THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

100 CAMBRIDGE STREET, BOSTON MA 02114

Meeting Minutes for December 8, 2022

Meeting conducted remotely via Zoom meeting platform, 1:00 p.m.

Minutes approved March 9, 2023

Members in Attendance:

Vandana Rao	Designee, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA)
Linda Balzotti	Designee, Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)
John Scannell	Designee, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
Kate Bentsen	Designee, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Hotze Wijnja	Designee, Department of Agricultural Resources (DAR)
Kathy Baskin	Designee, Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)
Todd Callaghan	Designee, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM)
Thomas Cambareri	Public Member
Christine Hatch	Public Member
Kenneth Weismantel	Public Member
Samantha Woods	Public Member

Members Absent

Vincent Ragucci	Public Member

Others in Attendance:

Erin Graham	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Jason Duff	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Viki Zoltay	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Vanessa Curran	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Sara Cohen	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Kara Sliwoski	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Nadia Madden	DCR/Office of Water Resources
Jamie Carr	DCR/Division of Water Supply Protection
Todd Richards	DFG
Rebecca Quiñones	MassWildlife
Marybeth Chubb	MassDEP
Tim Jones	MassDEP
Jennifer Pederson	Massachusetts Water Works Association (MWWA)
Katherine Lange	Mass Rivers Alliance
Rebecca Weidman	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority
Katie Ronan	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority
Gerald Clark	Dover
Andreae Downs	Wastewater Advisory Committee
Becca George	DHCD
Lexi Dewey	Water Supply Citizens Advisory Committee
Sarah Bower	Mass Rivers Alliance

Read Porter	EEA
Jason Stolarski	MassWildlife
Elizabeth Homa	General public
Caleb Slater	MassWildlife

Rao called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Rao announced that the meeting was being recorded for meeting minutes and all votes would be taken by roll call. She invited those who wish to speak during the meeting to indicate this in the chat window. Roll call attendance was taken for Commission members.

Agenda Item #2: Executive Director's Report

- Rao drew attention to the following items that had been sent out in the meeting packet and referred people to the packet for more detail:
  - Information about the public comment period for MassDEP's Title 5 regulations, which will be the subject of a presentation at this meeting
  - Comment letter submitted by Commission staff to MEPA on the MWRA tunnel project, requesting more information, although the project is not expected to trigger an Interbasin Transfer Act review
  - First quarter report by Flood Hazard Management Program staff, which can be discussed at a future WRC meeting with those staff members.
- Staff member Viki Zoltay will be presenting at the NOAA Eastern Region monthly webinar series on Dec. 15th on staff's work on the Drought Dashboard.
- The Department of Energy Resources (DOER) put out regulations on appliance efficiency standards a year ago and recently published guidance for them, which will help retailers and vendors to, among other things, implement recent changes to the plumbing code.
- The Drought Management Task Force (DMTF) met the previous day and made a drought recommendation to the Secretary based on the current hydrologic conditions, which will be reviewed during this meeting.

Additional Items:
Curran reported that one of the recommendations that came out of DCR's recent Strategic Readiness Initiative was to strengthen research efforts. In support of that recommendation DCR held a research symposium for DCR staff on December 6. WRC staff were heavily involved, with Curran and Carroll both sitting on the steering committee for the symposium. Zoltay presented on tools the Commonwealth has developed to help face climate change including the Resilient MA climate tool and the research to identify a more effective evapotranspiration index for the Drought Management Plan. Duperault presented on the intersection of MA flood plains and vulnerable populations, which she previously presented to the WRC. The symposium had a great turnout, with a lot of learning across programs. The agency will be hiring a director of research and similar symposia in the future will be open to people outside DCR. WRC staff will also coordinate presentations on some of the projects for future WRC meetings.

Bentsen announced two open positions in the Division of Ecological Restoration (DER), which is restructuring to include three technical branches supported by operational and fiscal staff. The

first branch is habitat restoration, which represents much of DER's current work, such as dam removals, cranberry bog restoration, and coastal and freshwater wetland restoration. The second branch will be technical services, which will support the technical aspects of all projects, including engineering, hydrology, modeling, GIS, and prioritization planning. This branch needs a branch manager and the posting for that position will be open until December 12. The third branch will be for capacity building and will house DER's partnership program and work to strengthen and develop regional partnerships for statewide restoration work. This branch will also house the Culvert Replacement Municipal Assistance (CRMA) grant program and hopefully develop new grant programs to accelerate the pace and scale of restoration. This branch also needs a branch manager, with applications due Dec. 19th.

Baskin announced that MassDEP is almost one year into the promulgation of a new sewage notification law that requires dischargers of untreated or partially treated wastewater to notify the public. For communities with combined sewer overflows, the final CSO notification plan is due to MassDEP the first week of January. Additionally, the Drinking Water program is offering a per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) remediation grant program for small systems, with applications due December 15.

Hatch asked whether hydrologic impacts of hydroelectric power ever come into the conversations around the plumbing code. Rao answered that this doesn't come up in context of DOER's recent regulations and guidance, but this issue does come occasionally at a broader level. The state is engaged on hydrologic impacts as part of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) relicensing. Baskin added that she has not seen DOER get involved in permitting of facilities. MassDEP participates in FERC licensing including a determination that what is in the permit meets state water quality standards. MassDEP pulls in expertise from DCR, DFG, EEA, and other agencies in their determination, so an internal collaborative process occurs in addition to the external stakeholder process. Flow is part of water quality considerations, because flow needs to be high enough to support secondary contact, such as boating. Katherine Lange added with a post in the chat that DOER just issued a request for proposals to conduct a study on medium and long duration energy storage. Currently only hydro storage meets their definition, but hopefully the study will yield new storage technologies that are less harmful to rivers. Rao will help coordinate a presentation on this study to the WRC.

Callaghan added that under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, which he reviews for CZM within the coastal zone, there is a general permit that is issued for hydroelectric facilities, which covers 25 – 30 facilities in MA, so MassDEP is involved in hydroelectric discharge in this capacity as well. He went on to note that under the state water quality standards as amended within the last 15 years, MassDEP has authority over the quantity of water entering the intake of desalination and power plant facilities as well as the discharge. He asked if the agency regulates this. Baskin stated she would look into it. She pointed out that the regulation of flow regime under FERC relicensing is a separate regulatory process than the water quality oversight of discharge through the NPDES permits.

Agenda Item #3: Hydrologic Conditions and Drought Status

Graham provided an update of current hydrologic conditions. The report is available at: https://www.mass.gov/info-details/monthly-hydrologic-conditions.

Highlights:

- November was a warm month; Boston had the 7th warmest November on record and Worcester the 4th.
- Precipitation was mostly in the normal to below normal range. Eastern MA had more of the below normal precipitation, with the Southeast region having a drier month than the rest of the state. Looking back more than 3 months, almost the whole state is still showing deficits.
- Streamflow was varied, with some gages in each region below normal. Only Cape Cod tripped the streamflow index, at index severity level (ISL) 1.
- Groundwater varied from below to above normal. Some wells improved, while others deteriorated causing a lot of movement in this index. The CT River Valley, Northeast, and Cape Cod were at ISL 1 and the Islands were at 2.
- Lakes and Impoundments still had some struggles, with the CT River Valley, the Northeast, and Cape Cod at ISL 2.
- The Keetch-Byram Drought Index (KBDI) was only elevated in the Northeast, at ISL 1.
- While the Crop Moisture Index (CMI), which will soon be phased out, showed no drought, the Evaporative Demand Drought Index (EDDI), which will hopefully be replacing CMI was elevated for almost the whole state.
- Snowfall is a little behind seasonal averages.
- MA DMTF recommended the following Drought Levels to the Secretary at yesterday's meeting: Western, Southeast, and Central regions were recommended as normal for November. The Islands and Cape Cod were recommended for Level 2 drought; the Northeast was debated at Level 2 or 1. Of note are worsening conditions in the Northeast and the Cape.
- The US Drought Monitor showed improvements and then some declines during the month.
- The temperature and precipitation outlook for December show no strong signal for temperature or precipitation and the seasonal outlook shows 40-50% chance of above normal temperature, with no strong signal for precipitation.
- The monthly and seasonal drought outlook shows drought remaining but improving for northern Essex County and drought removal likely in southern Essex County and the CT River Valley.

Discussion:
Cambareri noted that Hyannis has seen some pretty good recovery in contrast to the Cape overall degrading to Level 2. He asked what the drivers were for the recommendation for Level 2 on the Cape. Rao explained that the drivers were the longer-term precipitation deficits, declining streamflow and lakes and Impoundments, and groundwater still not having recovered. Cambareri expressed curiosity about whether the indices on the Cape are nuanced enough to reflect the Cape hydrology as well as whether the indices on the Cape are sufficiently independent, given the heavy groundwater influence on streamflow and lake levels. Rao explained the two streamflow gages on the Cape were added to the network in last few years, as previously there were none. Staff recognize the close connection of these streams to groundwater.

Agenda Item #4: Meeting Minutes, September 2022

Rao invited a motion to approve the meeting minutes for September 8, 2022.

VOTE	A motion was made by Weismantel with a second by Baskin to approve the meeting minutes for September 8, 2022. The roll-call vote to approve was unanimous of those present.

Agenda Item #5: **Presentation on MassDEP's Proposed Title 5 Amendments and Draft Watershed Permit Regulations**

Baskin introduced presenters Marybeth Chubb, Chief of the Wastewater Program, and Tim Jones, Legal and Policy Analyst in the Bureau of Water Resources, at MassDEP. She explained that Cape Cod, Buzzards Bay and other areas in southeastern MA are severely impacted by nitrogen pollution. Studies have generated Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) and recommendations for reducing nitrogen loading. Most nitrogen comes from septic systems, which are not designed to remove nitrogen. Title 5 regulations (310 CMR 15.00) give MassDEP authority to address this. MassDEP is also developing regulations for an optional watershed permitting program (314 CMR 21.00) that covers actions to address septic systems and all other sources of nitrogen loading, including fertilizers. The WRC will be asked to approve these regulations, as the authority for them comes from the MA Clean Waters Act. MassDEP is currently in the public comment period for these regulations. Since the watershed permitting regulations will work together with the Title 5 regulations, the presentation will cover both programs and show how they work together. Presentation slides are available at: https://www.mass.gov/service-details/review-our-meetings

Presentation highlights include:

- Dense population and associated nitrogen loading causes accelerated growth of nuisance plants, weeds, and algae, and loss of oxygen, shellfish, finfish, and eelgrass. Water bodies cannot support their designated uses under the Clean Water Act when this occurs, which leads to the requirement of the development of a TMDL.
- The nitrogen is also an economic problem, including declines in fishing, shellfishing, recreation, tourism, real estate values, and general business.
- After many years of assessments and increasing attention on the nitrogen impacts to MA coastal areas, Governor Baker's Executive Order 562 and public comments on Title 5 regulations led DEP to form a Title 5/Groundwater stakeholder group.
- A subcommittee of the stakeholder group was formed to help address the nitrogen problem in coastal waters by expanding the definition and provisions of Nitrogen Sensitive Areas (NSA) under Title 5, including creating new requirements and compliance options. The targeted areas for the changes include Cape Cod, the Islands, and parts of the South Coastal and Buzzard Bay areas.
- The regulatory revision process involved broad public outreach.
- The proposed changes to Title 5 involve a new designation called Natural Resource Area NSA. Two groups would qualify for this designation: 1) watersheds to an embayment or sub-embayment that have a TMDL for nitrogen *and* an Area Wide Water Quality Management Plan addressing nitrogen under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) [30 watersheds on Cape Cod meet these criteria and would immediately be designated upon promulgation of the updated regulation]; 2) watersheds to an embayment or sub-embayment that have a TMDL for nitrogen or are determined to be nitrogen sensitive by MassDEP based on scientific

evaluation and a public process. [Several watersheds on the Islands, in Buzzards Bay, and on the Cape potentially meet these criteria and would be designated at a point in the future.]

- Individuals with septic systems in a Natural Resource Area NSA, have 5 years from the time of designation to adopt "best available nitrogen reducing technology" for their system, which is defined by MassDEP.
- There is an exemption to this requirement if the community obtains a Watershed Permit that covers the area the septic system is in or if the community submits an intent to apply for the Watershed Permit within 18 months of the time of designation.
- Watershed Permits would be issued under a newly promulgated regulation. They would consist of a 20-year voluntary permit instead of traditional 5-year permit, incorporating a long-term adaptive management strategy, which provides a greater range of acceptable solutions to address water quality, including alternative/innovative approaches, and a wider source of funding options.
- The watershed permit would be issued to a local government, regional government, or a group of local governments with intermunicipal agreements.
- Watershed permits must be based on a town-approved and MassDEP-approved Watershed Management Plan to restore and protect water quality. For areas with TMDLs, the plans must be designed to achieve compliance with the TMDL and demonstrate >= 75% pollutant reduction within 20 years or an alternative schedule determined by MassDEP. These plans can also address phosphorus loading, which can be damaging to freshwater bodies.
- Watershed Permits would be issued, modified, revoked, or terminated through a public notice process. Revocation or termination of a watershed permit would result in reversion to the individual septic system requirements within the designated areas.
- Public information sessions for the regulatory changes were held in November and recordings are available, and the third public hearing was just held in the past week. The public comment period is scheduled to close on December 16th, but may be extended. Watershed Permit Regulations will need WRC approval. MassDEP hopes both regulations are promulgated in early 2023.

Discussion, Questions and Answers, and Comments:
Weismantel asked about the cost to a homeowner to upgrade a septic system. Chubb answered $25,000 - $35,000, depending on the condition and type of existing system and site constraints.

Cambareri reported that there is a lot of consternation on Cape Cod about this change and the potential onus on property owners, although they have been offered reassurance that their communities intend to move forward with watershed permitting to relieve the property owner burden. He expressed hope that the regulations don't cause a reversal of public trust in the regional comprehensive wastewater planning process and asked if consideration was given to place the onus directly on the communities. Jones responded that MassDEP has no legal authority to require a watershed permit. Its authority lies with Title 5, which directly regulates the property owner, so the onus lies on them. The tandem approach allows communities to avail themselves of additional sources of funding and address the wider contributors to the nitrogen problem. MassDEP is working with communities who have Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plans (CWMP) or are working on them to leverage that work as part of a watershed permit. Cambareri followed with a question of whether watershed permits would have to go through MEPA approval and Jones believed they would.

Hatch commented that she likes the approach presented to address many sources of nitrogen through the regulatory hooks that MassDEP has. She asked what investigations around sources of nitrogen went into the regulatory proposals. Jones answered that in the late 1990's and early 2000's, the Massachusetts Estuaries Project out of UMass Dartmouth analyzed sources of Nitrogen on Cape Cod and the Southeast MA coast and developed models related to those sources. Sources of nitrogen are quite diverse. The proposed regulations allow a community to conduct a scientific evaluation of the nitrogen sources as part of determining if they qualify as a nitrogen sensitive area.

Woods asked for more information on how enforcement power works under a voluntary permit and what the reasoning was for the 20-year timeline, given the urgent need for remediation, and whether there could be incentive to implement a plan more quickly than 20 years. She also expressed concern that it takes a long time for a community to become designated as a Nitrogen Sensitive Area. Jones responded that enforcement provisions do exist within regulations if a community pursues and is issued a permit. If they withdraw, the Title 5 requirements kick back in. Chubb added that most CWMPs are 40 years in timeframe, so 20 years reflects the pushback MassDEP has gotten about the length of that timeframe. They are trying to balance the need to do things quickly and the time it takes to implement the solutions. Baskin noted that existing sources of federal funds might provide incentive to move forward quickly to pursue that funding.

Weismantel asked whether there are other examples of this type of a watershed permitting approach. Jones responded that there is an existing pilot watershed permit for the Pleasant Bay Alliance, a municipal organization formed by four communities on Cape Cod, which has been quite effective at nitrogen reduction in its first four years. Weismantel followed up asking what primary solutions might be pursued under a watershed permit plan and whether any of them are really affordable. Jones conceded that cost concerns are high but noted that people recognize that all future scenarios are expensive including no action, and the proposed programs help move the state to action before the costs to address nitrogen issues go up even further. The MA legislature is showing interest in targeting funding for the nitrogen issue, too.

Wijnja addressed fertilizers as a source of nitrogen input and commented that DAR has plant nutrient regulations in place to address nitrogen and phosphorous loading to water bodies. He speculated that fertilization management could be low-hanging fruit for communities relative to other actions as part of their watershed management plans. MassDEP may want to be in communication with DAR if these regulations come into play in the Watershed Permits.

Pederson asked where the authority for regulating nitrogen loading other than from septic systems lies, if not with MassDEP. Baskin explained that there are gaps in the regulatory environment around nitrogen, which is why this carrot and stick approach is being proposed. TMDLs can be required by EPA, but they are not enforceable until pulled into permits, which don't exist for all sources. Pederson also expressed concern about the costs associated with compliance with these regulations when the money available is already too low to address the huge infrastructure needs and per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) concerns communities are now facing. Even 0% loans need to be paid back and can be financially burdensome. Baskin acknowledged the funding as a major issue. Jones noted that the watershed permit program can help distribute costs more widely across a community and bring in implementation options that

are less costly. There has been a lot of interest expressed in pursuing the watershed permit by communities in these nitrogen sensitive areas.

Rao invited Commissioners to submit comments officially, in addition to the robust discussion from the meeting. Jones also encouraged everyone to go to the informational websites on these regulatory updates.

Cambareri asked if there could be a follow up report from MassDEP on their response to comments before the WRC is asked to vote. Baskin explained that the opportunity to have an interim meeting to report on response to comments would depend on whether the public comment period gets extended. She also noted that MassDEP will be happy to come back after promulgation to keep the WRC apprised of which communities are seeking watershed permits and on the overall progress of the program.

Commissioner Balzotti left the meeting at 3:05. Commissioners Baskin and Cambareri left at 3:15.

Agenda Item #6: **Presentation on Road Salt Impacts on Drinking Water in the Wachusett Reservoir Watershed**

Rao introduced John Scannell, Director of the DCR Division of Water Supply Protection (DWSP), who reminded the commission that the Division manages the Quabbin and Wachusett reservoirs for the Boston metro water supply. He explained that routine monitoring in their watersheds has shown an increase over the years in chloride impacts in both tributaries and reservoirs, with the greatest source being road salt. He introduced Jamie Carr as the head of environmental quality at Wachusett to describe efforts to reduce the road salt impacts. Presentation slides are available at: https://www.mass.gov/service-details/review-our-meetings

Presentation highlights include:

- While the presentation focuses on Wachusett Reservoir, increasing chlorides concentrations also affect the Quabbin and watersheds across MA.
- Use of road salt and deicing chemicals have increased steadily since 1989.
- Specific conductance, as a proxy for chloride concentrations, have been clearly going up at all sampling locations, some more steeply than others.
- Values are exceeding chronic toxicity levels now in four sampling locations.
- Surprisingly, when digging into the data, DCR staff see some of the highest concentrations in summer months. Average summer values are higher than winter. A hypothesis is that concentrations in groundwater are building up over the years of application and summer flows are more heavily influenced by groundwater contributions.
- Problems due to high chloride concentrations include harm to aquatic life and roadside vegetation; damage to vehicles, bridges, and buildings with associated financial costs; contamination of drinking water wells and associated health concerns; and corrosion in water distribution systems leading to health threats from lead and copper leaching.
- Protection strategies include:
    - Improve Data Collection – track salt use by MA Department of Transportation (DOT) and towns (an estimated 18,000 tons of salt is applied per year into the watershed) and all deicing materials applied by DCR watershed staff; expand groundwater

monitoring; install automatic water quality monitoring devices in seven watershed locations for data collection at 15-minute intervals.
- Modelling - work with UMass Amherst on modeling chloride concentrations, chloride movement, and the impact of different management scenarios.
- Education and Training – focus is on salt application strategies that improve safety and lower chloride impacts.
- Salt Reduction Grant Program – 50/50 matching grant up to $20,000 to adopt salt reduction technologies.
- Upgrade of DCR WSP Operations – demonstrate and publicize many strategies to reduce salt application within DWSP watersheds, as statewide model.

Discussion, Questions and Answers, and Comments:
Rao asked if climate change and less snow have led to less salt application. Carr explained that temperatures now often hover around 32 degrees, which causes some of the most dangerous conditions, leading to more salt application. Woods added that there are now also more roads. Hatch pointed out that lower streamflows can lead to higher chloride concentrations. Rao also asked if towns need to retrofit trucks to switch to brine, and Carr replied that towns can sometimes retrofit existing equipment but some may need new equipment for this purpose.

Woods asked about the cost of the automatic water quality data loggers with remote capabilities. Carr recommended contacting Dan Crocker at DCR as the project spearhead for these loggers, which were developed by Stroudwater Resource Center and cost around $2,000-3,000. This contrasted with a quote from ISCO which was $25,000-35,000 plus monthly fees. Woods also asked for a link to the educational video that Carr mentioned during his presentation, which was posted in the chat (https://www.youtube.com/c/MassDCR/videos). Woods further asked about funding of the water quality work, given the jurisdictional breakdown between DCR and MWRA. Scannell explained the DCR Water Supply Division is responsible for keeping the watersheds and the water clean, and then giving the clean water to MWRA. MWRA funds the DCR Watershed Division through the rate payers, including the water quality work.

Wijnja asked whether DCR is planning to continue work on establishing the relationship between chloride in groundwater and summer surface water chloride levels. Carr said this is relatively new for DCR but that they will continue trying to figure out the details of the relationship. He didn't believe there was a MassDEP standard for groundwater, but DCR has found chloride levels in groundwater that are above the chronic toxicity thresholds for surface water. Wijnja also asked if higher levels in summer have a greater impact on aquatic life than in winter. Carr said this depends and noted that a very concerning situation is streams that are highly impacted in winter and then do not get any relief in the summer, lengthening the chronic exposure to the chloride.

Pederson commented that chloride is becoming an increasing issue with suppliers across the state, especially with sources close to highways – both surface and groundwater sources. These concentrations can also lead to pipe corrosion and resulting increases in lead and copper concentrations. She said several water systems are working with DOT on remediation for both surface waters and private wells and pasted a link into the chat for a report on this work that DOT updates every 5 years (https://www.mass.gov/doc/massdot-snow-and-ice-control-environmental-status-planning-report-2017/download). Rao added that some of the successes

that DCR has had in recent years might be worth sharing with communities grappling with this issue. Pederson suggested doing this at one of the regular MWWA roundtables.

Rao asked how much DOT is adjusting statewide operations based on what they are learning from this research. Carr responded that DOT has been good about training their district staff on road salt reduction, although reductions in applications are not uniform across the districts.

Richards commented on the implications of increasing salinities for aquatic life. He noted that there have been examples of streams that have salinity so high that only American eels can tolerate them. He is hoping to leverage salinity research on the drinking water supply front to improve education and management on the habitat protection front. He noted the importance of demonstrating that there are no reductions in public safety by using newer techniques for treating roads and that many communities might not realize how much they could save.

V O T E	A motion was made by Weismantel with a second by Wijnja to adjourn the meeting. The roll-call vote to approve was unanimous of those present.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05

Documents or Exhibits Used at Meeting or Attached with the Monthly Packet:

1. WRC Meeting Minutes: September 8, 2022
2. Documents for MassDEP's Proposed Title 5 Amendments and Draft Watershed Permit Regulations
   a. EEA Summary for proposed Title 5 amendments and draft Watershed Permit Regulations
   b. Redline draft Title 5 amendments
   c. Draft Watershed Permit regulations
3. Correspondence dated November 22, 2022 from the Water Resources Commission to the MEPA Office regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the MWRA Metropolitan Water Tunnel Program
4. 2023 WRC Meeting Schedule
5. MA Flood Hazard Management Program First Quarter Report to FEMA
6. Interbasin Transfer Act project status report, December 1, 2022
7. Hydrologic Conditions in Massachusetts, November 2022
8. Presentations found at https://www.mass.gov/service-details/review-our-meetings

Compiled by: SC

Agendas, minutes, and other documents are available on the web site of the Water Resources Commission at https://www.mass.gov/water-resources-commission-meetings. *All other meeting documents are available by request to WRC staff at 251 Causeway Street, 8th floor, Boston, MA 02114.*