

**RANDOLPH/HOLBROOK JOINT WATER BOARD**  
**MINUTES**  
**June 22, 2022**

**Via Zoom:** Greg Hanley, Joint Board Member, Chris Pellitteri, Joint Board Member, Brian Howard, Town Manager, Keith Nastasia, Superintendent, Holbrook, Peter Mello, Attorney, Holbrook, Bill Clark, Randolph, Paul Hennessy, Treatment Plant Manager, Katie Goldrick, Board of Health, Holbrook, Patricia Greeley, Holbrook Resident, Patricia Conway, Holbrook Resident

**Open Meeting:** 11:03 am by Chris Pellitteri

**Approved Minutes:** February 9<sup>th</sup>, March 24<sup>th</sup>, April 5<sup>th</sup>

**Vote:** Unanimous

Greg Hanley

- Requested to stay with the order of the agenda, asking for a vote on approving the Sycamore Street Standpipe replacement.

Chris Pellitteri:

- Discussion on voting on both standpipes in Holbrook and Randolph together, felt they are both competitively in need of repair or replacement

Greg Hanley:

- Disagreed with the above statement. Respectfully asked for a discussion and vote on the Holbrook standpipe. Felt Randolph standpipe issue was introduced at the last minute.

Peter Mello:

- Standpipe in Holbrook has been a result of a study that suggest replacement. Matter of logistics cleaner and more appropriate to discuss them separately. In terms of merit, need, Holbrook standpipe issue has been the subject of vetting and the Randolph standpipe has not been.

Keith Nastasia:

- Holbrook standpipe was built in 1887, Randolph's was rehabilitated in 2013

Greg Hanley:

- We are here as Joint Water Board, we are having a meeting of this group and this body, item on Agenda Item #2, moves question for a vote

Brian Howard:

- Stated that the question would die from a lack of a "second"

Greg Hanley:

- Asking for a vote on Agenda #2 either vote yes or no

Peter Mello:

- Makes a suggestion that the board take up two matters collectively in lieu of the way they are listed on the agenda,
- Can we just start a conversation on the Holbrook standpipe and see where it takes us?
- Randolph standpipe is on the agenda, so that will be discussed.

- The Board needs to talk about one at a time, you can only talk about one at a time
- Let Greg explain the technical need for the standpipe repairs in Holbrook

Chris Pellitteri:

- Discussing one without discussing all 4 standpipes is inappropriate

Greg Hanley:

- Asking for a vote

Brian Howard:

- Vote dies from a lack of a "second"

Greg Hanley:

- Move question, vote and then talk about the next item.
- Mr. Pellitteri

Chris Pellitteri:

- Wish to remain silent

Peter Mello:

- In terms of the procedural question calling for a motion and need for a second would have to consult Roberts Rules
- Practical matter - the agreement that was attached at the Joint Powers Agreement that was recently voted on by Randolph and Holbrook. It says that the Joint Board shall study and consider needed repairs to all four of the existing water source towers, any cause for replacement or repair of any of the towers shall continue to be determined by a vote of the Joint Board based on engineering study determining the scope of the work and estimates of the cost
- That is what we have here, Holbrook is putting before the board a request to vote on the needed repairs at one of its standpipes. I understand that Randolph has come along with a parallel request. It would be appropriate for the Board to consider both of those proposals; we are twisting ourselves in knots about how to have the conversation.
- Base it on engineering analysis, Greg is proposing to subject to the board, discussion and vetting Holbrook's proposal in regards to its standpipe and I don't see why the Board should not do that with the understanding that Randolph's request with its standpipe will occur as well.
- Unnecessary handling going on over these pretty strait questions. In so far as the Holbrook standpipe is listed on the agenda before the Randolph one, I think it appropriate to discuss that one first.
- Ultimately you have to talk about each independently so why can't we do that.

Chris Pellitteri:

- Would like to vote them all as one

Greg Hanley:

- I do not understand that, I ask for a vote and several meetings that you could not avail yourself,

Chris Pellitteri:

- I had requested the items to be listed together

Greg Hanley:

- I called for the meeting and listed the agenda
- We have to vote

Peter Melo:

- Consistent with the terms of the agreement I just read, it would be premature to vote on Randolph's standpipe, to my knowledge it has not been the subject of any study

Brian Howard:

- The study you refer to is a letter from Environmental Partners stating that the tank has outlived its usefulness, I have a letter from a month ago stating the exact same thing. There was no discussion at the Joint Board about these standpipes.
- A lot of unanswered questions that we do not know the answer to at this point. We do have to look at the whole thing and find out. What does it mean if you can take one standpipe and increase the size and not have to repair the other one?

Greg Hanley:

- Would like to vote

Chris Pellitteri:

- My position has not changed
- When we discuss these standpipes, they have an impact on the system, if you want to make an adjustment to one, they are connected

Greg Hanley:

Move the question

Peter Melo:

- Suggested a 5 minutes adjournment

Chris Pellitteri:

Motion: Chris Pellitteri to take 5-minute adjournment

Second: Greg Hanley

Vote: Unanimous

5 minutes adjournment took place

Motion: Reopen the June 22, 2022 meeting

Second: Greg Hanley

Vote: Unanimous

Chris Pellitteri:

- If agenda Item #4 wraps it up, would you be willing to discuss that?

Greg Hanley:

- Discussed improper handling of the agenda

Chris Pellitteri:

- Stated that projects like the standpipe are discussed at the Board, does not come from one Town Meeting,
- It has been taken out of order, need to discuss project and then go to town, did not happen that way, a little unusual

Greg Hanley:

- Predating you and I, there was action taken by the Board to authorize a study, that study yielded results.

- At this point I feel a tremendous amount of caution, system is leaking, ready to call DEP with advice on how to proceed.
- This has been identified over five years ago, if something were to fail, we have an obligation to protect the public
- Will not stand in the way of a need for Randolph to replace its standpipe
- I have an obligation to act upon this now, actively leaking, can call DEP and have them condemn it.
- Discussion on a reimbursement program
- Need to take action on this, bound contractually back to the 1800's
- Item #2 and Item #3 both need to be voted on

Chris Pellitteri:

- Looking at the system as a whole seeing how the two standpipes interact with each other.
- If you increase the size of the South St. standpipe you might not need a second standpipe
- Something worth discussing and looking into

Greg Hanley:

- Would like to move on taking the vote, per the agreement per the analysis
- Move forward as a common goal and get fully refunded.
- I have duty and obligation for the residents of Holbrook

Chris Pellitteri:

- What exactly is your vote intended to do?

Greg Hanley:

- To replace the tank, that is what went before town meeting, voted unanimously to replace the tank and that is what is before us.
- In that respect that vote is taken, 50% per the 1885 contract states that the Town of Randolph is responsible for their half
- Item #3 will be reciprocity, you have an aging structure, it certainly is not in the state of ours.
- I have a situation that I need to address, if I have to seek the guidance of DEP of the situation, asking for a vote

Chris Pellitteri:

- In reference to the 1885 legislation, they need to be voted together, why do they need to be a separate vote?
- I do not agree with it.
- My opinion has not changed

Greg Hanley

- How would you like to proceed? This is an embarrassment.

Brian Howard:

- With all due respect to say that it is an embarrassment, this is the first time this agenda item has been brought forward. If this is such an emergency, why has this not been brought before the Joint Board previously, doesn't make sense.

- The fact that process matters and the fact that this emergency was never brought forward, never voted on.
- At this point without we have a legislative vote by one body without a vote of the Board first. Do we have a cost on engineering?
- Try and say that this is on either Randolph or the Joint Board is not fair.

Greg Hanley:

- This was properly advertised, move forward with the order of business, it is here before us.

Chris Pellitteri:

- I do not see them as two separate issues, I see them as one.

Greg Hanley:

- Respectively Chris, you have known about this, because you are the one, I consulted on the matter.
- I will defer to Mr. Mello as my representative.

Peter Mello:

- In terms of how to proceed, as far as Greg's call for a Motion and it has not been seconded, perhaps the parties, representative can discuss appropriate next steps before the next Board Meeting.

Chris Pellitteri:

- Do have a meeting next week, get a little more information on it and bring it back up again next week.
- Discussion on dates for the next meeting. June 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup> will work.

Chris Pellitteri:

**MOTION:** To Move Items #2 and #3 to June 28<sup>th</sup> @ 11:00 a.m.

**SECOND:** Greg Hanley

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**MOTION:** To adjourn meeting

**VOTE:** Unanimous