

BOARD OF WATER COMMISSIONERS  
MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF  
AUGUST 5, 2025

A quorum being present, Chairperson Fox called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM. He announced that the virtual version of the meeting was being recorded and requested those in attendance to state their name and title for the record by roll call:

Board Members Present in Person: Robert H. Sheldon, Commissioner – Present; Joshua M. Fox, Commissioner and Chairperson – Present; and Robert E. Boyd, Commissioner –Present.

Others Present in Person: Vincent J. Roy, Executive Director - Present; Thomas S. Travers, Treasurer – Present; Karen Moretti, Assistant Treasurer – Present; and Renee Adams, Executive Administrator– Present; along with Sara Guglielmi and Andy Reid from Weston & Sampson

Others Present Virtually: None

**1. Review and Vote to Approve the Minutes from the Board of Water Commissioners Meeting held on July 22, 2025.**

The Commissioners reviewed the minutes for the July 22, 2025, meeting. Chairperson Fox moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sheldon and approved by unanimous roll call vote, with Commissioner Boyd abstaining because he was not in attendance at the July 22 meeting:

Joshua M. Fox, Commissioner and Chairperson - Aye

Robert H. Sheldon, Commissioner – Aye

Robert E. Boyd, Jr. – Abstained

**2. Review of the Director's August 1, 2025, Bi-Weekly Report.**

Director Roy presented his bi-weekly report, covering the following topics:

- Approved abatement request for 277 Old Sudbury Road:

Chairperson Fox requested that Director Roy provide details regarding the reported leak on the property. Mr. Roy explained that the leak occurred on a pipe running from the house to the horse barn located in the backyard and therefore the responsibility of the property owner. The contractor hired by the property owner and therefore responsible for the repair capped the line upstream of the leak and installed a one-inch yard hydrant at the end of the line, allowing the property owner to connect a hose and use it above ground in lieu of the abandoned buried line.

Mr. Roy further noted that the pipe servicing the barn is connected downstream of the water meter located inside the home. The leak was repaired on April 22, 2025, and the abatement was subsequently approved on July 28, 2025. District staff were on-site to inspect and verify the completed repair.

There were no further questions regarding the Director's Bi-Weekly Report.

**3. Review Wells 4 & 6 PFAS Treatment Study Report**

The discussion by Andy Reid and Sara Guglielmi of Weston & Sampson was a follow-up to their previous presentation of their report to address PFAS in Wells 4 and 6, whether to provide a separate treatment plant near those wells or to pump their water to the Raymond Road Water Treatment Facility for combined treatment with Wells 2, 7, and 9. Combining all sources would require modifications to the Raymond Road facility by constructing a new building or switching PFAS vessel media from granular activated carbon (GAC) to ion exchange, allowing for use of existing vessels without the need for additional ones. The disadvantage would be the need to conduct pilot treatment plant study to confirm the ability of ion exchange to adequately remove PFAS.

One significant piece of information provided by Weston & Sampson at the end of their presentation was that MassDEP now looks favorably upon blending water treated for PFAS with water not treated for PFAS, allowing to reduce PFAS concentrations to acceptable levels after combining. However, the blended flow must not exceed a 50/50 split. As noted at the end of the minutes from this discussion, the Commissioners generally thought blending offered the most cost-effective means of using Wells 4 and 6 while keeping within required PFAS limits.

Andy Reid presented an overview of the Weston & Sampson PFAS Treatment Report for Wells 4 and 6. He explained that Weston & Sampson's presence at the meeting was to address questions regarding the final report, which outlines a plan—based on the Board's guidance—for the most cost-effective method to redirect water from Wells 4 and 6 to the Raymond Road Water Treatment Facility for PFAS treatment. To accommodate higher flow volumes, the existing granular activated carbon (GAC) media in the four treatment vessels would be replaced with ion exchange resin. Director Roy noted that the project would likely be divided into two phases. Phase one would involve installing a new water main to redirect water from Wells 4 and 6 to the treatment plant. This phase would also include replacing the existing 12-inch asbestos cement (AC) water main along the route with a new 12-inch ductile iron pipe.

Chairman Fox inquired about the cost of the additional work. Director Roy responded that the estimated increase would be approximately \$2.2 million.

Commissioner Sheldon asked whether the well pumps would need to be replaced. Director Roy replied that the pump motors would likely need replacement due to head loss through the PFAS filters.

Commissioner Sheldon also asked Mr. Reid whether MassDEP required pilot testing to include water from Wells 2, 7, and 9, or if the testing was limited to Wells 4 and 6. Sara Guglielmi clarified that a pilot testing proposal for ion exchange at the Raymond Road facility would be submitted to MassDEP, along with a separate hydraulic pilot study for Wells 4 and 6. Mr. Reid added that a combined pilot test could be conducted, but it would require transporting untreated water from the Raymond Road facility to Wells 4 and 6 to allow for blending during the pilot testing process.

Mr. Reid reviewed the project schedule, noting that the SRF Project Evaluation Form (PEF) was submitted in July. The District expects to receive preliminary indication of the potential for SRF funding via the Intended Use Plan (IUP) draft list typically published in early January, in this case early January 2026. Pilot testing is scheduled to begin in December 2025 and conclude by July 2026, running concurrently with the treatment design phase. In response to Treasurer Travers' inquiry, Director Roy stated that the cost for design and pilot testing is approximately \$700,000. The total estimated project cost, including AC pipe replacement, is around \$8 million.

Commissioner Sheldon emphasized that the next annual meeting warrant must include authorization to borrow funds for the project to enable construction to begin in FY 2027, allowing the District to meet MassDEP's required schedule of commencing construction by June 2026. This is a rather aggressive schedule, with a minimal amount of pilot treatment data being gathered and thereby requiring potentially more conservative design of treatment facilities.

Mrs. Guglielmi noted that if SRF approval is not granted in January 2026, the District could resubmit the PEF application in July 2026. One advantage of this scenario is that design work would not begin until the pilot study is complete, allowing time to gather additional data.

There was also a brief discussion about the District switching its disinfection regime to chloramines instead of sodium hypochlorite. The reason for doing so would be because GAC has the beneficial side effect of reducing precursors to disinfection byproducts and switching to ion exchange removes that benefit. Chloramines have the advantage of minimizing the formation of disinfection byproducts with precursors, but the District would have to increase the pH of water in the distribution system and make provisions to add ammonia.

The Commissioners thanked Weston & Sampson for their presentation and participation. Following the discussion and after Weston & Sampson representatives left the meeting, the Commissioners discussed the financial advantage of blending, at least as a near-term lower-cost way of using Wells 4 and 6 if not a permanent solution. The cost of that alternative was not included in Weston & Sampson's report. So, the Commissioners requested that Director Roy follow up with Weston & Sampson to obtain a cost estimate for the blending alternative. Director Roy agreed to pursue this request.

#### **4. Review Abatement Policy**

Director Roy presented the Commissioners with a draft of the revised Abatement Policy, continued from the July 22<sup>nd</sup>, Commissioners' meeting, for their review and approval. Following a discussion on the policy, the Commissioners made additional edits to the draft (see attached).

Chairman Fox moved to approve the revised Abatement Policy as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sheldon and passed by unanimous roll call vote:

Joshua M. Fox, Commissioner and Chairperson - Aye  
Robert H. Sheldon, Commissioner – Aye  
Robert E. Boyd, Jr. – Aye

#### **Conclusion of Open Meeting**

Chairman Fox moved to conclude the open public meeting session and move into executive meeting session, not to return to the open public meeting session, under executive session "Exemption 3. To approve Executive Session Minutes for July 22, 2025, session, and the chair so declares." Chairperson Fox subsequently so declared. The motion was duly seconded by Chairperson Sheldon and was approved by a unanimous roll call:

Joshua M. Fox, Commissioner and Chairperson - Aye  
Robert H. Sheldon, Commissioner– Aye  
Robert E. Boyd, Commissioner - Aye

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.



199 Raymond Road | P.O. Box 111  
Sudbury, Massachusetts 01776

## SUDBURY WATER DISTRICT ABATEMENT POLICY

Revised

July 22, 2025

The Sudbury Water District (District) may, under limited and specific circumstances, authorize an abatement for water charges incurred by a customer. Abatements may be granted solely under the following circumstances:

- Verified leak (after the curb valve) and subsequent repair.
- Demonstrated financial hardship.

Customer's seeking relief must submit a formal [Abatement Application](#) using one of the following delivery methods:

Email	U.S. Mail	Hand Delivery
customerservice@sudburywater.com	Sudbury Water District P.O. Box 111 Sudbury, MA 01776	Sudbury Water District Administration Office 199 Raymond Road Sudbury, MA 01776

### LEAK ABATEMENT POLICY

A registered property owner or their authorized designee may file a formal [Abatement Application](#) for water charges incurred due to a verified water leak (after the curb valve) and subsequent repair.

Eligibility is contingent upon strict adherence to the following conditions and the provisions of the Sudbury Water District's Abatement Policy:

#### *Payment Requirement*

- The invoiced amount must be paid in full (100%), however, if the invoiced amount exceeds five (5) times the average consumption, as determined by the same three preceding quarterly billing cycles, the applicant must remit at least fifty percent (50%) of the invoiced amount.

- The applicant must be in full compliance with all prior billing obligations, with no outstanding balances at the time of submission.

- *A must elect have the meter test by*  
If a customer elects to have their meter tested, they waive the right to appeal the billing if the meter is found to be recording accurately in accordance with AWWA standards. No abatement or adjustment will be made to the disputed bill under these circumstances. All costs associated with testing shall be borne by the customer, unless the meter is determined to fall outside the AWWA standards.

*a test lab approved by the District  
Company that specializes in  
meter testing. and approve by  
the District*

*if the meter is found to be accurate in accordance w/ AWWA STANDARD, the customer shall bear the cost of the test*

The registered property owner is responsible for all water infrastructure beyond the curb valve including the service line (pipe), interior and exterior plumbing and fixtures, and ~~underground irrigation~~ systems.

*under ground irrigation*

**Exception:** The first valve and meter are owned and maintained by Sudbury Water District.

However the registered property owner is responsible for ensuring their protection from damage, freezing, tampering, or obstruction. If either the first valve or meter is damaged due to negligence (e.g., exposure to freezing conditions) the registered property owner shall be liable for cost of repair or replacement, including water consumption.

*98.5-  
101.5*

~~**The District will not consider any request for an abatement unless the following conditions are satisfied in full:**~~

#### **PAYMENT REQUIREMENT**

The applicant must remit either:

- One hundred percent (100%) of the invoiced amount; or
- Fifty percent (50%) of the invoiced amount, if the invoice is greater than five (5) times the average consumption established by the three preceding same quarterly billing periods.
- The applicant must be in full compliance with all prior billing obligations, with no outstanding balances at the time of submission.

#### **APPLICATION AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

To be considered for an abatement, the completed application and supporting documentation must be submitted within forty-five (45) calendar days from the date of the original invoice:

- A detailed invoice identifying the cause of the leak and subsequent repair services rendered by a plumber licensed by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or by a lawn irrigation specialist, as applicable.
- Photographic evidence of the leak and the completed repair (strongly recommended).
- If the repair was self-detected and repaired by individuals without license or certified professionals (i.e., a DIY repair), the application will be reviewed solely at the discretion of the Executive Director. In such cases, detailed receipts for all materials and parts must be included.
- No application shall be deemed complete, nor shall it be accepted for review, unless the applicant has fully complied with the Payment Requirement accompanied by a completed Abatement Application and Supporting Documentation.

*required*

#### **CLARIFYING CONDITIONS - FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBT:**

Water loss due to user negligence (e.g., unintentionally leaving a fixture running) does not constitute a leak and is not eligible for abatement.

*nooshol b  
Plumb: 29*

The burden of proof lies solely with the applicant, who must demonstrate eligibility by clear and convincing evidence.



Unexplained or uncharacteristic high water usage, without verifiable evidence of a leak, does not constitute grounds for an abatement.

### **REVIEW PROCESS**

The Executive Director will review all complete applications in consultation with the Executive Administrator and the Foreman, and issue a determination within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt.

### **LEAK ABATEMENT LIMITATIONS**

- An abatement may be granted only when water usage during the affected billing period exceeds 150% of the average consumption (established by the same three preceding quarterly billing cycles).
- Water consumption exceeding 150% of the established average will be re-calculated at the Tier 1 water rate.
- Only one (1) abatement may be granted per property per continuous ownership tenure.
- Abatement shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the invoiced amount.

### **APPEAL RIGHTS**

If the applicant is dissatisfied with the determination of the Executive Director, the applicant may file a written appeal to the Board of Water Commissioners. Said appeal shall be scheduled as an official Agenda item for discussion during an open public session Board of Water Commissioners meeting.

### **FURTHER LEGAL REMEDIES**

If the appeal is denied by the Board of Water Commissioners, the applicant may pursue one of the following remedies:

#### ***Where the disputed charges have been paid in full:***

The registered property owner may pursue a civil action for recovery of overpayment in either the District Court, pursuant to G.L. c. 218, § 19 (where the amount in controversy does not exceed \$2,500); or the Superior Court, pursuant to G.L. c. 212, § 4. See: Epstein v. Executive Secretary of Bd. of Selectmen of Sharon, 22 Mass. App. Ct. 135 (1986).

#### ***Where the disputed charges remain unpaid:***

The Sudbury Water District reserves the right to record a municipal lien for the unpaid outstanding balance; and/or terminate water service at the curb valve until payment in full is rendered, including any applicable turn on fees, pursuant to Section 6.4.1 of the Sudbury Water District Rules and Regulations.

In such cases, jurisdiction lies with the Appellate Tax Board per G.L. c. 40, §§ 42A–42F. An aggrieved owner may appeal under G.L. c. 59, § 65.

## **FINANCIAL HARDSHIP ABATEMENT POLICY**

The Board of Water Commissioners recognizes that some customers may experience extraordinary financial hardship. In such cases, discretionary relief may be provided under the Financial Hardship Abatement Policy.

### **APPLICATION PROCEDURE:**

The registered property owner or their appointed designee may apply for a Financial Hardship Abatement within forty-five (45) calendar days of the original invoice date by submitting:

- A completed [Abatement Application](#).
- A signed written statement describing the nature of the hardship, and
- Supporting documentation substantiating the applicant's financial condition.
- The abatement must be signed under the pains and penalties of perjury.

Applications for a Financial Hardship Abatement shall be scheduled as an official Agenda item for deliberation during a closed executive session Board of Water Commissioners meeting.

### **ADDITIONAL PROVISION:**

Payment extensions may be considered on a case-by-case basis, subject to approval and at the discretion of the Board of Water Commissioners.