

**WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE
MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MEETING MINUTES ~ JUNE 27, 2005**

Members in attendance: Dave Irwin, Chair; Tom Burns, Vice-Chair; Mike Blanchard, Mark Bornheim; Malcolm Brown; Bob Hunter; Rick Mattila; Joan Meschino; Ed Petrilak.

Also in attendance: Larry Van de Venteo (Medcalf & Eddy); Betsy Shreve-Cubb (Medcalf & Eddy); Ged Olson (Palmer & Dodge); Chris Woodcock (Woodcock & Assoc); Anthony Zuena (SEA); John Struzziery (SEA); Bob Higgins; Arnold Wallenstein (Ferriter, Scobbo); Gary Smith (W/P); Ernie Kartinen (Boyle Eng); Jeff Musich (W/P); Peter Waldron (MNW Consulting); Katie Barnicle (ENSR); Mark Kalpin (Wilmer Hale); Paul Weisman (W/P); Eva Borsody Das (Weir River Watershed Assn.); Jim Lampke (Hull Town Counsel); John A. Silva (Hull BOS); Robert Roland (Aqurion); Gene Schiller by phone.

Meeting called to order by Chair at 6:10 p.m.

Interview: SEA Consultants:

(6:15 p.m.) Anthony Zuena introduced his associates who would be participating in this study and gave an overview of company and proposed services. Most important considerations are site selection and technology. The project would be conducted on a go/no-go decision basis. Tonight four sites would be used to illustrate the range of issues faced. Betsy Shreve-Cubb present four critical issues regarding site selection: estuary versus ocean as main differentiator, potential complexity, design dollars and technology options. Larry Van de Venteo, very excited about the project, discussed the technical complexities and how reduction of pretreatment reduces costs. Chris Woodcock, who has been thinking about this project for a year, presented on the three infrastructure alternatives, management options and financial options. Ged Olson present on legal aspects of the work.

SEA responded verbally to the WRC's list of prepared questions and submitted a written response with detailed responses to each committee member for review later. The list of prepared questions is attached.

SEA responded to follow up questions by individual WRC members. E. Petrilak: why highlight these four sites? A. Zuena: To show SEA understands complexities and to demonstrate thought process. By M. Blanchard: Can SEA help us chase federal dollars in support of project? A. Zuena: Yes, through the state although unaware of any federal programs. C. Woodcock: Not aware of any federal dollars available; it would be state money for projects that are new or innovative with regional focus. By M. Blanchard: References were good, what assurances can SEA give the Town that this will be "the" team? Per A. Zuena: "We want this project. It is a professional's dream." SEA is willing to identify specific individuals within contract. By B. Hunter: at the conclusion,

how long and what will the deliverables be? Per A. Zuena: Timeframe is always longer than you think. He anticipates six months to one year. Deliverables will be well documented report leading to conclusions and recommendations. By T. Burns: Regarding Barnstable, what was involved in the context of cost? Per A. Zuena: SEA was hired by Palmer & Dodge for attorney client privilege reasons. Motivation was not cost but control of destiny. There were five water systems including a privately owned one which had recently been sold. SEA looked at the legal framework and capital costs. By R. Mattila: Describe other projects SEA has worked on involving desalination of seawater. Per L. Van de Venteo: None taking directly from seawater, many with ground water. Seawater is newer to US and this region. Projects in Corpus Christi and LA were feasibility studies of direct open ocean intake. Technology is the same although pre-treatment can be a problem. Per B. Shreve-Cubb: State initiated task force looking at guidelines and performance standards. The sentiment is to steer communities away from estuary sources. By M. Brown: Confidentiality issue? Per G. Olson: Can use experience but not confidential information of Barnstable. By J. Meschino: Permitting commission? Per B. Shreve-Cubb: She is participating in commission which will provide communities with guidance and performance standards making such projects do-able. By M. Bornheim: In projects, what leads to success? Per A. Zuena: Selling brain power, constantly trying to improve, document what learned and to move forward.

A. Zuena concluded SEA's presentation by stating that they want this assignment and distributed written answers to the prepared questions. (7:45 p.m.)

Interview: Wright-Pierce:

(8:00 p.m.) Paul Weisman introduced his associates who would be participating in this study and gave an overview of company and proposed services. Team will provide credible "go, no-go decisions" for town meeting. W-P will provide strong leadership and use a consensus approach. J. Musich runs the water group. He will focus on three areas: source, concept and legal/financing. G. Smith discussed Hull's unique geology and availability of angled well drilling technology. M. Kalpin will conduct legal review and provide strategic advice. G. Schiller will work with M. Kalpin to evaluate options regarding distribution system and evaluate mechanisms to implement business model.

W-P responded verbally to the WRC's list of prepared questions and submitted a written response with detailed responses to each committee member for review later.

W-P responded to follow up questions by individual WRC members. By D. Irwin: Regarding the distribution system, does it have to be hostile or can it be done amicably? Per Mark, yes. By M. Bornheim: What have you learned from past project challenges? Per E. Kartinen: Need to think about what quality of water you want, you can give any quality of water, just matter of cost. By M. Brown: Is there an amicable way to address infrastructure? Per G. Smith: Underestimating value of infrastructure is the biggest mistake made. Be fair and upfront. By R. Mattila: Angled well drilling is new. What are the potential issues, background, how does it work? Per G. Smith: Used for years in industry. It is newly adapted for drinking water. By T. Burns: Liked the focus on step

zero. By B. Hunter: What experience do you have with ozone versus chlorine? Per L. Van de Venteo: Industry is moving away from chlorine towards UV light. Per J. Musich: W-P will construct a small scale test plant before permitting finalized. Water chemistry will be one of the items evaluated. Per P. Weisman: W-P will help WRC understand and make the best decisions regarding issues such as water chemistry. By M. Blanchard: What assurances does Town have regarding commitment to the project? Per P. Weisman: W-P will sign contract which specifically names individuals on team. By M. Blanchard: Why are test wells not angled? Per G. Smith: Given limited funds, try to get data cost effectively. By M. Blanchard: Assuming Aquarion agrees to purchase water, how will W-P take that commitment to make financing easier? Are bonds well received on Wall Street? By G. Schiller: It provides a basis for long term partnerships which translates to cash flow guarantees. Steady sources of income are very positive for financing. Such bonds are well received. Per M. Kalpin: Exactly the issue with Brockton. Two parts to payment: incremental and fixed. DTE blessed the contract. Structure is attractive to Wall Street bonds. By E. Petrilak: What options exist regarding acquisition for distribution? What about a Hull Aquarion partnership? Per M. Kalpin: Definitely options including fixed long term contracts. By D. Irwin: What is the diameter, PSI and hydroelectric recovery for slant well drilling? Per G. Smith: Diameter is 40" with casings over 350' out. Per J. Musich: Regarding PSI, it would be low pressure pumping to the tank with high pressure pumping to the membrane. Per E. Kartinen: He explained energy conservation opportunities using diagram of such a system.

P. Weisman concluded W-P's presentation by reaffirming that they want this assignment and distributed written answers to the prepared questions. (9:30 p.m.)

Next Meeting: Monday, July 11, 2005
7:00 p.m. at Town Hall

MOTION by T. Burns, **SECOND** by R. Mattila, to adjourn meeting. **APPROVED**, unanimously.

9:35 p.m. meeting adjourned.

Approved: _____

Hull Water Resources Committee

Meeting Format for June 27, 2005

1. Twenty minutes or less for introduction of team members and any other type of presentation.
2. Five minutes or less for answering questions one through eight. Please have hand-outs available for committee members and guests. (25 copies).
3. There will be no response to these questions from committee members or guests.
4. Committee members may revisit any question they would care to in the spontaneous part of this interview.
5. Committee members should be able to ask at least one question and possibly two with time permitting.
6. Spontaneous questions should be answered in a three to four minute time period.
7. All speakers must be recognized through the chairman and there will be no speaking out of order. First time speakers will be recognized first.
8. Each engineering firm will get a full ninety minute interview.

HULL WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR JUNE 27, 2005:

1. Why are you interested in working with the Town of Hull on this feasibility study?
2. Are you able to assist the Town of Hull in educating the public regarding desalination technology costs and benefits and with public relations in general? Have you done so in the past? Please discuss potential methods that might be utilized to keep the general public informed of the study progress?
3. How do you propose to approach decision-making facilitation with the Water Resource Committee? What specific activities and sequence do you recommend? In your answer, please discuss your communication methods, potential tools for scenario development and analysis, etc.
4. How will your team work together with each other and how will your team interact with our Committee?
5. What method of tracking and progress reporting do you intend to use? For example, will you provide a schedule of work with milestones and if so, will you provide updates on a monthly basis?
6. How will you evaluate the existing relationship with Aquarion Water Company? Please discuss the distribution system, inherent strengths and weakness, and how this relates to a potential business model for a desalination plant
7. How will you develop the most appropriate organizational or business model suited to the Town of Hull? In your response, please discuss the potential partnership opportunities you envision for the Town of Hull, including but not limited to, municipal, inter-municipal, or municipal-private options.
8. How will you evaluate the existing infrastructure system and options for acquiring that system?
9. How will you determine the economic feasibility of desalination in Hull? Include in your response how you intend to ascertain the best method for sale of water and to whom?