

**SHARON WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (WMAC)  
MEETING MINUTES FOR AUGUST 19, 2004**

Prepared by Paul Lauenstein

**Present at meeting:** WMAC Chairman Rory McGregor; WMAC members Jack Sulik, Lealdon Langley, Paul Lauenstein, Richard Mandell, Len Sekuler and Michael Birschbach; Finance Committee member Charles Goodman; Conservation Agent Greg Meister, and citizens Richard Kramer and Alice Cheyer

**Summary of Minutes for the 8/19/04 WMAC Meeting**

- 1. Approve minutes of the July 19, 2004 meeting (with alterations)**
- 2. Inappropriate language**
- 3. Inappropriate email**
- 4. Water conservation questionnaire**
- 5. Peer review of hydraulic model by Wright-Pierce**
- 6. Radio meter e-coder option**
- 7. New business**
- 8. Schedule next meeting for Thursday, September 23 at 7:30 PM**

**Detailed Minutes for the 8/19/04 WMAC Meeting**

- 1. Approve minutes of the July 29, 2004 meeting (with alterations)**

The July 29 minutes were approved with modifications by Lealdon Langley and Rory McGregor. Len Sekuler and Richard Mandell, who were not present on July 29, abstained.

- 2. Inappropriate language**

Rory McGregor described Richard Kramer's request to the Board of Selectmen that Jack Sulik be removed from the WMAC because of using uncivil language at two meetings. Rory McGregor said the matter should have been presented to the WMAC before being presented to the Selectmen. Rory McGregor said that using uncivil language is not acceptable at WMAC meetings. Jack Sulik apologized for doing so, and promised not to let it happen again.

### 3. Inappropriate email

Rory McGregor read an email sent to seven radio meter system vendors by Paul Lauenstein soliciting input on their satisfaction with the RFP process.

Rory McGregor said Paul Lauenstein had no right to email the vendors independently, and no right to reference the WMAC in doing so. Rory McGregor said the email implied that the selection process for the radio meter system might have been conducted in an unfair manner. He said this kind of information gathering must first be agreed upon by the WMAC.

Rory McGregor said the email would be forwarded to the Selectmen.

### 4. Water conservation questionnaire

Paul Lauenstein presented the results of a water conservation questionnaire listing 11 possible initiatives to conserve water. He said that he acted on his own without input from other subcommittee members in developing and circulating the questionnaire.

Respondents were asked to rate each initiative as “High Priority”, “Low Priority” or “Bad Idea” and add their comments. Responses from all nine WMAC members, two Selectmen, the DPW Superintendent, and four Finance Committee members were tabulated. Their comments on each initiative were also recorded.

#### Summarized Results

Scoring: For each “High Priority” vote: add one point  
For each “Low Priority” vote: add zero points  
For each “Bad Idea” vote: subtract one point

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Score</u>
2	Public Relations	1	3
4	Feedback on Water Bills	2	2
11	Control Municipal Use	3	1
6	Rebates	4	9
7	Radio Meters	4	9
3	Involve Schools	4	9
10	Audit Large Users	7	6
5	Raise Water Rates	8	5
1	Hire Agent	9	4
8	Irrigation Permits	10	1
9	Water Efficiency Bylaw	11	-2

Paul Lauenstein presented his own conclusions and recommendations as follows:

### **Conclusions from Water Conservation Survey**

1. Informing residents about the need for water conservation through PR and water bills, is the most popular initiative.
2. There is an aversion to spending money on water conservation. Proof of cost-effectiveness will probably be a prerequisite to obtaining funds for water conservation. Hiring a water conservation agent is not a popular idea, but a suggestion was made to participate in a regional water conservation program.
3. Inducements like rebates are favored as long as they don't cost too much and are not effective enough to significantly reduce Water Dept. revenues.
4. Raising water rates is seen by some as an effective approach, but it is controversial, especially while there is a surplus in the water account.
5. A radio meter system is seen as a way to control usage through increased billing frequency and higher summer water rates.
6. A role for the school system in promoting water conservation is perceived, but since the curriculum is the responsibility of the School Department it is unclear how to make this happen.
7. Coercive tactics like by-laws and irrigation permits are not appealing to many committee members, and would probably be controversial, especially in the absence of a short-term water emergency.
8. Municipal water use should be minimized to set an example for the community.

### **Recommendations**

1. Obtain accurate information from the Water Department about where water is going. Get a handle on Unaccounted-for and Other Area water use. Get an accurate estimate of gallons per capita daily (gpcd). Analyze municipal water use to be sure a good example is being set for the town.
2. Get cost estimates for various PR programs such as inserting water conservation flyers in water bills.
3. Get a cost estimate for reporting gpcd on water bills.

4. Review the rebate program and decide whether or not to include other items besides washing machines.
5. Ask the School Department how water conservation could be promoted in Sharon public schools.
6. Find an answer to the question of how to reduce unnecessary lawn watering.

Lealdon Langley said he found the wording of Conclusion #3 troubling. He said water conservation measures such as rebates, if effective, would inevitably reduce Water Department revenues. He said the value to the town of lower water consumption would have to be weighed against the cost of the rebate program and lower water revenues.

Richard Mandell agreed that the emphasis of Conclusion #3 should be changed.

Lealdon Langley suggested that the word "Coercive" in Conclusion #7 be replaced by the word "Regulatory".

Lealdon Langley concluded by suggesting that an accurate estimate of the population being served by the Water Department that does not include people being served by private wells be used to calculate gpcd. This should be added to Recommendation #1.

Len Sekuler suggested adding an initiative designed to better distribute daily demand for water rather than reduce demand. The idea is to allow one third of the town to irrigate on Mondays and Thursdays, one third to irrigate on Tuesdays and Fridays, and one third to irrigate on Wednesdays and Sundays. The first letter of the street name would determine which days a given house would be allowed to irrigate. The alphabet would be divided into thirds such that the water demand would be divided equally.

Alice Cheyer said she thought the Water Department should not be cast in the role of water police.

Richard Mandell expressed the need to boil the results down to what should be done right away. He said irrigation permits as presented on the questionnaire were too restrictive, and therefore they were near the bottom of the list. He said that less restrictive irrigation permits could be useful in determining the number and location of irrigation systems in Sharon. He suggested that a permitting system limiting the irrigated area for each home might be politically acceptable. He added that he thought expansive, multi-acre irrigation systems should not be allowed.

Richard Mandell continued by saying that a public relations campaign coupled with providing water consumers with feedback on their gpcd usage would be effective and practical. He also regretted the loss of Earth Science from the Sharon High School curriculum.

Rory McGregor said it might be possible to reinstate Earth Science in the curriculum using a more politically acceptable name.

Lealdon Langley said students should be assigned to compute their families' gpcds from their water bills. He said both students and parents would be made aware of their water usage through such an exercise.

Len Sekuler recommended killing two birds with one stone by reprogramming water bills to include gpcd in conjunction with the implementation of the radio meter system, since implementation of the radio meter system would require re-programming anyway.

Richard Mandell asked how the WMAC could implement any water conservation measures, given its advisory capacity.

Rory McGregor replied that the Water Department could recommend that the Selectmen hire a PR firm to promote water conservation, depending on the cost and the budget remaining after deducting the cost of the rebate program from the \$50,000 allocated for water conservation.

Richard Mandell said the rebate program is paid for with water bill credits and should not be deducted from the \$50,000 allocated for water conservation.

Paul Lauenstein asked what other WMAC members thought of Recommendation #4: adding appliances other than washing machines (such as low-flow toilets) to the rebate program.

Lealdon Langley commented that the building inspector should be instructed to remind residents seeking building permits to install water-conserving appliances and take advantage of the rebate program.

Paul Lauenstein asked what other WMAC members thought of Recommendation #5: asking the School Department how water conservation could be promoted in Sharon public schools.

Richard Mandell said the Sharon High School science coordinator determines the science curriculum. He said the science coordinator must propose a science curriculum that will be approved by the School Committee. He said that since Earth Science does not command respect among college admissions officials, the School Committee is reluctant to offer it at Sharon High School.

Lealdon Langley offered to write a letter to the School Committee asking how water conservation could be integrated into the curriculum. He commented on the effectiveness of the aquifer model as a teaching tool, and said a bibliography of books about hydrology and water supply issues could be useful.

Paul Lauenstein said Robert Glennon's Water Follies and Diane Raines Ward's Water Wars are both worthwhile books to add to the bibliography.

Paul Lauenstein asked what the committee thought of Recommendation #6: how to reduce unnecessary lawn watering.

Jack Sulik said that most people pay a lawn management company to set up their lawn sprinkler systems and don't know much about them.

Paul Lauenstein suggested approaching lawn sprinkler companies to find out what kind of feedback systems might be available to prevent sprinkler systems from deploying when there is already enough moisture in the soil.

Richard Kramer suggested publishing a weekly notice in the Advocate to inform people about whether lawn watering is needed based on recent rainfall.

Rory McGregor proposed that committee members be assigned to "drive" various aspects of a water conservation program. He volunteered to work on Recommendations #2 (PR) and #6 (reduce lawn watering).

Len Sekuler agreed to help with Recommendation #6 (reduce lawn watering).

Richard Mandell and Lealdon Langley both volunteered to work on Recommendation #5 (water conservation in the school curriculum).

Lealdon Langley also agreed to work on Recommendation #3 (getting a cost estimate for programming the water bills to exhibit gpcd). Paul Lauenstein said he would provide Lealdon Langley with a water bill format designed to make it easy for the recipient to look up his or her gpcd. Richard Kramer suggested including a gpcd table cross-referencing six-month usage with the number of occupants with each water bill.

Paul Lauenstein volunteered to work on Recommendation #1 (accounting for water).

Jack Sulik observed that it has been a long time since water rates were reviewed. He said he was involved in setting the existing rates and was familiar with the process. He offered to respond to Conclusion #4 and look into water rates. He said the rates must be set in a way that is likely to cover the long-term

capital needs of the Water Department. He added that a dual rate system would be required during the years of transition from semi-annual manual meter reading to quarterly radio meter reading.

Richard Kramer questioned the legality of a dual rate water pricing system.

Rory McGregor asked Jack Sulik to consider some kind of credit to reward people for reducing their water use.

Lealdon Langley asked Jack Sulik to consider higher rates in summer when water is scarce, but noted that would be difficult without the radio meter system.

Richard Mandell asked how much water the average household uses per year.

Jack Sulik replied that average annual water use is around 90,000 gallons per household, but the amount varies widely. He said a typical household spends around \$300 per year on water.

Richard Mandell said he didn't think such a small amount of money would motivate people to conserve water.

Rory McGregor said he spends around \$600 per year on water because he has an irrigation system, and some residents spend considerably more than that on water.

Paul Lauenstein estimated that a typical family spends around \$3,000 per year on gasoline. He said that in that context even a \$600 water bill seemed relatively painless, and cheap water makes it hard to cost-justify water-conserving appliances such as low-flow toilets.

Lealdon Langley concluded the discussion of the water conservation questionnaire by requesting that water conservation be included as a regular agenda item at every WMAC meeting.

## **5. Peer review of hydraulic model by Wright-Pierce**

Rory McGregor read a letter to the WMAC from Greg Meister regarding Eric Hooper's representation at the prior meeting that the consultants from Wright-Pierce had had no prior professional dealings with the Town of Sharon. Eric Hooper had cited their lack of prior dealings with the town as a reason that they could be counted upon for objectivity with regard to conducting a peer review of the hydraulic model calibration and scoping of a water master plan update.

Greg Meister's letter pointed out that Paul Weisman of Wright-Pierce had in fact helped prepare a 1997 study of nitrates by Woodard & Curran, where he was employed at that time.

Rory McGregor pointed out that the study was a relatively minor one costing only around \$11,000, and had occurred prior to Eric Hooper's tenure as DPW Superintendent.

Rory McGregor distributed copies of the revised Wright-Pierce proposal dated August 3, prepared in response to the discussion at the July 29 meeting.

Paul Lauenstein asked how this revised proposal differed from the one presented on July 29. Rory McGregor explained that the new proposal specified that two meetings would be included, after which additional meetings, if needed, would be billed to the Water Department at \$750 per meeting.

Rory McGregor reiterated that the \$6,000 price for the project did not include any hydrant testing or other fieldwork. He said the study would include running various simulations with the model, such as a range of fire flow assumptions.

Paul Lauenstein asked what other variables besides fire flow would be investigated.

Len Sekuler pointed out that the Wright-Pierce proposal said demand apportionment would also be looked at. Paul Lauenstein asked if demand apportionment related to the fact that the model at present assumes that every home in Sharon uses the same amount of water. Paul Lauenstein commented that the Hampton Road area consumes much more water per household than the Sharon Heights neighborhood because of expansive lawn irrigation systems. Len Sekuler said he was not sure if differential water use in various parts of Sharon was what Wright-Pierce meant by demand apportionment.

Michael Birschbach asked if static pressures would be involved in the calibration of the hydraulic model. Rory McGregor replied that any fieldwork such as measurement of static pressures at various locations was not included in the price and, if needed, would have to be done by the Sharon Water Department.

Michael Birschbach asked if the model would have to be re-calibrated annually. Rory McGregor replied that the Water Department should be able to maintain the model going forward.

Rory McGregor said the main reason for the peer review of the hydraulic model was to allay the doubts of some WMAC members as to its reliability.



Richard Mandell said he was uncomfortable with the idea of endorsing the hydraulic model and thereby surrendering the right to question conclusions based on modeled scenarios in the future.

Alice Cheyer responded that Wright-Pierce would be evaluating the inputs to the model, not how it works. She added that there is no point in hiring the consultants if doubt will persist among WMAC members as to the credibility of future modeled scenarios. She said the Wright-Pierce proposal represents an opportunity for WMAC members to have their questions about the model answered, but unless WMAC members agree in advance to accept modeled predictions there is no point in going forward with the study.

Rory McGregor said the Wright-Pierce study would address the validity of the model once and for all. If it were not a good tool, the study would reveal the reasons why not. He added that Eric Hooper had already given the committee many examples of situations in which the model correctly predicted actual results.

Richard Mandell questioned the objective of the hydraulic model peer review. He said he thought validation of the hydraulic model might be inappropriately used as an argument to validate the conclusions of the Metcalf & Eddy report.

Lealdon Langley referred to comments made at the July 29 WMAC meeting, and expressed his concern that the objective of the peer review by Wright-Pierce was to confirm the model rather than identify discrepancies between modeled and actual results.

Michael Birschbach agreed, saying this was a crucial point and not just a question of semantics.

Alice Cheyer said that WMAC members would be free to put their doubts about the hydraulic model in writing, and Wright-Pierce would address them.

Lealdon Langley expressed concern that if for any reason WMAC members failed to think of all the right questions to ask, and agreed in advance to accept the outcome of the peer review, there would be no recourse in the future. He pointed out that WMAC members are not necessarily competent enough to debate the technical aspects of the hydraulic model with Wright-Pierce.

Richard Kramer told the committee that he has significant professional experience with computer simulation models even more sophisticated than the one in question. He pointed out that one problem with such models is that they have many degrees of freedom. In other words, there are a vast number of variable parameters that must all be programmed correctly in order to get simulation results that correspond to reality. He added that just because the

model accurately predicts a small number of actual observations, one should not conclude that the model will always make accurate predictions. He said it is relatively easy to force a model to agree with a small number of actual observations by manipulating the input parameters, but this obviously would not prove that the model is generally reliable.

Richard Kramer outlined the steps required to prepare a model for general use as follows:

- Step 1: Calibration by inputting all parameters (pipe layout, valve states, etc.)
- Step 2: Validation by comparing predicted results with field observations
- Step 3: Fine-tuning by ongoing validation

Richard Kramer cited the prediction by the hydraulic model that flow through a 10" pipe on Morse Street would only be 5.5 gpm greater than flow through a 6" pipe, given a full Massapoag Ave. tank and an empty Hampton Rd. tank. He said this prediction is not credible given that a 10" pipe has more than double the cross-sectional area of a 6" pipe.

Richard Kramer said step #6 in Wright-Pierce's proposal, which proposes to recommend a validation flow testing program, is appropriate, but will not in itself validate the model.

Richard Kramer commented on step #4 of Wright-Pierce's Hydraulic Model Review proposal about Insurance Service Office (ISO) fire flow requirements in various parts of town, saying that consensus must be reached about what fire flow standards are appropriate to use in the model for different neighborhoods.

In conclusion, Richard Kramer said that validation of the model is a time-consuming, iterative process. He added that unless sufficient resources are allocated to properly calibrate and validate the hydraulic model, it is a prescription for confusion and dissension.

Alice Cheyer said she was under the impression that because water is distributed throughout town in an interconnected grid of water mains that the largest ISO standard for fire flow needed in commercial zones should apply to the whole town.

Richard Kramer said that different neighborhoods have different fire flow needs, and that should be reflected in the fire flow goals for the system on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis.

Rory McGregor said the fire on Foundry Road required a flow similar to the 1,500 gpm assumed by Metcalf & Eddy for residential neighborhoods, adding that validation of the model would happen over time. He said that the hydraulic

model accurately predicted pressure changes related to routine hydrant flushing, and that Eric Hooper is currently using it routinely. He asked what it would take to convince WMAC members that the model is valid and useful.

Richard Kramer pointed out that the questionable Morse Street prediction casts doubt on the general reliability of modeled results. He added that fire flow of 1,500 gallons per minute for 4 hours was used as a basis for the conclusions of the Metcalf & Eddy report recommending the High Pressure Service District and new water tank. He said that is enough water to fill a box measuring 50' x 100', the footprint size of a large house, to a depth of almost 10 feet.

Lealdon Langley said he took issue with language in the proposal about ensuring "buy-in". He said the goal should be to find and correct inaccuracies in the hydraulic model rather than ensuring "buy-in".

Richard Mandell commented on Wright-Pierce's use of the word "selected" in referring to "an analysis of selected fire flows" in step #3 of their proposal, and asked how the fire flows would be selected for the analysis.

Richard Kramer pointed out that the sensitivity analysis called for in step #3 could be misleading and counterproductive unless the validation of the hydraulic model called for in step #6 had already been completed.

Rory McGregor replied that Wright-Pierce might take the position that the Water Department's experiences over the past year with the hydraulic model might constitute satisfactory validation, in which case the sensitivity analysis called for in step #3 of their proposal could be accomplished.

Richard Mandell asked if Fire Chief Mann's input should be solicited since fire flow seems to be a central issue.

Rory McGregor said Eric Hooper is using the hydraulic model and continuing to validate it by comparing its predictions with actual observations. He added that the Wright-Pierce proposal was intended to make WMAC members more comfortable with the hydraulic model as a tool. The proposal should be accepted if it would accomplish that.

Len Sekuler asked if Paul Weisman wrote the scope for the hydraulic model review based on Eric Hooper's request. He pointed out that Eric Hooper was only trying to provide a mechanism for satisfying WMAC members that the model is valid. Len Sekuler proposed that, in fairness to Eric Hooper, someone on the WMAC should take responsibility for modifying the scope to satisfy all members of the committee.

Richard Mandell asked whether the Town of Sharon had ever retained Wright-Pierce, and whether Paul Weisman had been involved in any other dealings with the town besides the Woodard & Curran nitrate study.

Rory McGregor replied that his understanding was that Wright-Pierce had never done any work for Sharon, and that Paul Weisman's prior involvement with the town was minimal.

Len Sekuler suggested that Wright-Pierce attend another WMAC meeting to hash out the points of contention with WMAC members.

Alice Cheyer said that had already been done at the July 29 meeting.

Len Sekuler replied that many new ideas had come out in the present meeting. Rory McGregor concurred that the thought process was moving forward regarding the hydraulic model, but said that it was apparent that the WMAC was not yet ready to recommend to the Selectmen that the Water Department act on Wright-Pierce's proposal.

Michael Birschbach then handed out a paper entitled "Acceptable Levels of Calibration" that establishes flow and pressure calibration criteria for hydraulic models. He said the WMAC members should not be responsible for writing the calibration criteria for the hydraulic model. That should be the sole responsibility of the Water Department. The WMAC should only receive the test results showing the level of accuracy relative to the predetermined criteria with explanations of any deviations.

Michael Birschbach also handed out a paper entitled "Elevation Pressure Loss". He said static pressure is very easy to calculate accurately with a simple hand calculator if the elevation of the water level in the tank and the elevation of the test location are both known.

Michael Birschbach said that the Cameron Testing study of the hydrant at 396 Moose Hill Street at elevation 374' could not have correctly measured a static pressure of 18 psi with the tank level at 418.8' as documented. The static pressure of 19.5 psi as predicted by the model agrees with the static pressure computed by hand, and must have been correct.

Rory McGregor reminded Michael Birschbach that the hydrant connection is 18" higher than the ground, accounting for some of the discrepancy.

Michael Birschbach said the 18" of additional elevation from the ground to the hydrant connection could not entirely explain the 1.5 psi difference between the predicted and the measured pressures.

## 6. Radio meter e-coder option

Len Sekuler, chairman of the radio meter subcommittee, reported that the winning radio meter system from Ti-Sales may be purchased with optional enhanced encoder registers called e-coders that detect leaks. He said the Selectmen were awaiting a recommendation from the WMAC on whether or not to order the system with the optional e-coders.

Len Sekuler said the e-coders record whether or not water is running every 15 minutes around the clock for a month. Based on the percentage of time water is running, a determination is made as to the probability that water is leaking. Customers whose plumbing is probably leaking (even leaking intermittently) get a notice on their water bill letting them know they probably have a leak. They can call the Water Department for a water audit if they are unable to find the leak.

Len Sekuler said the e-coders cost an extra \$10 apiece, or about \$56,000 for the entire town, and asked the WMAC members if they thought it was worth it.

Richard Kramer asked what the minimum detectable flow was for the e-coders. Len Sekuler said that the meters would detect flows as low as 1/8 gpm.

Richard Kramer said he doubted that steady drips would be detectable. He said 1/8 gpm equals two cups per minute, and he thought most faucet leaks would amount to considerably less than that.

Jack Sulik said he felt the benefits were not worth the cost.

Michael Birschbach asked if special receivers or software were required that would add to the cost. No one could answer that question. He also pointed out that the e-coders could only track water consumption for a month, but the plan was to take the meter readings quarterly.

Rory McGregor said the intent was ultimately to progress to monthly billing.

Lealdon Langley said that detecting leaks quarterly was better than not at all.

Richard Mandell asked if a decision to purchase e-coders could be limited to the Phase I pilot installation. Lealdon Langley said that would not be a problem.

Rory McGregor asked if there were any evidence that people would respond to notices on their water bills by fixing their leaks.

Richard Mandell pointed out that leaks can result in substantial water losses. He calculated that a 1/4 gpm leak amounts to over 30,000 gallons per quarter. He

said he thought the e-coders sounded like a good idea. He asked whether the committee thought the public would appreciate being reminded on their water bills that they should check for leaks.

Jack Sulik said that how the e-coders would be received by the public was an irrelevant consideration, and that the committee should just decide whether the e-coders were worth the money or not.

Lealdon Langley said that if few leaks were detected in the Phase I pilot then the rest of the town could be installed without e-coders. He asked if anyone had any idea how much water the e-coders would save and whether homeowners would respond to the notices on their water bills.

Alice Cheyer said that at \$10 apiece, the 1,000 units or so in the Phase I pilot would cost an extra \$10,000. Jack Sulik commented that Ti-Sales might charge a higher rate for a quantity of just 1,000 units than for a quantity of 5,600 for all of the water services in Sharon.

Paul Lauenstein asked if any other members of the radio meter evaluation subcommittee recalled hearing any information regarding the experiences of other towns with e-coders. Jack Sulik and Len Sekuler indicated that they had no recollection of hearing any reports about how e-coders have worked to save water in other towns.

Paul Lauenstein proposed a motion as follows:

**MOTION:** To recommend that the Water Commissioners add the e-coder option to the Phase I pilot installation of Ti-Sales radio read meter system, subject to the following provisions:

1. A waiting period of at least three billing cycles should be allowed following completion of the Phase I pilot installation to see how the radio system and the e-coders perform, and how they are received by the public.
2. A cost-justification should be completed based on the experience with the Phase I pilot installation as a basis for deciding on whether to install radio meters in the balance of the town.
3. The Water Department should avail itself of any free pilot installations of alternative radio read meter systems, and run these free pilots in parallel with the Phase I pilot installation from Ti-Sales. These alternative systems should be compared to the Ti-Sales system in the above cost-justification.

Rory McGregor said he would support the motion without the third provision.

Paul Lauenstein agreed to drop the third provision.

The motion was defeated by a vote of 3 to 4. Rory McGregor, Richard Mandell and Paul Lauenstein voted in favor. Lealdon Langley, Jack Sulik, Len Sekuler and Michael Birschbach voted against.

## **7. New business**

Rory McGregor announced that Cliff Towner was on vacation and therefore unable to make his scheduled presentation on recharging Sharon's aquifers.

Lealdon Langley asked if Selectman David Grasfield had succeeded yet in gaining access to the Gobbi property for the purpose of well exploration. Both Lealdon Langley and Jack Sulik thought the town had a statutory right to access the land for well exploration.

Alice Cheyer told the committee that she had looked up the statute and forwarded it to Selectman Grasfield. She said Town Attorney Gelerman had not yet been consulted on the matter.

Richard Kramer reported that the issue was discussed at the prior Selectmen's meeting. He said the town has the right to access the land but he was unclear about the exact procedure for doing so. He said the Selectmen had indicated a clear desire to move ahead with this.

## **8. Schedule next meeting for Thursday, September 23 at 7:30 PM**