



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION
100 CAMBRIDGE STREET, BOSTON MA 02114

Meeting Minutes for November 10, 2021

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

Minutes approved February 10, 2022

Members in Attendance:

Vandana Rao	Designee, Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA)
Linda Balzotti	Designee, Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)
Kathleen Baskin	Designee, Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)
Anne Carroll	Designee, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR)
Todd Richards	Designee, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Hotze Wijnja	Designee, Department of Agricultural Resources (DAR)
Thomas Cambareri	Public Member
Vincent Ragucci	Public Member
Kenneth Weismantel	Public Member
Samantha Woods	Public Member

Members Absent:

Todd Callaghan	Designee, Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM)
Marcela Molina	Public Member

Others in Attendance:

Marilyn McCrory	DCR, Office of Water Resources
Lexi Dewey	Water Supply Citizens Advisory Committee
Sara Cohen	DCR, Office of Water Resources
Kara Sliwoski	DCR, Office of Water Resources
Read Porter	EEA
Jennifer Pederson	Massachusetts Water Works Association
Katie Ronan	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA)
Andreae Downs	Wastewater Advisory Committee to the MWRA
Viki Zoltay	DCR, Office of Water Resources
Erin Graham	DCR, Office of Water Resources
Becca George	Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)
John Scannell	DCR, Division of Water Supply Protection
Katherine Lange	Mass Rivers Alliance
Phil Guerin	Worcester DPWP & MCWRS
Chris Bruet	U.S. Geological Survey
Gardner Bent	U.S. Geological Survey
Kate Bentsen	DFG Division of Ecological Restoration
Ashley Desrosiers	EEA
Susy King	DEP
Lealdon Langley	DEP

Rao called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions

Rao welcomed the attendees and reminded everyone of the virtual meeting operational formats. She invited those who wish to speak during the meeting to indicate this in the chat window. McCrory took attendance of Commission members and confirmed that a quorum was present. Rao reminded everyone that the meeting was being recorded for the purpose of the meeting minutes.

Agenda Item #2: Executive Director's Report

Rao announced that Commissioner Marcela Molina has stepped down from the Commission following the recent birth of her child but had expressed her gratitude for being on the Commission. Rao explained that they are in the process of filling her position on the Commission and will provide updates at future meetings.

Rao announced that Anne Carroll and Viki Zoltay were both recently recognized by Mass Rivers Alliance with an award for their work on water resources, particularly drought-related issues, as well as for their service to Commonwealth. Rao congratulated and thanked them on behalf of the Commission, the Secretary and EEA. Carroll thanked Rao and was honored to have the opportunity to accept the award alongside Zoltay. Zoltay thanked everyone for the opportunity as well.

Rao updated Commissioners on the status of the Foxborough draft staff recommendation from last month's meeting. They have since had a productive meeting with Foxborough to work through conditions with them in hopes to bring it back to the Commission in December, or January.

Rao mentioned that Commission staff have been working with Massachusetts Water Works Association to bring training to water suppliers on water rates. Sara Cohen explained the workshop is being hosted by Massachusetts Water Works Association; three trainers will be involved: herself, Mike Schrader from Tighe and Bond, and Dave Fox from Raftelis. The training is focused on data management and analysis to help suppliers understand their data to allow for analysis. This will show them what kind of analyses can help them handle trends, user patterns that might affect their rates, what rate structures might work for them, and water conservation strategies. It is a 3.5-hour training on December 14, 2021 from 8:30 am to 12:00 pm. Pederson explained registration is open to anyone interested, and credits are available to operators who attend. Link to training: <https://mwwa.memberclicks.net/2021datamngmt>

Rao mentioned she's been working with Office of Technical Assistance (OTA) at EEA to reach out to companies and offered a training on water conservation to the industrial, commercial, and institutional sector. The training was about water use and conservation in relation to climate change. Staff from the WaterSense Program at EPA and OTA presented about what the companies can do. The event was well attended and will try to offer similar types of workshops later in the year for the same sector group. Rao hoped the partnership continues and will update as needed again in coming months.

Agenda Item #3: Update: Hydrologic Conditions Update

Graham provided an updated on the hydrologic conditions for October 2021, which is available here: <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/water-data-tracking#hydrologic-conditions-reports->

Monthly average temperatures were above normal – the Boston climate site had its fourth warmest October on record, while the Worcester site had its ninth warmest. Precipitation was above normal throughout most of the state. Streamflow was above normal across the state except the Cape Cod region where it was mostly normal. There was high streamflow from the storm system at the beginning of the month, a dry stretch mid-month, and a nor'easter at the end of the month with streams running high again. Groundwater levels were high except for Nantucket and a few wells on Cape Cod that were recovering. Lakes and impoundments were mostly above normal except for the pond on the Cape which is in the normal range. The Keetch-Byram Drought Index (KBDI) values were either 0 or very low. The Crop Moisture Index (CMI) values reported for week ending October 30 were all in the excessively wet range for all three areas in Massachusetts. No snowfall in October, but historically there has been snow, so there was a very small deficit.

Massachusetts and US Drought Monitor both showed no drought conditions. Both November and three month-outlooks showed chances leaning towards above normal temperatures and precipitation. Monthly seasonal drought outlooks show no drought development.

Agenda Item #4: FY21 Draft WRC Annual Report

Rao introduced Anne Carroll to present the draft annual report. The Commission is required to file an annual report in December with the state secretary; a few years ago, the formatting was revamped to be more visually appealing. The report provides an overview and updates of things done over the fiscal year.

Carroll mentioned that the report explains each program and highlights the work that was done during the FY (this report being 07/01/20 – 06/30/21).

- Tracking of hydrologic conditions and advising on drought - In FY21, there were two separate drought experiences that were tracked. Staff spent time working with the Drought Management Task Force and reporting on those and flash drought conditions.
- Drought dashboard – Zoltay and staff have been working for over a year with Cornell staff to launch the site. Zoltay said they're doing the final prep and may present next month to the Commission.
- Staff applied for another National Groundwater Monitoring Network Grant and received it, which should continue the upgrade of the well network. Zoltay said it brings the climate response network up to real-time. Another round of grant application is out and will be applied for and allows for replacement equipment.
- Flood Hazard Management Program – The team with just two staff has completed a significant amount of work this year. Questions about the program can be directed to Carroll to check with Duperault.
- Interbasin Transfer Act – The Commission approved North Reading and Burlington's applications. Staff started updating the performance standards following the regulation revision. Cohen updated commission on water rates and billing.
- Water needs forecasts – Staff continued to work with DEP to update these as necessary and have done all the major basins. McCrory mentioned they continue to respond to requests of reviews of existing forecasts and update as needed.
- Water conservation standards – Staff kicked off with release of the toolkit and made some adjustments as necessary. This fiscal year's work continued to refine the website. Cohen gave a shoutout to Ashley Desrosiers, EEA intern, for updating the user experience

on the site for the public launch. Rao mentioned WRC staff will be back to the Commission soon with more details.

- Oversight of the state water programs – Staff heard a presentation and discussion around surface water quality standards, which had been recently voted on during the fiscal year.

Discussion:

Pederson asked to include Kate Bentsen’s time-lapse drought progression photos of streamflow in the report. Rao acknowledged the comment and will look into inclusion. Rao said the final annual report will be voted on next month before filing with the secretary of state and distributing.

Agenda Item #5: Presentation: Update on the Massachusetts Hydrologic Monitoring Network

Rao introduced Gardner Bent of USGS to present and thanked him for agreeing to defer the presentation from the October meeting. Link to presentation: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/usgs-monitoring-network-update/download>

Bent introduced himself and said the presentation was an effort between Chris Bruet of USGS, Zoltay of DCR OWR, and himself. Bent presented an update on the cooperative monitoring program, which involves many partners (DCR, DEP, DER, UMass, etc.).

- The program uses surface water, ground water, water quality and climatological data for various purposes. There are 105 real-time streamflow gages across the state, but the map shows more as it includes tidal and other gages.
- Empty circles on the map show sites with less than 30 years of data, while colored circles on the map show sites with greater than 30 years of data. Monthly groundwater tape-down sites are measured by cooperators at DCR, DEP, Cape Cod Commission and UMass. Annual cost for a real-time well includes O&M, review, approval, and publishing data on the web. Data from furnished wells is also reviewed, approved, and published.
- Map shown next to well diagram shows early September 2021 conditions. Wells are sealed with bentonite, grout and surface concrete to keep out contaminants and additional water that may influence the level within the well. The wells in the Climate Response Network were currently being reviewed with DCR staff. Network changes include moving the real-time equipment from Webster well to Dover well; Westford well was upgraded to real-time.

Rao asked how often USGS is visiting the real-time wells to check their operation. She understood the manually measured wells get visited once a month and those cooperators can report back on anything that may be amiss. Bent said they are visited quarterly, unless there’s a problem, but typically there aren’t big changes observed in them. If there is an issue observed, they visit more frequently as needed.

Cambareri asked what the difference between the real-time and continuous wells is. Bent said nowadays they are the same, with the only exception being Wellfleet as it is downloaded manually but is continuously recording data. Real-time wells are transmitted automatically. 99% of the time, if a site is continuous it is also real-time. It is worth it to have continuous sites be real-time so if data isn’t being recorded due to an issue, it can be addressed immediately. Bent mentioned the yearly comparisons of the real-time groundwater network is to show how they have been and will be improved over time in cooperation with DCR. Over the next two

years priority is to change the discrete wells to real-time on the climate response network, which includes the round circles (real-time wells) and the triangles (discrete measurement wells) on the map. Rao mentioned they would love to have the entire network switch to real-time, but the annual O&M cost for a real-time well is greater than for a discrete well. The cooperators are slowly converting these wells but depends on funding available. Bent noted it takes time to prepare and setup a site, so that's why it is over a two-year period.

The Popponessett station is also a tide gage; DCR obtained it this year when it was going to be discontinued. A tide gage is a stage-only gage, so it has quarterly or as-needed visits to check it is functioning. Tide gages need different equipment because of the salt water.

Discussion:

Rao thanked USGS for their long-standing relationship with Massachusetts for cooperative programs and mentioned this is priority for EEA especially given climate change. Rao invited Zoltay, who manages the cooperative program for the state, to comment. Zoltay added that the network is appreciated by many as it serves people beyond our agencies. She mentioned that it has been great to have additional funding support to get more sites to real-time and that there continues to be a lot of work behind the scenes each month. Bent thanked the state for the funding and those involved with the program.

Cambareri mentioned that funding allocations are so important for the program as it touches many aspects of water resource management. He noted the State being able to participate in significant funding is important and the State should be looking to emphasize all the uses of the data through EEA programs.

Rao thanked Bent for presenting as the network expands. Rao explained that the meeting would be taking a five-minute break before continuing. She resumed the meeting at 2:07 pm.

Agenda Item #6: Presentation: Proposed Sewage Notification Regulations (314 CMR 16.00)

Rao reminded Commissioners that any regulations that are part of the Clean Water Act are under the Commission's purview to review and approve. These new regulations are part of a new law enacted earlier this year and are under the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act. Rao introduced Baskin and invited her to introduce her team and the presentation, which can be viewed at <https://www.mass.gov/doc/314-cmr-1600-draft-regulations/download>.

Baskin thanked Rao and said the new law was signed by Governor Baker in January 2021. It is known as the Sewage Notification law, which requires dischargers of untreated or partially treated wastewater to notify the public of these discharges. She introduced Langley, Director of Watershed Management, and King, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program Chief. The regulations respond to the Act, and once finalized will be under the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act. DEP has drafted regulations and received public comments already. This was on a tight timeframe as these draft regulations need to be finalized by next month, to be enacted a year from the date the law was signed. DEP plans to come back next month with the final set of regulations and request the Commission's vote.

Langley thanked Rao and those attending and handed it over to King. King noted the presentation aligned with different sections of the regulations with a few additional topics.

- The statute was reviewed, showing dates and requirements of DEP.
- Events that require notification are Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs), some types of Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs), partially treated wastewater and blended wastewater.
- A CSO is when sewage and stormwater are mixed in one pipe, in systems with older infrastructure. An SSO is when untreated or partially treated wastewater overflow occurs, typically because of an equipment failure or wet weather.
- Blending only happens during wet weather when the system has very high flows coming in. To manage those flows, some flow would go around the secondary treatment process to combine with the fully treated wastewater, be disinfected and discharged. It is not receiving the normal full treatment but is higher level of treatment than none at all or just receiving primary treatment before discharge. This is often used by systems that have CSOs. Practicing blending can reduce the number or volume of CSOs. Within the regulations, they have specifically defined blended wastewater to say that it meets or is predicted to meet effluent limits in NPDES or surface water discharge permits.
- Public advisory notification requirements are to be posted within two hours of discovery on a permittee's website and sent to appropriate parties and organizations. The public advisory notification must contain site and system specific information, potential impacts and precautions. Blended wastewater notification requirements differ as they are predicted to meet their effluent permit limits; they are limited in distribution and information compared to a public advisory notification.

Rao asked about what requires prior approval by DEP. King responded that it is not approval for each discharge. When the permittees submit the CSO notification plan to DEP, they are seeking the approval to be able to issue blended wastewater notifications instead of the full public advisory notification. They would have to provide data to DEP that demonstrates that their blended wastewater discharges meet their permit effluent limit. If they can't make that demonstration, DEP would not give them approval. If they can make that demonstration, when they had blending events, they would have permission to issue this CSO notification instead of the full notification. Rao asked if it is a one-time approval or an annual approval? King explained initially they would submit the plan to DEP, get approval, which can be revisited, but there is not a set frequency in the regulations. King continued that CSO permittees must have a specific website and signage to coordinate with their respective CSO plans, per the regulation. King turned the presentation over to Langley.

Langley explained at each of the CSO outfalls there are various measures that permittees take to identify inactivation and measure the flow involved with a discharge. As part of the regulations, they created this process for a permittee to be able to detail for DEP the criteria and measurements at each outfall, amongst other information. This gives the permittee the ability to describe it specific to their own systems and DEP the ability to review those. There are 19 CSO permittees in the state. CSO public notification plans are due to DEP by February 1, 2022 and will have a 30-day comment period after publication in the Environmental Monitor. The plans will describe the discharge detection and volume, and include website, signage and environmental justice (EJ) population communications. Historical data provided would be effluent data from events when permittees were blending to demonstrate that during all or some portion of those blended events, they met their permit effluent limits. If they meet permit effluent limits, they would be able to publish the blended wastewater notification. For those events that don't meet the permit effluent limits, a full public advisory notification would be required.

DEP is developing a data system portal where data could be received, links to the permittee's public advisory notifications could be published, be publicly available for understanding a CSO or SSO discharge, or what may be going on in an area because of weather, etc. The system is in the design phase currently. Permittees will have monthly reporting requirements for discharges. Permittees can request a waiver from regulation requirements if an outfall has been decommissioned or not had significant discharge in 5 years; waivers are subject to DEP approval. A Board of Health must issue a public health warning every time there is notification of a discharge by a permittee, excluding blended wastewater notifications. This warning must be posted with signage showing water use restrictions and informing the public about sewage in surface waters.

Rao asked if the Board of Health notification is to go out when the event is over the permit limits. Langley explained that for blended wastewater that meets permit effluent limits, they would not have to have a public health warning; those events that do not meet permit effluent limits have both a public advisory notification issued by the permittee and a public health warning issued by the Board of Health.

Langley said EEA has an EJ policy that was issued in 2017. These regulations are the first amongst DEP regulations to include EJ provisions to ensure that EJ populations are being notified and able to fully participate in the administration and purpose of the regulations. Permittees are required to include EJ population news organizations in public advisory notifications and translate the language appropriately for public notices.

DEP received 45 different comments by the close of the comment period on Monday, November 8 at 5pm. There was strong opposition to the concept of blended wastewater notifications being different than regular public advisory notifications. Commenters were concerned about resource impacts on public Boards of Health issuing notifications, as well as notification fatigue. There was strong reaction to the CSO notification plan due dates, with there not being enough preparation time by the February 1 deadline. Commenters noted that SSO notification plans should be required. Langley explained communities that may be affected by a discharge are difficult to determine because of variation in system specifics and conditions. Commenters also noted that the regulations should require DEP to maintain a website for notifications.

Langley thanked the Commission for their time and noted they want to come back in December for the Commission's vote. Rao thanked Langley and King and commended their team's efforts given the tight timeline. Rao opened the meeting to any questions from Commissioners.

Discussion:

Weismantel asked how many events take place each year? Are the events usually from the same systems? He noticed that many are wet events rather than equipment failures, which would be random. Is it just a few small systems that are in bad shape? King replied that she does not have a number offhand of the discharges, but whether they are the same systems each time it depends on the discharge type. For CSOs, there are 19 sewer systems across the Commonwealth that have combined systems and some have more CSOs than others. For SSOs, there are certain areas where there are recurring SSO discharges, generally if the capacity of the system is not large enough to handle very wet events; in those cases, DEP sees recurring events.

Carroll departed at 2:44pm.

Woods thanked DEP and asked why blended is being treated differently if the goal of the law is to notify the public when there is sewage in the water? She mentioned that it seemed complicated to do so. Langley replied the issue with blending is that what they are trying to do during wet weather events is ensure that the permittee is maximizing their flows to the treatment plant. By doing so, the permittees are protecting the secondary treatment from being washed out during high flow events and that some portion of treatment is happening before discharges during blending events. If they were not maximizing the flow to the treatment plant, then the amount of untreated CSO discharge would be greater. It was to recognize that it is one of the nine CSO minimum control measures defined by the EPA and a practice they know is carried out by systems during wet weather events. This also establishes a standard that only those blended events that meet permit effluent limits and not posing an additional risk to public health would have the benefit of the blended wastewater notification. All other blended wastewater events, if they couldn't meet permit effluent limits would be required to do the full advisory notification. Langley explained it is a controversial part of the regulation.

Woods asked how the permittee could meet the effluent limits if they are avoiding the biological part of the treatment; is it because it is an average? King explained that not all the flow that is discharged has received secondary treatment, it is some that received only primary mixed with some that received full treatment, everything then disinfected and discharged. It is different for different facilities, but they have facilities that do this and can meet their permit limits. Baskin explained that it isn't that they meet all the conditions of the permit, because the conditions do require secondary treatment, but there is an EPA policy for CSOs to maximize the flows that receive some treatment. The disinfection is where it would reduce the pathogens so the limits could be met. All discharges would have notification, but those that were expected to exceed a bacterial standard or have no treatment at a combined sewer discharge, would have the public health warning accompany it. Woods noted that they have two treatment plants in the North and South Rivers watershed which do this and sometimes they can meet their standards because the volume of their discharge is so large, so that the solution to pollution is then dilution. Woods noted that part of the reason for notifying people is to make the public aware of how often their systems are unable to handle the capacity they should have been built for. Baskin thanked Woods for her comments.

Cambareri departed at 2:53pm.

Rao read Cambareri's questions submitted before his departure. Why did the Commission not hear about the regulations prior to the comment deadline? He was unsure about the status of NPDES permitting, did EPA delegate authority to DEP? Baskin replied that Massachusetts is not a delegated NPDES state, so they do not have authority to issue permits on their own. DEP does issue separate permits from the EPA but they are often parallel. DEP regrets they were not able to let the Commission know about the regulations prior to the comment deadline and noted that a year sounds like a long time to get regulations promulgated but there is a lot of work involved when starting from scratch. With the timeframes and notices, they missed getting on the October meeting agenda. Next month, they will come back with the final regulations and how they considered the Commission's comments. Langley added they sent out the notice of public

comment period to the permittees, advocates and organizations who were interested. When the notice was published, the capacity of the notice had been exceeded and was instead broken into multiple groups. If any group(s) fell through the cracks, they can review their lists.

Guerin said blending occurs at wastewater treatment plants to protect the treatment plants. If they wash out the microbes that treat the wastewater during high flow, then the treatment plant doesn't work anymore and could take extended time to get running again. It is a necessary, protective measure. Guerin pointed out that blending meets NPDES permit requirements, which are protective of water quality and public health. As blending occurs during wet weather events, it is likely that CSOs are discharging at the time they are blending, so there's notification happening for the CSOs. Guerin noted that the February 1st deadline seems tight, and likely no one will be in compliance.

Downs mentioned if blending was not a public health issue, she is not sure why we would want to notify the public as notification fatigue could set in. Most precipitation is received during winter, when people are less likely to be on the water. Therefore, getting too many phone notifications could make one potentially turn off the notifications and to add in blending events adds more confusion and becomes like the boy who cries wolf. The goal is to let the public know when there's a real health issue so they can stay out of the water. Downs also commented that having notices of cessation and reactivation within a 48-hour period will cause notification fatigue. Downs concurred with the timeline of February 1st being challenging. She wondered if DEP's data system will be ready to receive all the data by the deadline. Rao thanked Downs.

Wijnja departed at 3:03pm.

Langley noted that the data system is expected to be in place by July 6, which is 540 days from passage of the Act. The CSO notification plans

would not have to be submitted through DEP's portal, but through other means and reviewed by DEP until it is ready. February 1 is when the notification plans will be due, however not through the portal as it will not be ready at that time.

Pederson asked regarding the EJ communities and additional notifications, could DEP explain more where those requirements for EJ notification came from? Will that be from census tract? By community? Who is doing the translation? Are the communities responsible for that? Langley replied that what constitutes an EJ population is detailed in the EEA policy. DEP is helping the communities to identify them and gathering EJ information to ensure it is available. EEA website has an EJ viewer tool. King added that it is broken down by census tracts. Pederson asked if the regulation package included estimations of what it would cost the regulated communities to comply with? King and Langley replied that it does not. Pederson asked if DEP was required to provide an estimate to MMA in the regulatory process? Langley replied the requirement was that DEP identifies aspects that potentially have costs associated, for MMA and small business. Baskin added that in the final letter that DEP sends to MMA with the regulations, they would identify impacts to municipalities. King added they identified things that would result in costs but not specific numbers.

Pederson asked if DEP had considered assisting communities with development of plans? Baskin replied that yes, they have plans to assist and recently held a technical session with dischargers to review what CSO notification plans would look like, inclusive of reviewing EJ tools. DEP will develop guidance and templates for the CSO notification plan. Rao added she can send Pederson further information on EJ matters and the EJ policy to review. Pederson replied that she has seen it but noted her members have had questions when DEP requests more information during permit review, so there may not be a good understanding amongst regulated communities. Baskin replied that DEP Commissioner Suuberg and the Baker administration has committed to implementing efforts to improve inhouse diversity, equity and inclusion and improve out-of-house interaction with EJ populations. This law is about letting people know there was a discharge to ensure DEP is communicating with everyone.

Rao thanked Baskin and noted this was a good approach taken by DEP to ensure notifications of discharges that exceed permit limits happens in a timely manner per the law, but also reaches many people. Rao acknowledged that some is seen as controversial but looked forward to hearing from DEP at the December meeting after reviewing all comments. She reviewed the timeline for Commissioners; the December meeting is the 9th so she may need to call a special meeting of the Commission if DEP is not ready by then to vote on the regulations. Baskin noted it is to be promulgated by January 12 and must be filed before the holidays to accomplish that.

Pederson asked about Molina’s replacement. Rao noted the Commission recently found out she was leaving, and they are looking at people to recommend to replace her. Pederson asked if there were people that were interested in being considered, how would they do that? Rao replied that they can contact her directly. Woods asked what Molina represented. Rao replied that she was a broad water user representation; there are five public members on the Commission, of which one needs to represent the groundwater industry (currently Cambareri’s seat) and all other members represent any water user.

Rao thanked everyone for the discussion today and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Meeting adjourned, 3:20 p.m.

Documents or Exhibits Used at Meeting:

1. FY2021 Draft WRC Annual Report
2. Correspondence data October 19, 2021, from Water Resources Commission to the MEPA Office: Comments on the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Auburn Water District’s proposed connection to the City of Worcester
3. Links to additional information for agenda item #6
 - a. <https://www.mass.gov/regulations/314-CMR-1600-notification-requirements-to-promote-public-awareness-of-sewage-pollution>
 - b. <https://www.mass.gov/guides/sanitary-sewer-systems-combined-sewer-overflows>
4. Interbasin Transfer Act project status report, November 4, 2021

5. Hydrologic Conditions in Massachusetts, October 2021 (available at <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/water-data-tracking>)

Compiled by: (KS)

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.