

# Lost Lake Watershed Advisory Committee (LLWAC)

Town of Groton, Groton, MA 01450 978-448-1111

## Meeting Minutes - September 11, 2014

**Present:** Mark Deuger, Susan Horowitz (BOH), John Petropoulos (BOS), Jay Prager (Finance Comm.), Arthur Prest, Michael Rosa

**Absent:** Tom Orcutt (Groton Water Dept.)

**Recorder:** Stephen Legge (Note: Susan Horowitz will retain the title of Secretary-Clerk.)

**Guests present:** Alex Woodle, Guest #2, Guest # 3.

**Call to Order:** Chairman Petropoulos called the meeting to order at 6:36 PM.

### Introductions:

Mark Deuger is a citizen-at-large. Michael Rosa's great grandfather settled at Knop's Pond 100 years ago. His family has been there ever since. Art Prest is a citizen-at-large. His family settled at Lost Lake in 1947.

### Committee Goals and Objectives.

Discussion ensued, continued from the August 28, 2014 meeting. A subcommittee was formed at that meeting, consisting of Deuger, Prager and Prest, to develop in the interim a recommended statement for the committee to adopt. There was vigorous discussion around the uses of terms, "nutrients", "pollutants" and "contaminants", and what exactly they meant. Drinking water and surface water technical standards were cited.

Deuger said the BOS assumed there is a problem on the lakes, i.e., it is an impaired waterway. Prest said, not everyone believes there is a problem. Prager asked, "What has caused the lake to go eutropic?"

Guest Alex Woodle remarked we need to include Knop's Pond in our wording, not just Lost Lake. He also asked, what are acceptable limits for nutrients and pollutants which we may find in the watershed surface and ground water.

Prest commented it is easier to say "more than a certain amount is a problem than to say a certain amount is the acceptable limit.

Tom Orcutt, not present, submitted a memo (attached) dated September 11, 2014, making three suggestions for the committee's objectives statement.

Petropoulos suggested that we back off from specific definitions of what is wrong, and allow our research and studies to reveal to us what is wrong. He asked, are there current or pending

water quality problems with surface water, ground water or drinking water in the defined watershed area. He proposed wording for the goals statement which when amended to make most members satisfied, read as follows:

1. “To determine if there is a problem with the surface water quality within the Lost Lake/Knop’s Pond watershed. If yes, determine their sources, their proportional contributions as well as the potential solutions and proportional benefits.
2. To determine if there is a problem with the ground water quality within the Lost Lake/Knop’s Pond watershed. If yes, determine their sources, their proportional contributions as well as the potential solutions and proportional benefits.
3. To determine if there is a problem with the drinking water quality within the Lost Lake/Knop’s Pond watershed. If yes, determine their sources, their proportional contributions as well as the potential solutions and proportional benefits.”

[there is more to this statement – I do not have the language].

There was a motion by Prager to accept the above amended wording as the committee’s goals and objectives statement. Horowitz seconded. The motion passed with 5 approving and 1 abstention (Deuger).

### **Review Committee Charge.**

See the 2-page handout titled “Lost Lake Advisory Committee”. Discussion took place resulting in the following revised wording, starting at the second sentence:

“The main charge of the committee will be to quantitatively determine whether there is a water quality problem in the Lost Lake watershed. If a problem is determined, the committee shall provide a proposed solution.”

Also changes were made to Item Number 8 as follows: “Make recommendations to the Board of Selectmen with respect to addressing issues within the watershed.”

It was moved by Rosa to accept the amended wording to the charge, seconded by Horowitz. Passed by unanimous vote.

### **Review Article 14 to be submitted for the Fall Town Meeting.**

See attached 1-page wording for Article 14. Discussion ensued.

Rosa commented, without money to get consulting resources, the committee cannot make further progress. Any money appropriated but not spent, will go back to the town.

Petropoulos said, a request for information (RFI) to a good number of firms may produce a significant amount of useful information to the committee. Good ideas may then be used to write a request for proposals (RFP) for interested firms.

Discussion about the timing of the article, using it as a “placeholder”.

It was moved by Prest, seconded by Rosa to present the article, with amended wording for \$50,000, for town warrant. Deuger felt it was too soon for this. Prager commented the money would be expended by the Town Manager and approved by the LLWAC.

Revised wording was proposed for line 4, to insert the words “quantitatively determine if there is a water quality problem in the Lost Lake Watershed. If a problem is determined, provide proposed solutions.” after the words “Lost Lake Watershed Advisory Committee to ...”. The remaining words in Lines 4 and 5 are to be deleted.

Prest will re-draft the article to reflect the language of the new charge.

The motion to advance the amendment with revised wording was approved with 4 in favor and 2 opposed (Petropoulos and Deuger).

Petropoulos commented his negative vote was because he thinks this is the wrong time to appropriate \$50,000, before we know what to do.

### **Review Identification Statements.**

These statements have been developed individually by members of the committee. Deuger offered to collect and compile the statements emailed to him by members.

### **Discussion on Outside Consulting Services.**

Deuger asked, if a consultant is to be hired by the committee to guide the committee, what would their role be?

Prager cautioned, be clear that this consultant would have no vested interest in a specific future outcome of the study. That person/firm would also have no role in funded studies resulting from recommendations for going forward.

Petropoulos said the committee needs to define what is needed before going after specific persons or companies. LLWAC must be very careful how it proceeds. First create a Request for Information (RFI), hopefully at the next meeting. Then, and only then, consider who is talking and how valuable is what they are saying. At that point write a Request for Proposals (RFP) and invite those deemed to have good and valuable ideas to bid to the town.

## **Other Topics:**

Guest Alex Woodle questioned the committee, how are they **planning to keep track of documents submitted**, and make them available to the public? He then submitted a document, for consideration:

“Erosion and Stormwater Runoff at Lost Lake/Knop’s Pond”, dated 2014, authored by the Groton Lakes Association.

Tom Orcutt offered five documents describing “BioBlast 15-0-15”, a bio-enhanced fertilizer, and four other substances of interest with respect to current studies of lake conditions.

Art Prest submitted the document (18 pages), “Understanding Lake Data”, G3582, dated 2004, authored by Byron Shaw, Christine Mechenich and Lowell Klessig, all affiliated with the University of Wisconsin – Extension, Cooperative Extension.

Deuger submitted “A Quick Guide to Developing Watershed Plans to Restore and Protect Our waters”, issued by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Deuger proposes the committee use a “watershed approach” to proceeding forward. Petropoulos encouraged the committee to discuss incorporating a “watershed approach”.

Deuger will modify and update the committee’s website.

## **Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

Revisions were submitted for consideration in the draft Meeting minutes for August 28, 2014 by Orcutt and Horowitz. Horowitz moved and Prager seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. Minutes were approved with four in favor, two abstaining (Deuger and Petropoulos, the latter due to absence from the meeting).

**\*\* The next meeting will be on Thursday evening, September 25, 2014 \*\***

## **Adjournment:**

Prager moved to adjourn, Rosa seconded. Unanimous agreement. The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 PM.