

**MINUTES OF THE  
REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2011**

**WATER COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Robert L. Burnham, Chairman  
Mr. John S. Lovewell, Water Commissioner

**EWD STAFF PRESENT:**

Mr. Shane A. Ben David, Foreman  
Mr. Fred R. Domont, Water Superintendent  
Mrs. Pia Webster, Administrative Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Paul E. Cote, P.E., Associate, Tata & Howard Incorporated

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:**

The Board of Water Commissioners of the Town of Edgartown held their Regular Meeting on Tuesday, September 13, 2011, at 4:00 p.m. at the offices of the Water Department located at Fifty-Eight Kavanagh Way, Edgartown, Mass. At 4:00 p.m., Chairman Robert L. Burnham called the meeting to order. Before getting down to official business, the Chairman commended the Department staff for the fine job they had done in pulling together the control center open house that had just wound down.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES.**

The Commissioners considered the **Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 9, 2011**. Water Commissioner John S. Lovewell wished to comment about Superintendent Fred R. Domont's proposal to apply for Community Preservation Act funds to repair the windows at the Old Wintucket Pump Station, mentioned on page 7. He thought, he said, that the Board ought to be "looking at the big picture" before changing the windows and making them watertight.

The Chairman advised Mr. Lovewell that he could opine on this subject under Other Business. The point at the moment was, he stressed, did Mr. Lovewell have any

amendments to the minutes? No, answered Mr. Lovewell, just one other thing. On page 8, under the section regarding the Board's demand for a reconciliation of the Surplus Fund from the Town Accountant, all he had to say was, "Hurray!"

Then Mr. Lovewell made a motion to accept the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 9, 2011 as written, seconded by Chairman Burnham. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote. *[Note: Water Commissioner William R. Erickson was not present at this meeting.]*

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**DISCUSSION/VOTE: CREATION OF ASST SUPERINTENDENT POSITION.**

Superintendent Domont said that he had not had a chance to work on developing the parameters of the new Assistant Superintendent position. *[See page 6 of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 9, 2011.]*

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**TATA & HOWARD PRESENTATION: REPORTS ON SCADA SYSTEM; USDA SPENDING; AND CAPITAL EFFICIENCY PLAN.**

"It's up and running," reported Paul E. Cote, an engineer and associate with Tata & Howard Incorporated, updating the Board on the newly installed supervisory control and data acquisition [SCADA] system. "It runs pretty well," he added, noting there were what could be referred to as punch list items needed to iron out a few snags. "But all in all, it's made a big jump," he concluded.

Chairman Burnham wanted to know if the cost of the so-called punch list items was expected to be considerable. No, answered Mr. Cote. The Superintendent related that he was looking into changing the Department's cell phone carrier from Nextel to AT&T or Verizon, both of which reputedly offered better reception. "Verizon is the best on the Island," remarked the Chairman.

Mr. Domont pointed out that AT&T offered push-button communication, as well as military-grade cell phones that could stand up to the kind of pummeling expected from a construction crew. So, he continued, instead of field crew members using a laptop computer to access the SCADA system, they would use a form of iPhone.

Mr. Lovewell asked if the Commissioners were ever going to see a set of system plans comparable to the ones for the Duxbury system that Mr. Cote had brought to an earlier meeting. Yes, responded the engineer. And who decided about the alarms? inquired Mr. Lovewell. "Shane [Ben David] and Fred [Domont]!" exclaimed Chairman Burnham. "We gave them the authority!" *[See pages 3-4 of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 16, 2011.]*

The Superintendent said that entry alarm situation still needed to be upgraded and that he had spoken to the appropriate parties at EII Inc. Mr. Cote asked if the control center building was alarmed yet, and Mr. Domont said it was not.

Mr. Cote shifted to the topic of USDA financing and the development of spending priorities for the last of the grant funds, which amounted to, at this point, around \$325,000. They had, he said, until October 1 to present the agency with the list, noting that some of the \$325,000 was already committed. What about the Old Wintucket Pump Station? asked Mr. Lovewell. “CPA money,” replied the Superintendent, referring to the Community Preservation Act.

Does that building have, or should it get, an historical designation? wondered the Chairman. No, answered Mr. Domont, because then you’re limited as to what you can do with the building.

Lastly, Mr. Cote offered a presentation regarding a trademarked approach to system planning developed by Tata & Howard. He explained that the Capital Efficiency Plan (CEP), though similar to a master plan, went further by identifying those areas of the water system needing rehabilitation, repair or replacement while making the most efficient use of limited infrastructure dollars.

The CEP would start, he continued, by evaluating the distribution system at three levels: with a systemic hydraulic evaluation; through asset management considerations; and via a critical component assessment. By integrating at all three levels, the infrastructure-improvement-making process and overall “Capital Efficiency” would be maximized.

Mr. Cote pointed to a study by the American Water Works Association, the results of which had indicated that it was not necessarily the oldest pipe that had to be replaced first. There was, for instance, an inverse correlation between pipe diameter and failure rates. Pipe material affected longevity, as did the period during which it was produced and installed. Thermal factors also entered into it, as did pressure.

Mr. Lovewell wanted to know if Mr. Cote had “a feel for how much asbestos-cement pipe we have.” Mr. Cote replied that he and the Superintendent could sit down and work that out. He showed on his PowerPoint-style screen a graphic illustrating the aforementioned three levels at which the system would be evaluated: a systemic hydraulic evaluation; asset management considerations; and a critical component assessment. Each was represented by a circle of a different color and size, the latter signifying relative weight assigned to that element; the circles intersected.

An analysis and synthesis of the results of these evaluations, Mr. Cote went on, would result in a Prioritized Improvement Plan (PIP). He provided an example of where asbestos-cement pipe might fall under all three approaches. In the demonstration case, it would rank high on the list for replacement.

Mr. Cote reminded those present of the systems evaluation study done by Whitman & Howard in the early 1990s. This would be an update of that, he explained, but would be in many respects more specific and more proficient at targeting the weakest areas of the system.

Mr. Lovewell inquired whether the Superintendent received many “low pressure complaints.” “Not really,” responded Mr. Domont, who related that recently, though, there *had* been a few from residents in Dodger’s Hole because the standpipe level had fallen after the powerful lightning strikes a few weeks before. But that had been an exception to the rule. Addressing another query from Mr. Lovewell, the Superintendent said it was time the Department did a comprehensive fire-flow test.

Chairman Burnham wondered if the Board could use data culled from the Capital Efficiency Plan to stoke the State’s interest in the concept of a well and pump station in the Manuel F. Correllus State Forest. We *had* good support from Turkington and O’Leary, said Mr. Domont, referring to the former State Representative and State Senator, respectively. “We should rekindle this,” suggested the Chairman, adding that the Department ought to swap some land with the State.

Returning to the subject at hand, Mr. Cote asked the Commissioners to consider the Capital Efficiency Plan for the Department. Chairman Burnham noted, “It *is* time we upgraded it.” “We also look at supplies and storage,” added Mr. Cote. Would you bring us a proposal next time? requested the Chairman. Yes, replied the engineer.

**VOTE: ARTICLE FOR FUND TRANSFERS FOR SPECIAL TOWN MEETING.**

Next, the Commissioners considered a draft Warrant Article for the Special Town Meeting of October 25, 2011. Chairman Burnham made a motion to approve the following: That the Town vote to transfer \$37,898.81 from Account No. 6501/584000, the North Water Street Main Project Account; \$25,760.39 from Account No. 6100/584000, the Lily Pond Modification Project Account; and \$1,302.83 from Account No. 6200/584000, the Repair and Maintenance Account to the Water Department’s Surplus Fund. Mr. Lovewell provided a second, and the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**USAGE ABATEMENT REQUEST: EDWARD OLIVER, BILL OF OCT 15, 2010.**

Administrative Assistant Pia Webster presented a Usage Charge abatement request from Edward Lee Oliver, Jr. of 2 Beetle Swamp Road (EWD Account 067-106). This was the second such appeal from Mr. Oliver, with the first regarding the Usage Charge attached to his semiannual bill of April 15, 2011 and the current one pertaining to the Usage Charge appearing on his October 15, 2010 semiannual bill. [*Ibid.*, pages 2-4.]

It was when the October 2010 bill was generated that Department staff first suspected a break in Mr. Oliver's on-property line, Mrs. Webster continued. At the time the customer's usage had leapt from an average of a little over 100,000 gallons for the summer period to 450,000 gallons from about April 1 to October 1, 2010. The Board, she said, was familiar with the rest of this customer's story. *[Ibid.]*

Part of the Commissioners' instructions to Mr. Oliver in August had been that he meet promptly with EWD staff to work out a payment plan. Mrs. Webster recounted that the day after the August meeting, Mr. Oliver had come to the Department office to do just that. He had made his first monthly payment of \$110.00 a week later and had made another just recently.

In addition, Mr. Oliver had paid \$800.00 toward his April bill in July. He understood that he was obliged to keep current on his payments for any *new* water bills; that is, the monthly \$110.00 could not be applied toward future semiannual bills. Those had to be paid separately in a timely manner.

Today, explained the Admin Assistant, Mr. Oliver was asking for a 30 percent abatement on the Usage Charge of \$1,000.00, already paid in full, from his October 15, 2010 semiannual bill. The abatement, if granted, would come in the form of a credit toward the remaining balance on the April 2011 bill.

Following a brief discussion, Chairman Burnham made a motion to grant Edward Lee Oliver of 2 Beetle Swamp Road a 30 percent abatement of his October 15, 2010 Usage Charge, amounting to a \$300.00 credit toward his current balance. Mr. Lovewell provided a second, and the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**DISCUSSION: CLARIFICATION OF "NO SHOW" FEE.**

"There seems to be a little confusion," said Superintendent Domont, referring to the so-called No Show fee established in June. *[See page 7 of the Meeting Minutes of June 16, 2011.]* According to the June minutes, "Chairman Burnham recommended that when an agent or customer missed an appointment, the customer (and not the plumber or agent) be charged \$45.00 (and not \$50.00) when the appointment did, in fact, take place."

Admin Assistant Webster suggested that a better approach would be to charge the \$20.00 for the No Show when the next set of miscellaneous bills was done, as a separate charge, instead of bunching it with the turn-on or turn-off as a \$45.00 charge incurred when the service was actually delivered (because the customer or agent had finally shown up). The total amount charged would be the same; but the invoices would be clearer to the customers, and the paperwork, less confusing to staff.

Some discussion ensued. Chairman Burnham confirmed with the Superintendent that it would be the customer who was billed for the No Show and not the plumber or other agent. The Board reached a consensus that the \$20.00 charge for a No Show incident would be in a separate billing category and could be billed soon after it was incurred. In other words, staff did not have to wait for the turn-on or turn-off to be carried out before the charge was generated.

**LETTER: REQUEST THAT TOWN ACCOUNTANT PROVIDE RECONCILIATION OF SURPLUS FUNDS FOR PAST FIVE FISCAL YEARS.**

Next, the Commissioners considered a draft letter to Town Accountant Kimberly G. Kane requesting a full accounting of the Operating Budget surpluses and the transfers into the Capital Expenditures Account for the past five fiscal years. *[See page 8 of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 9, 2011.]* “Sounds good to me,” remarked Mr. Lovewell. Chairman Burnham agreed, and the two Commissioners signed the letter.

**SHURTLEFF LAND.**

Mr. Lovewell wondered if staff had heard from Adam Moore of the Sheriff’s Meadow Foundation about his proposal to use the buildings at the decommissioned Shurtleff Well Pump Station. The Superintendent indicated that Mr. Moore was still working on it.

**SOME COMMENTS FROM MR. LOVEWELL.**

Commissioners Lovewell said he wished to commend Department staff for the work they had put into the open house event earlier in the day. He then returned to the subject of the windows at the Old Wintucket Pump Station structure. *[See page 1 of these minutes.]* “What is the plan for the building?” he asked, pointing out that there was a need for a floor.

“My priority,” responded Mr. Domont, “is to make that building weather-tight.” The wood around the windows, he said, was rotted. “After we get it all tight,” he explained, “you can open a window and pour the floor.” “Okay, do the windows,” said the Chairman.

**PAYROLL:**

The Commissioners signed payroll forms.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairman Burnham asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lovewell made a motion to adjourn, seconded by the Chairman. The motion carried

unanimously by voice vote, and Chairman Burnham adjourned the Regular Meeting at 4:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pia Webster  
Administrative Assistant

APPROVED:  
BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS  
TOWN OF EDGARTOWN

---

Robert L. Burnham, Chairman

---

John S. Lovewell, Water Commissioner