Lost Lake Sewer Committee Minutes
January 23, 2014

Present: Dr. Horowitz, Board of Health; Thomas D. Orcutt, Water/Sewer Superintendent; John G. Petropoulos, Selectman; Jay Prager, Finance Committee, Michael Rosa, At Large

Meeting was called to order at 6:30

Meeting Minutes from January 9. 2014 were reviewed. Minor changes were made.
Mr. Rosa motioned to approve the minutes of January 9, 2014 pending changes made in response to today's review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Prager and approved unanimously.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday February 6, 2014 at 6:30.

Mr. Petropoulos passed out a document with each Member's suggestions on what we should do next. He asked each individual to present their suggestions.

Mr. Duger from the audience spoke about the use of the term 'Constituents' rather than Nutrients or Contaminants. He suggested that the term represented more neutral language.

Mr Rosa suggested:

1) Have the board of Selectman expand the charter of the committee to look at any recommendations that could be made to protect the water shed and lost lake.
2) Look at by-laws that would help protect the water shed.
3) One of the issues is water quality in privet wells. The board of selectmen should add to our charter looking at creative financing to help residents with new or improved there septic systems.
4) Look into doing a partnering betterment with residents to install town water.
5) Look into trying to determine if there are areas that are contributing more contamination in the water shed and what can be done to fix the problem.

Mr. Petropoulos stated that he believed that the Committee should summarize its position and make recommendations on moving forward.

Mr. Prager agreed with Mr. Rosa on the idea of focusing on the watershed. He agreed with using the term Constituents rather than Contaminants or Nutrients. He expressed the need to understand the extent to which homes contribute to the condition of the watershed. For instance how do we understand what percent of the problem comes from homes, and specifically from homes that could reasonably be sewered. He stated that he would like us to understand the contributors and the cost benefit of the various solutions.

Mr. Orcutt suggested that we should hear from CEI, form Ken Wagner and from DEP.

Dr. Horowitz agreed that hearing from Ken Wagner was important. She stated that she would like to know what the continuously referenced DEP threat was all about, and why we seem to think that the DEP has told us that we need to install a sewer.

Mr.Prest from the audience stated that he could ask Mr. Wagner if he would be willing to speak with the Committee.

Mr. Orcutt noted that DEP is quite aware of our situation and appears to be reading our minutes or otherwise staying current. They are aware of the fact that we found Emerging Contaminants in our well. He noted that there are no current regulations on Emerging Contaminants.

Dr. Horowitz summarized her understanding of our consensus as: We don't know the problem other than that we know that it is varied. She suggested that we change from the "Sewer Advisory Committee" to a Committee whose name referenced the term: Watershed as it would be less likely to cause resistance and hostility. She noted that if money was no object, that the Board of Health would like to see the entire area get public drinking water. She also noted that the BOH was concerned about Emerging Contaminants.

Mr. Orcutt confirmed that we are on the SRF list. He clarified that Stormwater management is not included in the covered activities eligible for funding by SRF loans. SRF will not fund land use projects, but all projects funded by SRF loans must contain a land use plan.

Mr. Orcutt provided documentation that showed the cost to provide public drinking water to the lake area at roughly the same cost as the proposed sewer:

- Infrastructure to pipe water to the streets: $6M
- Installation of a new well to produce the water: $6M
- Treatment for Nitrates $6M
- Private Property Connections to water $5K/per dwelling

Mr. Prager asked if there was public funding for developing water supply. Mr. Orcutt informed the Committee that there are no grants available but that SRF funds could be applied for at 2% .

Mr. Petropoulos asked what watershed the available new sources of water would come from and if they would come from the same watershed into which Ayer discharged its wastewater treatment. Mr. Orcutt confirmed that one of the 2 new available wells would draw from the same watershed that Ayer discharges back into. Mr. Petropoulos went on to explain how this may make it possible to provide sewer to 4 corners as it resolves the problem of Interbasin Transfer which would have prevented a phasing the project where phase 1 was 4 corners only. This would allow a substantial portion of a sewer project to be paid for by the businesses, leaving a smaller portion to be paid by homeowners should phase 2 become desirable.

Mr. Duger suggested getting involved with the State working group on Emerging Contaminants. He also asked if expanding the scope of the Committee too much would end up with the Committee stepping on the toes of other groups in town such as the Con Com.

Mr. Petropoulos asked who could take a stab at writing a summary of where we are. Mr. Prager jumped at the opportunity.

Mr. Orcutt clarified an earlier conclusion reached by the Committee that suggested that there was town money in the form of a revolving loan to help residents to pay for installing septic systems. The Loan Program is strictly through the Commonwealth and not through the Town of Groton. The Loan Program does exist but the town opted out of the loan program for two reasons. #1 it could not be administered by the Town as originally proposed and RCAP would administer the Loan Program for a fee and secondly, the financing within the Loan Program was 2% - 4% more than on the open market (no low interest loans).

The Committee also determined not to move forward with testing private wells around the lake at this time.

The next meeting was set for Thursday February 6 at 6:30

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00

Action Items

Mr. Prager to write a summary of the Committee's position and learnings.