

FINANCE COMMITTEE MINUTES

4-13-21 AT 5 PM

ZOOM



The meeting was called to order by Chairman Figy at 5:38 PM. Chairman Figy apologized for the late start and explained it was due to technical difficulties. In attendance were Committee members Councilor Bridget Matthews-Kane and Councilor Richard K. Sullivan, Jr. Also, in attendance were Mayor Donald Humason, Westfield Police Lieutenant Kevin Bard, Westfield Police Detective Todd Edwards, City Purchaser Tammy Tefft, City Treasurer Matthew Barnes, Interim Director of Department of Public Works and Wastewater Francis Cain, Systems Engineer of the Water Department Heather Stayton, Mark St. Jean of the IT Department and Marisa Colon, scribe to the Finance Committee.

Councilor Matthews-Kane made a motion, seconded by Councilor Sullivan, to APPROVE the acceptance of Finance Committee minutes from March 30, 2021. There were no objections or amendments to the minutes. The motion passed 2-0 with Councilors Figy and Matthews-Kane voting YES. Councilor Sullivan abstained.

Chairman Figy asked if anyone from the public would like to speak during public participation. There are 15 minutes allotted to the public to address the Finance Committee. There was no one who participated.

Councilor Sullivan made a motion, seconded by Councilor Matthews-Kane, to APPROPRIATE \$42,411.99 from free cash to Police Department Additional Capital Equipment Account.

Councilor Matthews-Kane made a motion to divide the motion into two parts as follows: 1) an appropriation of \$3,650 from free cash to Police Department Additional Capital Equipment Account for the purchase of riot gear and 2) an appropriation of \$38,761.99 from free cash to Police Department Additional Capital Equipment Account for the purchase of a drone. Councilor Sullivan seconded the amendment to the motion. The motion to amend the original motion passed 3-0 with Councilors Figy, Matthews-Kane and Councilor Sullivan voting YES.

Lieutenant Bard stated the money is for 10 sets of shields, helmets and batons. Stressed the importance of purchasing new equipment by stating the last time that there was a riot was in 2004. The riot occurred on the campus at Westfield State University after the American League Championship Series when the New York Yankees lost to the Boston Red Sox. He stated that the Westfield Police department had sparse equipment at that time and were limited to what they could do in regards to protection. Then later, there was another riot after Red Sox won the World Series and called on the Massachusetts State Police for assistance. Also, he stated that Westfield has an agreement of support with the surrounding towns and stated that the Westfield Police Department does not want to be under prepared and under protected should the surrounding towns call for assistance. The shields that the Westfield Police Department have are archaic, some are cracked, scratched and damaged which will leave the Police Officers vulnerable. The shields are just basic protective gear compared to the other equipment which is needed as well, such as special gloves, elbow pads and other specific riot gear equipment. Westfield Police Detective Todd Edwards who is the DT instructor and who instructs Taser

training as well as other defensive tactical trainings. Detective Edwards further explained the importance of updating the protective gear. He stated that on June 4th the Westfield Police Department was involved in a possible situation where they could have been potential issues. They went to the Westfield National Guard and requested personal protective equipment. Unfortunately, they could not get the equipment through the guard because they had to go through MEMA, but were refused. He emphasized that he prefers not to call it riot gear because the equipment is meant to protect the officers from getting seriously injured. The batons, although they can be used for assault, they are meant to be used as a defensive tool to maintain distance between the officers and the people who would do them harm. He mentioned that during the Blarney Days, several years ago, the Amherst Police suffered major injuries such as cuts from glass bottles being thrown at them because they lacked the proper personal protective gear. Councilor Matthews-Kane asked Detective Edwards to elaborate on the June 4th situation. Detective Edwards stated that there was a demonstration on the Westfield City's Green. Councilor Matthews-Kane asked, are you referring the "Black Lives Matter" protest? Detective Edwards answered, yes. Councilor Matthews-Kane, and you were concerned that was going to turn into a riot? Detective Edwards answered, no, but there are situations where the Police Department would like to protect our officers in case it does turn into an issue. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated that the protest was very peaceful and Detective Edwards agreed. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated that she understood that there have been riots on the Westfield State University campus relating to certain sporting events as well as the situation in Amherst and asked, what indications are there that the City of Westfield needs riot gear? Lieutenant Bard reiterated Detective Edwards sentiments regarding using protective personal equipment and not riot gear. The objective is really to be able to properly protect officers in certain situations and not to be used on individuals who are protesting. However, it can be used on somebody who's mentally disturbed, and this type of equipment can be used in those sets of circumstances. It really will be used to protect officers from putting themselves in harm's way and prevent serious bodily injury that could cause them to be out for long periods of time at the City's expense. Lieutenant Bard stated that if we can protect those instances from happening or from escalating to the point where officers are being put into harm's way, we want to be able to protect the officers and the City's best interest in potential lawsuits and officers potentially being out for long periods of time to the cost of the City because of work related injury. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated that on page 14 of the invoice, it is listed as "riot helmet" and "riot baton"; those are the words used on the invoice itself. Lieutenant Bards said that is how the companies, Century or Guardian, have presented these products and the Westfield Police Department have no control over how the equipment is listed. He further explained the collapsible batons that the police are trained with are the ones that they use and they must be recertified every year. Lieutenant Bard further explained the batons that will be purchased are longer and made out of hard rubber and will be used to gain distance from the people who are trying to put officers in harm's way. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated that in 2017, there was a mob at Westfield State University and police who showed up in riot gear were called to circle the globe statue on campus. Then in 2018 there was another riot where State Police, Local Police and Campus Police were present. They used high powered lighting, they had a fence around the globe statue and they implied that things went better where the riot gear was not used. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated in regards to the riots in Amherst, there was an article, [Win or Lose, Parties Can Draw](#), the Police Chief of Amherst was asking the chancellor of UMASS Amherst to pay for the police department's riot gear. In Amherst, UMASS Amherst pays for that riot gear because it's necessary. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated the most important issue for her is there is a lot of research that shows

wearing intimidating tactical gear tends to escalate conflict and can turn peaceful protest violent. In light of this research, why would the City of Westfield want riot gear for officers? Lieutenant Bard replied, I understand where you are coming from Councilor Matthews-Kane and he reiterated that the personal protective gear equipment is so the officers can be properly protected in case a situation should arise. The fear is to enter into a situation where the officers are not prepared with the equipment they need and then be attacked. He explained that in 2004, the officers were standing by just in case something did occur then they would have entered the fray. He stated he was glad they did not have to go into harm's way because they would have been ill-equipped to properly protect themselves. Councilor Matthews-Kane stated that she understood Lieutenant Bard's explanation of what occurred in 2004 but the articles made it seem that there are different strategies being used currently and it seems that the riot gear was not necessary. Lieutenant Bard explained that when Law Enforcement is aware of certain situations that could get out of control, police can take a proactive approach and take other strategies into consideration. However, certain situations can escalate in seconds or minutes and the officers have to come prepared just in case. The Westfield Police Department's motto is "I'd rather be trained in something that I don't need, then need something that I'm not trained in." He stated that he understands that the personal protective gear can appear intimidating but at the end of the day, it is their goal to ensure that the officers return safely home to their loved ones. In closing, Councilor Matthews-Kane stated that her husband is in the United States Marine Corps and she is thankful that he has the right protective gear for the right situations that he has been involved in so he can return home safely. She believes that it is important to question, what is the right equipment for the right situation and that is where she is come from. She thanked Lieutenant Bard and Detective Edwards for the open discussion. Chairman Figy asked Detective Edwards if he would like to make a comment. Detective Edwards stated that the main point he would like to make is the importance of protecting the police officers and the hope is that the new personal protective gear would be stored in the closet for another fifty years. However, if something awful does happen, the important thing is that the equipment will be there for the officers who may be placed in that position. Again, he hopes that it will never happen; this is a wonderful city and does not foresee anything happening in the near future. He reiterated that he wants to see his fellow police officers and himself be able to protect themselves to where they can go home and not be altered by something such as a glass bottle thrown at the back of the head due to not having a helmet. Councilor Sullivan asked, in terms of deployment, will the Westfield Police Department immediately arrive in the gear or will the situation be assessed first and then there's a different call that goes out. Lieutenant Bard stated, for example, during the "Black Lives Matter" demonstration, the Westfield Police Department was present but in the background. Prior to the peaceful event there were conversations that were had between the WPD administrators and the people who were in charge of the demonstration. They were both on the same page in regards to what will be taking place and the expectations of what could happen should things become violent. He stated that the WPD just watched to make sure that everyone was to going to be safe in terms of the protestors, the community at large and the officers would be in position to be able to protect themselves as well. However, they did not have that equipment and was not brought out in that particular situation. Councilor Sullivan asked, with this new equipment, would the same scenario take place? Councilor Sullivan stated that he would like to make sure that when the Westfield Police Department receives the new equipment that the same protocol will take place moving forward especially because the June 4th event was peaceful. Detective Edwards stated that officers would be dressed in the personal protective gear but waiting inside in case things turned violent. Things would

have to deteriorate drastically before they were called to present themselves or to protect whatever needs protecting. Chairman Figy called for a roll call vote on the 2 separate motions. The first is an appropriation of \$3,650 from free cash to Police Department Additional Capital Equipment Account for the purchase of personal protective gear. First motions passes 2-1 with Councilor Figy and Councilor Sullivan voting YES. Councilor Matthews-Kane voting NO.

Councilor Bridget Matthews-Kane made a motion, seconded by Councilor Sullivan for an appropriation of \$38,761.99 from free cash to Police Department Additional Capital Equipment Account for the purchase of a drone.

Detective Todd Edwards stated that the Westfield Police Department has one drone that was gifted by a generous benefactor back in 2017. The drone has since been used for various missions such as search and rescue, runaways for juveniles and documenting scenes. Currently, there is a large technology gap between with what the 2017 drone can do compared to what is now needed in terms of communications systems and camera technology. With the new drone, the MP300 RPK, the WPD will be able to have infrared and visual at one time. Also, with the new one they will be able to create a command post, leaving the controller behind and put it into Auxiliary mode in order to feed information to the command post to allow them to see what the drone is seeing in real time. Currently, the controller has to communicate with officers what the drone is seeing via radio. The current drone has open wiring which causes it to be vulnerable to mist and may cause it to malfunction. The new drone has an IP 45 rating that is dust and light run approved. Also, it has two batteries which allows for 45 to 50 minutes of flight time as opposed to only 20 minutes with the current drone. The pay load for the new one is six pounds versus three pounds which allows WPD to drop off various equipment to those who need it. The speaker on the new drone is much louder than the current one which allows the officers clearer communication. It has a flood light which allows for aerial lighting to the officers below which guides them to where they need to go or to help people who are lost or to document certain scenes, etc. The current drone limits what the WPD can do in terms of distance and capabilities as is it is over five years old. Chairman Figy asked if other departments would have a use for this drone and if so, would they be able to utilize this piece of equipment. Detective Edwards stated that he met with several other Department Heads at the onset of this purchase, such as DPW, building maintenance and the Westfield Fire Department and WPD Chief Valliere offered the services of the drone to inspect buildings, water towers, and other infrastructures. For example, there were things that blew off of the Westfield City Hall's roof and instead of going up there physical to assess what the damage was, the drone was used to figure out what screws needed to be replaced as well as what needed to be fixed. Councilor Figy asked how many licensed drone operators do we currently have in the WPD. Detective Edwards stated that there were two in the WPD, himself and Officer Cordere and there are two in Westfield Fire Department; there are a total four licensed drone operators on the City's Insurance Policy. Councilor Sullivan asked if there is just one drone for the entire city. Detective Edwards stated that they currently have two. The Inspire One version II, which is the large drone and has the night vision capability with infrared sensors which allows the Fire Department to detect hot spots during a fire, but it is so old. The second one is much smaller and though it has night vision, it is not as fine and used more for a quick assessment situation. Councilor Sullivan stated that he would like to avoid the city from purchasing a fleet of drones because several departments want to have their own. Councilor Sullivan asked Detective Edwards will you be a keeper of all of the drones. Detective Edwards stated, yes, he will be in charge of the drones. He reiterated that he has made himself available to other

departments when a drone is needed but he's been involved with the Fire Department regarding purchasing this drone and they will be working together as far as the use of this new drone goes. Councilor Figy asked if there will be a drone that the WPD will be selling after the purchase. Detective Edwards, stated yes, there is a Police Department that is looking into transferring the Inspire One Version II which they could benefit from that older technology. Currently, it is cost prohibitive for that Police Department to purchase a new drone. Detective Edwards stated that the Westfield Police Department will still maintain only two drones. Councilor Matthews-Kane asked when the last time your drone policy was updated. Detective Edwards replied September 1st, 2020. She asked Detective Edwards how often is it updated. He answered that the policy shall be reviewed every two years for compliance with any changes in law or federal agency rules. However, because the technology is so new, the Westfield Police Department tries to keep up with the changes more often than just every two years. Also, due to the Reauthorization Act of the FAA which changes various rules, that must be addressed in order to comply. Roll call vote for an appropriation of \$38,761.99 from free cash to Police Department Additional Capital Equipment Account for the purchase of a drone. The motion passed 3-0 with Councilor Figy, Councilor Matthews-Kane and Councilor Sullivan voting YES.

Councilor Bridget Matthews-Kane made a motion, seconded by Councilor Sullivan to APPROVE a Bond Order in the amount of \$12,257,000.00 for construction of a permeant granulated activated treatment facility for Wells 1 & 2 at the Dry Bridge Treatment Plant Project.

Chairman Figy stated that Councilor Kristen Mello and Councilor Figy were the only councilors who submitted questions ahead of time in regards to the bond. Councilor Figy submitted those questions to the Mayor who in turn submitted them to the appropriate Department Heads. The appropriate Department Heads responded in writing to the questions and were read by Chairman Figy.

The questions and answers were as follows:

1. Councilor Figy asked: *How much money will the ratepayers save with this bond?*
Treasurer Matt Barnes answered:

The estimated savings of utilizing SRF funding is approximately \$5,000,000 over the life of the bond. This is based on a calculation that Tighe and Bond helped prepare that was presented at the last council meeting. This is an estimate based on the expected interest rate that would be obtained if the City sold a bond in the open market. The savings is comprised of interest savings of \$3,100,000 and debt forgiveness of \$2,427,000. The debt forgiveness is 19.8% of the SRF funded amount. There are some additional SRF funding fees related to origination and administration that are about \$205,000 and \$290,000 related to additional SRF engineering consultant costs and potential cost increases related to utilizing minority and woman owned businesses. Additionally, the City will save in reduced interest costs related to temporary borrowing. The SRF does not charge interest on temporary borrowing while the project is being constructed, thus saving an estimated \$200,000 to \$300,000.

2. Councilor Mello asked: *Why use the bricks bought for the new school in this water department project?*
City Purchaser Tammy Tefft answered:

The bricks were purchased for the "Ashley Street" school project, these were taken at the close out of that project and stored for over a year at a cost to the City. We have since taken the pallets of

brick and they are now stored with the DPW. They are of no real value to the City for any project and in discussion it was determined that there is not a real value to anyone else. We thought this would be a great way to possibly save a little money by reusing this brick in this way. In addition this plant is in a neighborhood and the larger buildings in the area, such as Papermill School, and Blessed Sacrament, are brick buildings whose design was considered when the architects were choosing a design for this building.

3. Councilor Mello asked: *What is the exact amount left of unused/unspent funds from the previous \$5M and \$13M bonds? Of the funds spent, how much was spent on the temporary treatment at Well 2, the East Mountain Road tank, and the Owen District Road WTP? Please break down each of those numbers into the projects' broad spending categories like materials, labor, consulting, testing, and design.*

Please see below for the information (Answer/spreadsheet provided by City Purchaser Tammy Tefft):

Water Bond Projects	Approved	Spent/Encumbered	Left
Report Bond 2806	\$ 5,000,000.00	\$ 4,992,029.43	\$ 7,970.57
Report Bond 2888	\$ 13,000,000.00	\$ 7,675,469.38	\$ 5,324,530.62
	\$ 18,000,000.00	\$ 12,667,498.81	\$ 5,332,501.19
		Spent/encumbered	
Well 7 & 8 Plant Construction		\$ 5,720,356.34	
Well 7 & 8 consultant servcies		\$ 87,615.87	
Well 7 & 8 Plant Construction Materials/Supplies not in GC contract		\$ 243,223.87	
Well 7 & 8 Construction Misc Services not in GC contract		\$ 216,017.17	
Well 7 & 8 Plant Design		\$ 559,660.00	
Well 7 & 8 Plant Construction Admin Services		\$ 874,100.00	
Well 1& 2 Plant Design		\$ 665,062.77	
East Mt Road Tank Construction		\$ 2,871,397.00	
East Mt Road Tank Design and Construction Admin		\$ 332,300.00	
Tank Rehabilitation Construction		\$ 485,710.00	
Tank Rehabilitation Design and Construction Admin		\$ 57,000.00	
Well 2 Temporary Treatment		\$ 555,055.79	
Springfield Interconnect		\$ -	
Total Spent or Encumbered		\$ 12,667,498.81	
Left in Bonds		\$ 5,332,501.19	

4. Councilor Mello asked: *How much treated water entered the system produced from Well 2 with the temporary GAC filtration prior to Nov 24, 2020? Given the answer to question 2, what is the price per gallon of treated water that entered the system from the temporary filtration on Well 2 from its startup until Nov 24, 2020?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

From start up to November 24, 2020 the well produced over 300 Million gallons of treated water. An extensive assessment would have to be done to calculate the cost for treatment per gallon of water, this answer is not simple or cut and dry, and involves hundreds of variables. Some of the factors that it depends on are the amount of water we pump from the well, longevity of filter life, power usage, cost for the temporary structure and heating, chemical usage, costs offset from other areas of the water system, whether you are looking at the cost of water produced or cost of water at the tap, where in the system your baseline location for comparison is, etc. Additionally, capital costs for

construction would be spread out over the entire usable life of all of the components of the plant, so the longer the plant is in use, the more spread out the capital costs become, and if the components are reused from the temporary system, such as the intention for the GAC contactor, that capital cost is spread out even further.

Some of the supply costs are readily available, including:

- For each 40,000 pound filter the cost for GAC replacement currently would be approximately \$120,000.
- Cost per Sodium Hypochlorite tote (250-275 gallons) is normally approximately \$1,000 with a credit with each returning tote; from startup in November 2018 through November 24, 2020 we have ordered approximately 6 totes.
- The cost per gallon of Sodium hydroxide is currently \$0.90 per gallon, and in that same time period we ordered approximately 12,100 gallons.
- Zinc Orthophosphate currently costs \$7.80 per gallon, and we have ordered approximately 350 gallons since start up in November of 2018.

5. Councilor Mello asked: *How much treated water has entered the system to date from the Owen District Road Water Treatment Plant? Given the answer to question 2, at this point, what is the price per gallon of the treated water that has entered the system produced from the Owen District Road Treatment Plant?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

Since trial startup of Owen WTP in June of 2020, the plant has produced approximately 93 Million gallons of finished water. As in the previous answer, an extensive assessment would have to be done to calculate the cost for treatment per gallon of water, this answer is not simple or cut and dry, and involves hundreds of variables.

As far as the supply costs, as outlined above, the cost per filter to replace the GAC currently is approximately \$120,000. Up to date we have spent approximately \$1,800 on Sodium Hypochlorite at \$0.90 per gallon. And we have not had to purchase any Poly Orthophosphate yet. We do not use Sodium hydroxide or Zinc Orthophosphate at this location.

6. Councilor Mello asked: *What is the cost for the Dry Bridge Road construction with just the Butler Building and water treatment necessities? Does the money spent on the current plans for extra office space qualify for the loan forgiveness and 0% interest rate?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

This question assumes that there is an option for alternate designs for this plant. Alternatives were considered in the initial stages of project design. The plant is now designed, permitted, approved, and funded as it is. No optional change out of building types or design alterations would be acceptable without starting over through the entire design and permitting process, and there would be no funding tied into that process. This is not a generic project where pieces and parts can be manipulated and changed around.

Additionally, this question assumes that there are superfluous items added into the design that are not necessities. All of the elements of this design have been included because of the need for them.

There is no "extra office space,"; our water treatment facilities have an office/conference room, which is a part of the original design, and this one has been designed to be larger than the previous plant design due to lessons learned through that plant operation and the necessity of having a north side base of operations during an emergency.

7. Councilor Mello asked: *At what concentration, and from where specifically in the system, is the threshold for ordering replacement carbon media for the GAC filters? How do these parameters affect the estimated price per gallon of the treated water from the proposed Dry Bridge Road Treatment plant? What is the expected downtime, if any, for change-out of filter beds?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

As has been previously described when questions about specific operational decisions are posed, all of our operational staff are appropriately licensed by the state of Massachusetts to perform their jobs. Their professional judgement on how to meet the needs of the City as well as maintain and exceed compliance with all appropriate local, state, and federal guidelines for clean and safe drinking water will determine operational decisions.

Regarding the presumed intent of this question, Well 2 currently has low level PFAS detections at the 25% sample port, after producing over 300 Million gallons of finished water. There are multiple factors that will weigh in to when to order new carbon. It would be safe to say that once we see PFAS detection at the 50% or mid-point, that will give us a better estimate as to how long the filter will last and when to change the carbon out, since we will have seen how many MG have been treated before detection at the first two sample ports. This will still leave 50% of the filter (after any reliable PFAS detection) that has yet to be used, and will allow the scheduling of filter GAC change out to happen prior to any reasonable risk of PFAS MCL violation or breakthrough.

8. Councilor Mello asked: *Were non-targeted PFAS analysis, or bench scale testing performed with the water from Well 1 and Well 2? If so, how do their results inform the expected price per gallon of the treated water from the proposed Dry Bridge Road Treatment plant?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

As we have explained multiple times, the bench scale testing was done with water from Well 8, which has a higher concentration of PFAS in the raw water than any result we've seen from Wells 1 or 2. What we've seen in the past 2.5 years is a full scale testing of the filtration system using the temporary vessel at Well 2, a much more robust and rigorous proving out of this technology than a simple bench scale test. Please refer to questions 3 and 4 regarding cost of water produced.

9. Councilor Mello asked: *How have the results from the Air National Guard's Oct 2020 Expanded Site Inspection Report impacted the plans for the Dry Bridge Road Water Treatment Plant and its anticipated costs to the City of Westfield?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

We are aware of this report and it would be inappropriate to comment on an adverse party in litigation's self-investigation and assessment.

10. Councilor Mello asked: *For each year 2015 - 2020, what was the annual production for each of Westfield's water sources: each of the groundwater wells, the Granville Reservoir, and the total purchased from Springfield Water Works? For each year, what percent of the City of Westfield's annual water production was from each source? For each year, what percentage of the City's annual production came from the North Side wells combined?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

As always, this information is included in the annual statistical reporting that is done in compliance with Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection required documentation. These reports can be requested as a part of a public records request through MassDEP or the City's records officer. They are all public documents. Additionally, this question does not enlighten any aspect of the matter before the committee, the request for bond authorization for this treatment plant in order to take advantage of the most favorable financial terms for the City.

11. Councilor Mello asked: *For the water purchased from Springfield, what is the cost to the City of Westfield?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

Westfield DPW-Water has not purchased water from Springfield during the past decade. Previous time periods could be found in the annual statistical reports, as described in the previous question, and again this question does not enlighten any aspect of the matter before the committee.

12. Councilor Figy asked: *Have the updated lab results come in and what did they report?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

Although this question does not apply to the bond authorization, and therefore does not enlighten any aspect of the matter before the committee, for the purposes of transparency we can go over this information in brief as has been discussed previously. As described to the Water Commission, we continue to work with the labs and MassDEP to confirm QA/QC issues, reporting discrepancies, and issues with data consistency. Westfield has received the PFAS lab reports for February and some of the reports for March. However, all reports that we have received confirm that there are no MassDEP defined PFAS detections at point of entry or finished water for either the Well 2 temporary treatment system or the Owen District Road Treatment Plant as well as confirming the previously reported low level detections at the Well 2 25% sample port. There is no "breakthrough" or contamination getting through the filters that has been detected.

13. Councilor Figy asked: *When was the date that Well 2 was taken offline?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

Although this question does not apply to the bond authorization, and therefore does not apply to this matter before the committee, to combat misinformation and confusion we will clarify this issue. Well 2 has not been taken offline, in terms of it being shut off or unusable or unable to be used. It is currently isolated from the system. It has not put water into the distribution system since November due to operational needs. The well can be used whenever the system demand requires it. We do not need this well during the low demand winter season with Owen District Road water treatment plant in operation. The well has only been run way two ways for testing purposes since November.

14. Councilor Figy asked: *From 11/2 to 11/24 approximately 1.8 million gallons of water was pumped out of Well 2. Why was this done? Did any of this water enter the distribution system?*

Francis Cain, Interim Director of DPW answered:

As in the previous question, this question does not apply to the bond authorization, and therefore does not apply to this matter before the committee, however to combat misinformation and confusion we will provide a short explanation. Well 2 has been on according to the system demand and in full compliance with all appropriate local, state and federal guidelines for clean and safe drinking water depending on operational needs. The well is ready to be used whenever the system demands requires as it has been and continues to be fully MassDEP compliant. Again, it has not pumped water into the mass distribution system since November, due to operational needs.

Chairman Figy stated that completes all of the questions that were submitted by the Council members. He asked if the Committee members had any further questions. Councilor Sullivan asked, in regards to the lab results received from November through to part of March, have those been filed with DEP and has DEP raised any concerns with any of those results other than the lab inconsistencies? Heather Stayton, Systems Engineer of the Water Department, replied all of the results are filed directly from the lab to MassDEP and they undergo a separate quality controlled/quality assurance check outside of our processes. The Westfield DPW has been in constant communication with MassDEP throughout this entire time and they do not have any concerns about the discrepancies that are shown in terms of the safety of our drinking water. She further explained that there are quality control issues when you get down to these really low level of contaminants. The MassDEP is working with systems around the state and labs that have been certified to resolve some of these issues as the technology exists to report lower and lower quantities or estimated quantities. She states that they are working on trying to get the best data so DPW can post correct and informative data for the City's purposes but DEP has been overseeing all of the data submitted so far. The MassDEP does not have any concerns about the safety of our results. Chairman Figy asked if there were any further questions, hearing none, moved to a roll call vote for the approval of the bond. The motion passed 3-0 with Councilor Figy, Councilor Matthews-Kane and Councilor Sullivan voting YES.

The Finance Committee members discussed and agreed that the next Finance Committee meeting date will be held Monday, May 3rd at 5 PM.

Councilor Sullivan made a motion to adjourn, which Councilor Figy seconded. The motion passed 3-0 with Councilors Figy, Matthews-Kane and Sullivan voting YES.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:34 PM.

Respectfully submitted

Marisa Colon, Scribe of the Finance Committee