

**TOWN OF ACTON**  
**WATER RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING NOTES OF OCTOBER 25, 2017**

**Documents:** Any documents utilized during this meeting are either included in these minutes, available on the web and/or can be examined at the Town offices during regular business hours.

**Present:** Robert Sekuler, Matt Mostoller, Ron Beck, Barry Rosen, Joan Gardner (BoS Liason).

**Note Taker(s):** Barry Rosen

**Chairperson:** Ron Beck

**Called To Order:** The chairperson called the meeting to order at 7:35 PM

**New Business:**

1. Approval of Minutes: On a motion by Mr. Rosen, seconded by Mr. Beck, the minutes of May 10, 2017 were approved. [3 approve, 1 abstain]
2. Date/Time of Next Meeting: Wednesday, November 29, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the headquarters building of the Water Supply District of Acton (693 Massachusetts Ave., Acton).
3. Introductory Comments:
  - 3.1. Mr. Beck welcomed Mary Lynn Miller who was attending this meeting of the WRAC as a liaison from the Green Acton organization. Ms. Miller may also be interested in becoming a member of the WRAC. She told the committee that she would like to attend additional meetings before deciding whether to apply for membership. Mr. Beck then provided a brief history of the WRAC to Ms. Miller.
  - 3.2. The chair explained that he had met with Ms. Gardner over the summer where it was suggested that the WRAC should wait until it was closer to full membership before holding its next meeting.
4. WRAC Officers: The committee reached a consensus that it would not choose officers until it had obtained full membership (5 full members). In the interim, Mr. Beck would serve as the acting chairperson and Mr. Rosen would serve as the acting clerk.
5. Town Water Study:
  - 5.1. Mr. Rosen asked whether we should proceed with scoping or other things associated with the study which was voted during the Town Meeting as a non-binding resolution for a water resources study until we had obtained direction and approval from the BOS.
  - 5.2. Mr. Sekular pointed-out that Peter made it very clear that no money was available to carry-out the study during the current fiscal year.
  - 5.3. Ms. Miller asked if the WRAC could raise money privately to provide funding. Mr. Rosen stated that he had been involved in projects which were funded in part or in whole by grant monies. At least at that time, it took 3-6 months on average to apply for and receive grant money.

- 5.4. Mr. Mostoller suggested that we should get the BOS to tell us to go forward and develop the scope of the study. We should then go back to them and tell them the estimated costs to perform the actual study.
- 5.5. Ms. Gardner mentioned Acton residents ask her about water issues all of the time. They want to know how much water is available.
6. What should be considered in scoping the study? (“ideas placed on the table”)
  - 6.1. Group consensus is that the study should attempt to cover a 20-year look towards the future with the understanding that probably the first 10 years will be the most accurate.
  - 6.2. Some believe that the town’s build-out would directly project demand.
  - 6.3. Various scenarios should be presented. Perhaps the best case/worst case scenarios of water demand, quantity and quality.
  - 6.4. How do we get a consultant to add value rather than what has already been done and what is already known? E.g. There is already information available in the AWD files that can be used by the WRAC and a consultant.
  - 6.5. What are the things with which we need to be concerned as a town to protect water?
  - 6.6. What NGO’s could be helpful to us? How could we liaise with them?
7. Opinions: were solicited from each member on how to best proceed.
  - 7.1. Mr. Sekuler suggested that we ought to carve out a relatively modest piece or it will take forever before we can get to the BOS. We need to get started soon. Quality and quantity are the most important stuff with which to begin. Other things can come later. It should be a goal to be ready in about two months.
  - 7.2. Mr. Mostoller suggested that we should get explicit direction from the BOS as well as on the scope. We need to be concerned about natural contaminants which can endanger the water supply as can man-made contaminants. Starting by examining quality first might help us to look at quantity differently. Maybe we should do a parcel-by-parcel examination?
  - 7.3. Ms. Gardner thought we need to examine quantity and demand.
  - 7.4. Mr. Rosen believes that it is important to get the BOS to provide the direction to the study as well as the approval to move forward so that we don’t waste our time spinning our wheels.
8. Conclusions: We want to spend time further outlining the study and to get “permission.” The study should be done in two phases—this year’s budget and next year’s budget. The goal is to come back with something practical to present.
9. Actions:
  - 9.1. Mr. Beck will write-up some notes which he will circulate to the committee.
  - 9.2. WRAC members will send Mr. Beck their thoughts/comments on the document. Note: Do not comment to each other as this could be considered deliberation.

**Old Business:**

There was no old business on the agenda.

**Adjournment:** On a motion to adjourn the meeting by Mr. Rosen and seconded by Mr. Sekuler the motion was passed unanimously to adjourn at 9:10 PM.