem – I don't think that you should have your homeowners pay for a replacement meter. Mr. Sinclair – we should start phasing them out and replace a certain amount, every year. Mr. Milanoski – should we do a pilot program and test it out? Mr. Trumbull - You can. Mr. Milanoski- Do we have any 3" locations? Ms. McCollem I don't believe so. Mr. Sinclair – Let's put a line item and fund eight meters (\$1000). Ms. McCollem – a separate line item? I think you should do them together. Change to meter replace/new meters.

Mr. Milanoski – we need to get the budget approved by February 28th. Is there anything else that should be added to this?

Mr. Tracey - \$46832.36 Indirect Costs for fy18 should be in.

Mr. Sinclair – Indirect costs – knowing that the billing was moved back to Jill, etc. Did those costs come with that move? Mr. Milanoski – Yes it has. Mr. Sinclair – does that come out of Bill Support? Ms. McCollem there's no actual money – our salary doesn't change it just changes our workload. Mr. Sinclair – So the amount of work necessary to take care of this, they are accepting all of that additional workload. Mr. Milanoski – Staffing has increased for Ms. McCollem department. Ms. McCollem – Just to be clear, that staffing change happened for the current fiscal year. Mr. Milanoski – there is adequate staffing and we have made changes. We are anticipating one retirement and will handle that at the appropriate time.

Bills Payable:

Mr. Sinclair – Verizon for \$600 +, why is it so high? Ms. McCollem this is a double bill as we didn't get a previous bill.

Ms. McCollem – We have received a random bill for fire alarm testing in 2015. We have opted to not pay this at this time. Mr. Trumbull – We did have a problem with lines coming in that had to be replaced. I believe it was before 2015.

Motion was made to approve bills as submitted, \$10279.64 for North Carver Water District: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Romano

Approve: Unanimous

Water Operator's Report:

Postponed to next meeting, due to members needing to attend another meeting.

Minutes: November 22, 2016 and January 10, 2017:

Postponed to next meeting, due to members needing to attend another meeting

Correspondence:

Postponed to next meeting, due to members needing to attend another meeting.

Next meeting: *Has been set for February 28, 2017 at 5:00 PM*

Motion to approve meeting date of February 28, 2017: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Romano

Approved: Unanimous

At 7:00 PM, Mr. Sinclair, Mrs. McCollem and the recording secretary, Mrs. Hannon had to leave this meeting to attend the Planning Board Meeting.

Meeting adjourned:

Motion to adjourn was made at 7:02 PM: Mr. Romano

Second: Mr. Tracey

Approved: Unanimous (2-0)