THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

100 CAMBRIDGE STREET, BOSTON MA 02114

Meeting Minutes for March 9, 2023

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

Minutes approved June 8, 2023

Members in Attendance:

Vandana Rao	Designee, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA)
Duane LeVangie	Designee, Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)
Anne Carroll	Designee, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
Becca George	Designee, Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)
Kate Bentsen	Designee, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Hotze Wijnja	Designee, Department of Agricultural Resources (DAR)
Thomas Cambareri	Public Member
Christine Hatch	Public Member
Kenneth Weismantel	Public Member
Samantha Woods	Public Member

Members Absent

Tyler Soleau	Designee, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM)
Vincent Ragucci	Public Member

Others in Attendance:

Andreae Downs	WSCAC
Andrew Reid	Chelmsford Water District
Erin Graham	DCR/OWR
Jason Duff	DCR/OWR
Jeff Murawski	Concord Water & Sewer
Jennifer Pederson	Massachusetts Water Works Association
John Westerling	Town of Hopkinton
Julie Butler	MassDEP
Kara Sliwoski	DCR/OWR
Lexi Dewey	WSCAC
Melissa Simoncini	Concord Water & Sewer
Nadia Madden	DCR/OWR
Pine duBois	Jones River
Rebecca Weidman	MWRA
Sara Cohen	DCR/OWR
Sarah Bower	Mass Rivers Alliance
Vanessa Curran	DCR/OWR
Viki Zoltay	DCR/OWR

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

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Rao introduced herself, welcomed attendees, reminded all to put their name and affiliation in the chat for the meeting minutes, to use the chat for any questions and to keep microphones on mute until called upon. A roll call of members in attendance was taken by Cohen; a quorum was present.

Agenda Item #2: Executive Director's Report

Rao mentioned in the meeting packet was a letter, related to the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), sent to MEPA about how WRC staff help to implement the NFIP in MA, with comments to alert the developer of the building code as it aplies to a small house in the floodplain and some potential changes to the code that may be coming this year. Rao added other noteworthy items were mentioned in the email sent out but wanted to highlight some again: Fix a Leak Week is in March, which will be discussed later in the meeting agenda; a link to an article by Commissioner Hatch; the Dept. of Energy Resources (DOER) is hosting some webinars (in 2022, Rao presented on some of the changes proposed by DOER as a result of the climate bill that was passed over a year ago and included changes to various aspects of the plumbing code.) Starting in January 2023, many older or less efficient fixtures cannot be sold in MA, so webinars are being offered to help manufacturers, installers and others around the state that sell these products on how to comply with the new regulations and law. Rao said that EEA is hiring again. There were four positions posted in the last month: Climate Scientist, Deputy Director for Climate Adaptation and Resilience, Assistant Climate Scientist (someone with a water resource related background), and a Deputy Director for Climate Change, Equity and Environmental Justice. Rao also announced that Stephanie Cooper had been named Under Secretary for Environment; staff are familiar with Cooper from her previous roles at EEA, DEP and DCR. Cooper understands the WRC and the issues it works on.

Rao added that WRC staff have been working on the projects presented at the January meeting and will provide updates again at the April meeting, as well as looking at grant applications, including the NRD (previously discussed with commission), and that many communities are reaching out for partnership or collaboration. These opportunities can potentially implement items and/or policy at the community level that has been discussed for decades. Rao inquired with Commissioners for any announcements from them.

Bentsen noted that Division of Ecological Restoration is hiring a technical services branch manager, which would support restoration planning, prioritization, GIS, engineering services, etc.

Woods announced that the North and South Rivers Watershed Association (NSRWA) was awarded a one million dollar grant over the next three years to help with river restoration and dam work. She also noted that NSRWA is hosting a week of educational seminars, Green Gardening Expo, which is relevant to water conservation, in conjunction with the water smart program on the South Shore. Each night there is a different speaker, which can be joined via Zoom, Doug Tallamy a well-known entomologist will be speaking; Saturday, March 18 is an in-person day at a local nursery for people to have their soil tested, learn about keeping more natural landscaping. Rao said that staff will connect with Woods to try to coordinate outreach efforts. Woods also added that without the recently promulgated public sewer notification law, the public would have not known of a recent wastewater treatment overflow spill in Rockland which shutdown harvesting of shellfish beds for a month. She said this has likely happened in the past, but no one was notified because it was not required; however, with the notification the town can be supported in fixing the situation.

Cambareri commented that during the last meeting he raised the issue whether the MEPA regulations had been updated, and wanted to confirm that he saw they were amended and promulgated in January 2023; these implement the climatic roadmap for various projects that come under MEPA review, as well as the environmental justice type.

Agenda Item #4: Vote: Meeting Minutes, December 2022 and January 2023

Rao suggested voting on the minutes prior to reviewing the Hydrologic Conditions Report, and invited motions to approve the December 2022 and the regular January 2023 WRC meeting minutes, respectively. Rao thanked Cohen and Duff for their efforts on the long meeting transcription and noted that the special January 2023 meeting minutes will be shared at the next meeting.

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

VOTE	A motion was made by Weismantel with a second by Hatch to approve the meeting minutes from the January 12, 2023 WRC meeting. The roll-call vote to approve was nine in favor while George abstained.

Agenda Item #3: Update: Hydrologic Conditions

Rao introduced Graham to present the Hydrologic Conditions Report for February 2023.

- *Temperature:* above normal across the state.
- *Precipitation*: below normal across the state, with Central, Northeast and Southeast regions receiving slightly less than the remaining regions.
- *Streamflow*: normal to above normal across the state except for 3 gages in the Southeast region.
- *Groundwater*: normal to above normal across most of the state, with a few locations in the Northeast and Southeast regions being below normal.
- *Lakes & Impoundments*: levels varied widely across the state, with the Northeast region at level 1 and the pond monitored in the Cape Cod region at level 2.
- *Keetch-Byram Drought Index*: Not applicable as it is reported seasonally, outside of winter months.
- *Evapotranspiration:* both Crop Moisture Index (CMI) and Evaporative Demand Drought Index (EDDI) are reported seasonally, outside of winter months.
- *Flooding:* no flooding reported by National Weather Service; flood outlook is below normal for the spring.
- *Snowfall:* minimal snow water equivalent across much of the state; negative snowfall departures across the state range from -7 to -25 inches.
- *Drought status*: all regions are in Level 0 Normal Conditions as of February 13, 2023
- *US Drought Monitor*: no areas of drought shown across the state.
- *NOAA Climate Prediction Center outlooks*: 50-60% chance for below normal temperatures and equal chances for above normal, normal or below normal precipitation. The seasonal outlook through May shows a 30-40% chance of above normal temperatures and equal chances for above normal, normal, or below normal precipitation. The monthly and seasonal (through May) drought outlooks both show no drought development.

Rao thanked Graham, noted how one month of precipitation deficit can bring the accumulated precipitation departure down so much and asked if anyone had any questions.

Woods mentioned that she's noticed a trend in low spring flows in recent years, and the impacts they have on herring runs, without snow to melt and without some major precipitation the flows are below median for this time of year. Rao replied that is something that WRC staff, NOAA, NWS are concerned about and watching; we've come out of a drought, but without snowpack to help baseflow and recharge groundwater, if we have another dry month like February, we could easily be back in a drought this summer, which relates to the next agenda item of water conservation efforts that can be done on an individual level.

Hatch noted that in addition to the low stream flows in winter months, combined with hot temperatures, it provides double difficulty for migratory fish as they'll get the warm water temperature signal to migrate but without the additional water and flows to do so.

Agenda Item #5: Discussion: Massachusetts' Participation in Fix a Leak Week, March 20-26, 2023

Rao introduced Fix a Leak Week, noting the state has been involved and promoting it over the last few years. This year's week is March 20-26th and is an EPA Water Sense run campaign promoted throughout the country. Rao said we have been spending time and effort promoting to the general public to be more alert, look for and address leaks in their homes and businesses, given the recent droughts and potential for more in future years. Rao introduced Duff to present. Presentation slides can be accessed here: ***Massachusetts' Participation in Fix a Leak Week.***

Duff reiterated Rao's comments about this year's dates, being a national campaign, and added that the goal is to promote the identification and repair of household leaks. Duff showed a summary of last year's campaign, specifically on Twitter, which focused on toilet leaks as they are one of the biggest culprits. Duff also reviewed some basic things that Water Sense was asking organizations to do, that MA is planning to do: a banner on our website and join others in a Twitter "party" aimed to get different groups to tweet during the week. Duff noted that we are targeting one Twitter post each day of that week, but also include some posts with a combination of topics in case we were unable to tweet each day. Anticipated posts would be as follows:

Day 1 – basic introduction to Fix a Leak Week, with household leak statistics to grab people's attention and link to our available water conservation tools, such as the toolkit

Day 2 – general leak information, with resources from Water Sense for checking for leaks

Day 3 – toilet leaks, with related resources such as replacing a toilet flapper. This day also coincides with World Water Day, which may have a separate post or combined one to highlight it.

Day 4 – faucet leaks, with resources from Alliance for Water Efficiency on repairing leaking faucets

Day 5 – outdoor water leaks, for spigots and sprinkler systems as a reminder to not overlook those when checking indoor fixtures

Duff added that there is an opportunity to highlight Fix a Leak Week on the Conserve MA Water website, either temporarily during the respective week, or permanently as a data repository for related resources. He mentioned that staff have also been trying to collaborate with other state agencies and how they may be able to help spread the word for various campaigns (i.e., Leading by Example Program at DOER, and with DCAMM), and for Fix a Leak Week also prioritizing the identification and repair for leaks at state facilities. Rao added that Duff put together a small write up for the Coastal Zone Management newsletter that month.

Weismantel thanked Duff and suggested also encouraging water suppliers to fix leaks and improve unaccounted for water, as that part of outreach hasn't really happened, which Rao and Duff agreed was a great idea. Rao said they've always talked about the benefit of water audits to identify real versus apparent loses for communities to hone in on the losses and prioritize funding and time accordingly, and can look at including that information in posts.

Woods inquired about who to follow on Twitter, which Rao answered it is the EEA account.
Rao added staff are planning to post on their personal LinkedIn pages; OTA has a LinkedIn page and newsletter to help share the message to businesses; DCAMM was appreciative of any water conservation information provided to them.

Pederson commended the staff on reaching out about graphics and messaging, as she appreciated the time and effort gone into seeking feedback and improving the social media messaging. She noted that water suppliers don't need a reminder on issues with unaccounted for water, as they know they have an issue, they just need funding to address it and is supportive of outreach that speaks to additional funding for suppliers. Rao added that staff and a design firm have worked to fix and adjust wording and graphics based on feedback received, so that these graphic resources can be shared with communities that don't have the resources to produce their own; this also creates consistent messaging across the Commonwealth.

Woods added that if any unaccounted for water post was done, the message should be about supporting your local water supply and not shaming them, as most people want to address an issue.

Carroll thanked Pederson for the focus group and feedback, and the graphics can be presented to the Commission when they are ready soon.

Rao reminded everyone to keep a look out for social media posts to reshare and thanked Duff.

Agenda Item #6: Presentation: Planning for the Future: Exploring the Feasibility of Expanding MWRA's Regional Water System

Rao introduced Rebecca Weidman from the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) and noted that many Commissioners have expressed interest in MWRA's expansion studies in response to communities looking for other sources of water because of PFAS and similar issues. The initial feasibility studies that MWRA has conducted have elevated those conversations. Rao noted that Weidman worked at DEP for many years prior to joining MWRA. Presentation slides can be accessed here: ***Planning for the Future: Exploring the Feasibility of Expanding MWRA's Regional Water System***

Weidman introduced herself as the Director of Environmental and Regulatory Affairs at MWRA, and they have recently completed two feasibility studies to look at expanding their regional water system to two new regions of the state, with a third study in process. She noted she is discussing the first two studies and sharing a few details about the third.

Highlights included:

- For purposes of the feasibility study: for sizing pipes, they're looking at the max daily demand (in million gallons per day [MGD]), as opposed to the usual average daily demand.

- The study areas are the Ipswich River Basin (12 communities), South Shore (10 communities) and Metro West (22 communities), which were shown on a map with current MWRA service areas also illustrated.
- The purpose of the studies are planning level, to address the feasibility in connecting to MWRA's regional water system; ultimately, could MWRA actually transport water to these communities? Could they move water from their treatment plant to these communities? How would these communities connect? How much would those connections cost? How long would it take to make those connections? All information that communities would need to decide if connecting to MWRA was feasible for them.
- The Ipswich River Basin community study was undertaken at the request of the Baker-Polito Administration.
- The South Shore community study was completed as directed by the legislature.
- The Metro West community study was initiated at the request of those communities participating in the study.
- Additional work is required for any community that wants to connect to MWRA, so this is just the first stage of a much larger process.
- Does MWRA have water and can they transport it? Weidman showed a graphic that illustrated the total consumption of communities that are current MWRA members, MWRA's safe yield for its two reservoirs (300 MGD on average, which is trending down from water conservation efforts, to about 203 MGD). 2022 had an increase due to Cambridge being online for about 3 months to address treatment needs at their own plant.
- MWRA made conservative estimates of an increase of 29 MGD, due to increased population and employment demand, to provide for additional communities; they also accounted for 17 MGD for additional potential demand (for impartial, existing, partial and emergency users).
- The current 203 MGD plus the 29 and 17 additional MGD brings the conservative estimate for future use to 249 MGD, leaving 51 MGD to supply new communities. This gives MWRA a starting point for discussions with new communities for their comfort level and when reassessment would be needed for water availability.
- Weidman emphasized that many of the MGD values are average daily demands while the study focuses solely on maximum daily demands.
- For the Ipswich and South Shore studies, all communities would be fully supplied, but there are different scenarios where maybe not all the communities are fully supplied. However, different options were reviewed in which all would be fully supplied, with every community having a direct connection to MWRA pipeline.
- The Metro West study involves wheeling from one community to another.
- Ipswich and South Shore studies had costs in September 2022 dollars, and estimates out to 2027 dollars. All costs are conceptual with many contingencies, given recent volatile infrastructure prices and anticipated time for design and permitting.
- Reminder: this study is a planning level study, not a design study. The design and permitting process would take at least 2-3 years before any construction could begin.
- The closer a municipality is to the MWRA system, the larger the diameter of the pipes; the further away, the smaller the diameter of the pipes.
- Any tentative schedule would be broad and variable, and dependent on size and location of the pipe. The permitting and construction process takes longer in more developed areas due to having to work around existing development and underground structures, as opposed to more open areas.

Ipswich River Basin Study:

- Included communities are Beverly, Danvers, Hamilton, Ipswich, Lynn, Lynnfield Center Water District, Middleton, Peabody, Salem, Topsfield, Wenham, and Wilmington.
- Ipswich Basin option 1 – fully serving all Ipswich River communities via a connection to the MWRA tunnel, which would take about 30 miles of 72-inch pipe. Estimated costs would be approximately 1 billion dollars and would take 20-25 years to complete design and construction.
- Ipswich Basin option 2 – moving water through MWRA's existing distribution system (pipes in the ground in the area). This would be providing water to the communities closest to MWRA's existing system (Salem, Peabody, Lynnfield Center Water District) and maintaining full demand to Wilmington who is already connected. Estimated costs would be approximately 110 million and would take 5-7 years for design and construction.
- Ipswich Basin option 3 – also moving water through MWRA's existing distribution system but would add significant piping to move the system further north, all the way into Ipswich. Estimated costs would be approximately 350 million dollars and would take 10-15 years for design and construction.
- Overall, the less expensive option is not having to connect to MWRA's tunnel system, but they can't move as much water through the existing distribution system as they could tunnels.

South Shore Study:

- Included communities are Abington, Avon, Brockton, Cohasset, Hanover, Hingham, Norwell, Rockland, Scituate, Weymouth and the former Naval Air Force Station.
- South Shore option 1 – fully serving all of the communities, which would require extending a pipe from the existing MWRA tunnel system in Dorchester. Estimated costs would be 1.25 billion dollars and would take 20-25 years for design and construction.
- South Shore option 2 – partial supply to Avon, Brockton, Weymouth and the former Naval Air Force Station, which would utilize MWRA's existing distribution system while also modifying and extending that system. Estimated costs would be 460 million dollars and would take 10-15 years for design and construction.
- Braintree, Randolph and Holbrook were not included in the study because they have broken ground and are moving forward with their treatment plant.
- Ipswich River Basin and South Shore studies are complete and available online; the Metro West study is ongoing and will likely be completed this spring.
- In helping garner interested amongst communities to join their system, the MWRA Board of Directors waived the entrance fee for up to 20 MGD for new communities seeking admission, but the communities also need to show they have water quality or quantity issues or need additional water for economic development and have completed the MWRA admission process by 12/31/2027. The admission process does not require an actual connection to be made, but it does require all regulatory reviews.
- MWRA's next steps are outreach to legislators, communities, and regional organizations to discuss funding opportunities.

Discussion:

Rao noted that the max daily demand coincides with the way Interbasin Transfers are viewed, which is also in max daily demand.

LeVangie inquired if there was a way to understand the separate costs by municipality; Weidman replied they did not include that in the report but could figure it out if necessary.

Woods asked if the Ipswich Basin study assumed that the towns would completely abandon their existing water supplies. Weidman replied that all the communities would be fully served and would stop regularly using their current sources but could maintain their existing supplies for emergencies. Rao noted that it would be better to design the infrastructure for a community to fully connect in the future rather than having smaller infrastructure in place, and asked Weidman if the study took that approach, which she confirmed.

Cohen followed up by asking if the communities were connected to be fully served, but only decided to be partially served, how does that play into MWRA's cost calculations? Weidman noted that this was only a planning level study and the finances have not been determined yet, but that it's a better cost benefit in the long term to put in large enough pipes for potential full future use.

Bower asked if Weidman could elaborate on what parameters were looked at when evaluating how much water is available and exactly how much water is available to supply additional communities. Weidman said the safe yield is the safe yield of the system, which is a firm number; the 203 MGD is a five-year running average, as MWRA monitors usage daily. Weidman noted she can't speak specifically on how the conservative growth for increased population and employment value was developed but does think it's incredibly conservative when looking at their usage over time. The 249 MGD value is based on who is an emergency use, partial use and fully served.

Woods asked if climate change was considered when MWRA made their determinations and conservation approaches, as it should be considered given increasing temperatures and changing precipitation. Weidman said she doesn't think it played a large factor in this analysis, but a more detailed analysis would be revisited when communities want to join the MWRA system. Weidman added that the 29 MGD builds in a conservation buffer for MWRA, and that they've had downward usage trends.

Hatch noted her appreciation of the study accounting for full service to new communities, as in the event of an emergency or contamination a community would need their full amount. Hatch asked about where the water supply numbers are deemed to come from, what the safe yield is, and for another explanation of the average and max daily values. Weidman said usually water supply is discussed in average daily demands, but the planning study uses maximum daily demands, which by general rule of thumb is one and a half times the average daily demand. MWRA is using the max daily demand for planning purposes so they can understand the infrastructure required for that type of demand potential. Hatch noted that its more about being able to move the water safely within the infrastructure rather than the water quantity, to which Weidman agreed.

Rao asked what the max daily demand is currently. Weidman replied that she assumes it's probably just below 300 MGD, but that the data is available on MWRA's website. Rao noted she assumes MWRA will have to keep track of the current max daily demand is versus what may be a new max daily demand when communities join the system. Weidman said yes, there are other components of their water system that need to be considered when determining how much water they can supply. LeVangie confirmed MWRA's 2022 maximum was 312 MGD, while most years it is between 300 and 310 MGD.

Woods asked if the safe yields include stream flow releases to maintain downstream habitat areas, and when those volume values were developed. Weidman said yes and that the stream flow value requirements are set in a permit so many of them are old.

Westerling noted Hopkinton is in negotiations with Southborough for approximately 3 MGD, which would be an MWRA connection due to PFAS. He suggested MWRA consider extending down the I-495 to serve Hopkinton, Holliston, Milford, Bellingham and others. He also inquired about the next steps of the Metro West study, as Hopkinton is included in that. Weidman said they are still working through the study but are starting to work with communities on an outreach strategy on all levels on funding and community support to connect to MWRA. Rao reminded Westerling that Hopkinton will have to come before the WRC for approval for the Southboro transfer and that staff will help with the application process.

Weismantel noted that if MWRA expansions move forward, the Interbasin Transfer requests may need to be approached on a regional basis instead of a town basis. He also noted that in another MWRA presentation it was highlighted that connected communities can offer more to "water consuming" industries (i.e., pharmaceuticals, etc.), which should be considered during Interbasin Transfer reviews since it could have both good and bad impacts to a community/region. He questioned whether abandoning existing water sources is necessarily good or bad, as it could have good downstream impacts but also bad impacts for flooding, though he understands it from a revenue standpoint for MWRA, but that some of these points of question should be answered by the WRC before any next steps. Rao asked if he meant the system should be first come first served (if the infrastructure was only passing through some communities) or if he's more concerned about the process of what's coming to the WRC and weighing one community's needs versus another's. Weismantel replied that he meant from a political reality, as MWRA communities have the political power to change the process, but that ultimately the WRC needs to figure out how a community would get through the approval process. Rao added there are regulatory defined environmental criteria to be reviewed. The legislature when they passed the interbasin transfer act felt the need to provide a pathway to a community that had a serious need for water from across a basin line and without a local viable water sources. Rao added that again this is just a conceptual study and ultimately it will come down to a community scale decision of viability, which is a lot to unpack and for the WRC to be thinking through. Rao said there is a streamlined process in place for a regional water supply system application for approval for certain volumes and times, which she encourages the MWRA to pursue.

Weismantel asked if the MWRA was going to take the study results and come up with a yes or no answer as to the feasibility. Weidman reminded again that the studies are planning level only to give a ballpark cost and that if/when the time comes, it ultimately is up to the community to decide what is right for itself; she noted that each community has different priorities and budgets and the study wasn't intended to specifically answer that question, but instead create dialogue about the feasibility.

Hatch added about downstream releases saying that you'd have imported water inputs added to natural stream flows when connecting to the MWRA system.

Pederson noted she appreciated the WRC's streamlined regional process, but noted communities with water quality or PFAS issues receiving water also need a streamlined process as many will

have the same answer that their potential treatment would be an extreme expense otherwise. She also noted that the focus on water rates and structures is going to burden communities with significant water quality issues. Rao noted that water quality issues are one reason why a community may want to connect, based on past interbasin transfers, but that the Interbasin Transfer Act is specific on what the WRC needs to review, which likely won't change anytime soon. However, Rao added that they can certainly think about being flexible on the receiving side in other ways.

Bower asked if MWRA has studied how the potential expansion donor basin releases will environmentally impact the donor watersheds and how other stakeholder groups can be involved in meetings on the potential expansion in their region. Weidman replied that they have not done any analysis on the donor basin impacts, because it was a feasibility study and just conceptual. Weidman added MWRA has been working with the North Shore Resiliency Task Force and the Southeast Water Task Force (which Woods noted the name isn't finalized yet), and that Bower can be connected with all three of the study area groups, though the North Shore is farthest along in the process as the conversations have been ongoing for a while.

Rao thanked Weidman, noted Cohen has been helping to facilitate both North and South Shore groups, and told Commissioners if they had additional questions to email them to her and she'd forward them to Weidman and perhaps have her at a future meeting for a follow-up discussion.

Rao asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

V O T E	A motion was made by Weismantel with a second by Woods to adjourn the meeting. The roll-call vote to approve was unanimous. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned, 3:03 pm.

Documents or Exhibits Used at Meeting:

1. WRC Meeting Minutes:
   a. December 8, 2022
   b. January 12, 2023
2. Correspondence dated February 24, 2023 from the Water Resources Commission to the MEPA Office regarding the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF) for a Proposed Single-Family House Reconstruction in Marion
3. Interbasin Transfer Act project status report, February 28, 2022
4. Hydrologic Conditions in Massachusetts, February 2022 (available at https://www.mass.gov/info-details/monthly-hydrologic-conditions

Compiled by: kms

Agendas, minutes, and other documents are available on the website 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.*