



**BARNSTABLE**  
Water Resources



**Town of Barnstable  
Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan  
Ad Hoc Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Date: June 16, 2025**

**Location: Selectman's Conference Room, Town Hall, Second Floor**

*The meeting will be televised live via Xfinity Channel 8 or high-definition Channel 1072. It may also be accessed via the Government Access Channel live stream on the Town of Barnstable's website:*

*<http://streaming85.townofbarnstable.us/CablecastPublicSite/watch/1?channel=1>*

**Committee Members Present (In-Person):**

Scott Horsley, Chair; Tom Cambareri; Kris Clark, Town Council; Zee Crocker; Rob O'Leary; Louise O'Neil; Butch Roberts; Glenn Snell; Gordon Starr, Town Council

**Committee Members Absent:**

Brian Hughes, Vice Chair; Paul Neary, Town Council

**Others in Attendance:**

Dan Santos, Director, Department of Public Works; Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works; Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works; Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works; Kelly Collopy, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works; Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works

## **Agenda:**

### **Call to Order**

Scott Horsley, Chair, called the June 16, 2025 meeting of the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan (CWMP) Ad Hoc Committee to order at 6:00 PM. The meeting of the committee was held in-person in the Selectman's Conference Room, Barnstable Town Hall.

### **Administrative Items**

#### **a) Recording Notice**

Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, read the notice of meeting recording.

#### **b) Roll Call**

Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, conducted a roll call from the committee. The attendance of members is reflected above.

#### **c) Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Scott Horsley, Chair, entertains a motion to approve the May 19, 2025 meeting minutes. Councilor Clark moves to approve the minutes. Zee Crocker seconds. The committee unanimously votes to approve the May 19, 2025 minutes.

#### **d) Next Meeting**

Scott Horsley, Chair, opens the discussion by inquiring about possible dates and times for the next meeting. Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, provides several possible meeting dates and times. After some discussion, it was decided that the next meeting of the committee will be on Tuesday, July 15, 2025 at 6:00 PM in the Selectman's Conference Room.

Scott notes that the committee has "turned the corner" and should be educated on the relevant topics as the committee works to formulate recommendations. He asks Rob Steen to clarify the proposed schedule for presenting to the Town Council.

- Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, responds that preliminary conversations put the committee in front of Town Council in September. He notes that, in addition to the Town Council, the Health Division and Board of Health were promised additional conversation about the recommendations being brought forward.

Scott notes there are two more meetings before September, not including the meeting being currently held.

- Rob Steen clarifies that this is assuming a monthly meeting. There is nothing preventing the committee from meeting more frequently if desired.
- Scott notes his understanding and desire to keep the schedule the same, if possible.

### **Update on Watershed Permit**

Kelly Collopy, Communications Manager, Department of Public Works, gave an overview of the MassDEP Title 5 Regulation Amendments and Watershed Permit Regulations, which the Town utilized to apply for a Watershed Permit in 2023. Since then, there have been numerous reviews with MassDEP, to the point where the Draft Permit is now available for public comment. She notes that all comments must go through MassDEP, via the contact information on the public notice. Public comment will be accepted until August 11, 2025. She notes that the notice has been translated in Spanish and Portuguese, posted on BarnstableWaterResources.Com, and has been sent to the committee.

Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, notes that DPW's role in this process is facilitating public outreach. MassDEP maintains and manages the actual comments.

- Scott Horsley, Chair, asks to clarify that Barnstable would be the second watershed permit in the State.
  - Kelly confirms this, noting that Barnstable is the first under the new regulations. The Pleasant Bay Alliance has the actual first watershed permit, but that was part of the pilot program.
- Scott asks if it would be worthwhile to have a representative from MassDEP come to a future meeting and discuss the watershed permit. He notes interactions with them in other towns that he has found helpful.
  - Rob Steen responds that he is unsure what MassDEP would be allowed to discuss, as the permit is in the public review period.
  - Kelly notes that part of the public notice is requesting a public hearing which may be more formal. She notes we can ask MassDEP but is also uncertain of what they would be able to discuss.
- Councilor Starr asks to clarify that the watershed permit is for a period of 20 years.
  - Rob Steen responds that MassDEP has acknowledged that the CWMP is for 30 years. The permit has been written using a prediction of nitrogen removal in 20 years
- Councilor Starr asks to confirm the amount of nitrogen removal as 80% in 20 years
  - Rob Steen responds that it is correct, the exact number is closer to 81%
  - Scott notes the regulations require at least 75%
- Councilor Starr asks if the draft permit addresses effluent

- Rob Steen responds that the permit is moot on effluent. The permit basically says we are going to the CWMP and need to remove “X” amount of nitrogen by “X” time, based on the watersheds. The tables presented in the draft permit include both 20- and 30-year tables, most of which are the same as the goal is met in year 20.
- Scott asks if the Town will need an updated Groundwater Discharge Permit
  - Rob Steen responds that we are working with MassDEP on that currently but do have an existing permit.
- Scott recommends all members of the committee review the draft permit. It is posted and available online.
  - Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, noted he sent the public notice to the committee, which contains links to access the full draft permit and documentation.
  - Scott asks if it is possible to download and distribute the permit directly with the committee.
    - Rob Steen responds that MassDEP does not want the Town to distribute the actual permit.
    - Kelly notes that MassDEP has only had the Town distribute the public notice, which tells people where to find the permit.
    - Scott asks if we have confirmed the draft permit is online and findable
    - Kelly confirms that we have accessed the draft permit online.
- Councilor Clark asks why there is a public notice for comment, but MassDEP doesn’t want the actual document shared.
  - Rob Steen responds the assumption he has is to prevent a working draft from being mistakenly distributed. MassDEP controls the final version of the draft permit.
- Councilor Clark notes it seems MassDEP is hiding the document.
  - Kelly responds it is available but acknowledges that the process of getting the document through MassDEP can be cumbersome.
- Chris notes that he will send instructions to the committee for accessing the draft permit.
  - Scott notes a concern on timing and the difficulty of using certain government websites. He hopes to make it as easy as possible for the committee and the public. He wonders if the permit could be posted on the Town website.
    - Rob Steen responds that MassDEP is definitely clear not to post the draft permit on the website.
- Councilor Starr asks, in reference to statements in the permit, where the responses by the Town to questions from MassDEP could be found.

- Kelly responds that these responses are located on the project page through MassDEP.
- Scott requests, to conserve time, that any further questions be sent to Chris after the meeting for him to address. He reiterates a review of the draft watershed permit as strongly recommended homework.
  - Chris agrees with this.
- Zee ponders about the role this committee has to play in the draft permit. Part of the equation is the Watershed Permit Regulation, but another part is the local regulator, in our case the Board of Health. To him, the watershed permit does not answer a lot of the questions based on the CWMP. It doesn't speak to a lot of alternatives and how/why they are important. In a presentation to the Town Council, what does this committee say, whether that is the draft permit goes far enough, or it could go further.
  - Rob Steen notes the CWMP requires a five-year update, which is due this year and is the focus of this committee. The permit requires five-year updates once awarded. As long as the permit is awarded in 2025, the two updates will align and be part of the same effort going forward. However, there is a chance that there will be additional wrinkles to iron out as we are the second permit. The expectation is for this committee to come up with their recommendations, bring them to the Town Council, and, if approved, include them in the five-year update. That sparks a discussion of whether the CWMP materially changed or if there is just a notification. The CWMP is the base document for the watershed permit.
- Scott asks when the permit will be issued and how much time there will be to comment on it
  - Kelly responds that public comment is open until August 11, 2025. There has been no indication once public comment closes as to when the permit is actually issued.
- Scott notes that Barnstable's permit covers the same area as the CWMP, which is the entire town. Other towns, such as Falmouth, Wellfleet, and Tisbury, have CWMPs for the town but watershed permits for each watershed.
  - Rob Steen notes that the Town requested to have the watershed permit cover the entire town, as that is what the CWMP is designed for, and MassDEP agreed with this approach.
- Scott requests to add a discussion on the draft watershed permit to the agenda.
  - Chris confirms this will be on the agenda.
- Zee notes that it will be worthwhile to look at the permit regarding the areas where the committee is looking to recommend I/A systems and the various setbacks.
  - Rob responds that, so long as the implementation of I/A systems is an "and" not an "or", the Town will have satisfied the regulatory requirements. Anything further is the Town

deciding to do more on top of the regulations. The permit acknowledges that the CWMP has adaptive management built in. There is a question on whether a Notice of Project Change would be needed, which is a later discussion. He does not anticipate a problem with the permit so long as any recommendations of the committee are in addition to the CWMP.

- Zee notes a potential problem with cost over time as he is looking towards the future. There needs to be incentives to the “and” such as regulatory or “carrot” incentives.
  - Rob Steen responds that this is part of the evening’s conversation but is not anticipated to change the permit status.
  - Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works, notes that the permit identifies the need to remove “X” amount of nitrogen by traditional means and any material change to the plan would need to go through a modification process which is outlined in the draft permit. Doing I/A in lieu of sewer would be deemed a modification. Doing I/A in addition to sewer would not be deemed a modification based on Griffin’s understanding, and confirmation from MassDEP would be requested.
- Zee comments that the permit says if there is an approved permit, a Title 5 can be installed anywhere else in town.
  - Rob Steen clarifies that it allows the town to do that, but that doesn’t mean the Town would allow that.
  - Zee responds that is his point, that we need to address Title 5 systems in Town through some regulatory agency.
  - Griffin responds this is based on the Title 5 regulations, which would require local communities to decide on the use of Title 5 systems.

### **Continued Discussion of where to recommend policy on Nitrogen Reducing (NR) Septic Systems**

Scott Horsley, Chair, begins by thanking the DPW Staff for putting together a document of talking points to start the conversation.

Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, states that nothing in the document is set in stone. The contents of the document are a reflection of what was heard at the last meeting, with all the details being up for discussion. None of the document is presented as a “must do”.

Scott requests Rob Steen to summarize each bullet, provide rationale, and give feedback on each bullet.

Rob Steen summarizes the first bullet, which is based on the discussion of a distance from a waterbody where I/A systems could be implemented. At the end of the last meeting, it seemed the committee was in favor of using a 500-foot boundary. Rob notes that while drafting the document, it became apparent

that there were other bodies of water, such as the Marstons Mills River, which feed into affected waterbodies that should also be addressed. Once the basis of “where” was established, potential scenarios were devised such as receiving sewer. Rob notes that this document uses doctrinal language to provide a consistent definition throughout the discussion.

- Scott asks to clarify whether a property whose corner is within the 500-foot boundary but whose septic system is 600 feet away would be included in the recommendation.
  - Rob Steen responds this was not a consideration that was addressed.
  - Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, responds that the map presented by Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works, was inclusive of any property which is touched by the 500-foot boundary.
- Scott notes that Wellfleet is doing the same thing, utilizing the edge of the property. However, there is also discussion of where the line is. It is a GIS datapoint, but can it be contested?
  - Rob Steen and Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works, respond that the line can be contested.
  - Amber responds that a property on the coast is owned to the mean low water line, in the State of Massachusetts. That is considered the property boundary in GIS.
- Scott asks to confirm that the 500-foot boundary is measured from the mean low water line.
  - Amber responds that the 500-foot boundary is measured from where the parcel line is in GIS.
  - Scott notes this may be something that should be focused on.
  - Griffin notes that it is based on what GIS has as the property line.
  - Scott notes that a provision may be needed with an overlay of map of properties included in the boundary. If someone wanted to contest it, they would have to go out and have it surveyed.
    - Amber notes the point could be changed to read “All septic systems...”
    - Scott notes that this would require knowing where all septic systems are, which he is uncertain if the Town has a record of.
  - Amber adds that a definition should be drawn up to where the boundary is.
- Dan Santos, Director, Department of Public Works, notes that these talking points are not what the DPW wants, it is what the committee wants.
  - Scott notes his understanding of this.
  - Dan responds that the document is written slightly vaguely, which is purposeful and up to the committee to define.
- Rob O’Leary asks how many properties would be impacted by this proposal.
  - Scott notes that this data was reported at the previous meeting.
  - Chris notes the data is included in the packet given to all committee members.

- Amber notes a discrepancy in the data presented in the packet.
    - Chris responds the data in the packet is only for the Three Bays Watershed and will update the packet with the correct number.
  - Amber refers to the map that was shown to the committee at a previous meeting, noting that when Shoestring Bay, Three Bays, and Centerville setbacks are combined there is a total of 1,892 total properties within the 500-foot boundary, 1,062 of which are anticipated to receive sewer, 473 not anticipated to receive sewer, and 407 without a septic system.
  - Scott notes his preference for using the map as it can clearly show the parcels and reduce uncertainty of being included.
- Griffin suggests, in regard to appeals to the distance setback, that it could be set up as a zoning boundary where it is shown on a map and clearly marks the line.
    - Scott asks if this would be incorporated into a health regulation, which often contain variances and appeals.
    - Griffin responds that it is correct.
  - Scott asks about the bullet identifying the use of “best available technology”, which is referenced to being defined by the Health Division and Department of Public Works. He questions why we wouldn’t just use the State’s Best Available Nitrogen Reducing Technology (BANRT) list.
    - Rob Steen responds that there were several discussions about this point. The BANRT list includes some technologies which achieve 19mg/L, which may not be the level the Town wants to achieve. The fear is if the state list contains technology that the Town doesn’t want installed, there is nothing stopping someone from installing the technology if we were to utilize the BANRT list. This approach allows for more control at the local level, which could be managed by a sub-board that meets at designated intervals to update the list.
    - Zee notes this is an important distinction if the committee were to take the approach of allowing a delay on connecting to sewer when an I/A system is installed. The nitrogen removed could factor into how long a property owner gets the delay for.
  - Rob Steen provides the reasoning for the last hollow bullet, which includes all properties on Little Island and Grand Island being included in the determination of where to implement I/A systems. When the 500-foot boundary was overlaid on the islands, a small sliver was remaining which seemed “silly” to not include. This was done only by looking at maps and does not include the political aspect of making the determination.
    - Tom Cambareri notes the discussion depends on whether you think the setback is arbitrary.
    - Rob Steen responds that, arguably, the entire setback approach is arbitrary.
    - Scott notes his agreement but also that there are many regulations, such as 100 feet from wetlands, that are arbitrary.

- Tom notes that, with groundwater flow of 1 foot per day and at 500 feet, that is a 1.4-year travel time.
  - Scott notes this is one of the benefits of doing this.
  - Tom asks if there is a desire to do more.
  - Scott notes that it is a good question, and Amber has presented the numbers for 500, 1,000, 1,500, and 2,000 feet.
- Rob O’Leary asks what the time-of-travel is for the properties identified in each boundary.
  - Amber responds by displaying a map which overlays the time-of-travel with the identified parcels, along with sub-watershed lines. She notes that the travel time is to the nearest waterbody, so the northern area of the Marstons Mills River may include wetlands and cranberry bogs, and greater than 10 years of travel time.
- Councilor Starr asks why Grand Island has a long time-to-travel.
  - Amber responds that there is a tendency when close to the divides of a sub-watershed the travel time goes up.
  - Tom explains that the edges of Grand Island have a preliminary horizontal flow, while the interior follows the trend of groundwater going down, then horizontal, then back up, creating a longer travel time.
- Amber provides additional context on the map, noting that the bold outline is the area included in the CWMP. Areas in pink have a less-than 10-year time-to-travel, while areas in blue are greater than 10-years. She reiterates that the colors are displayed only for properties within the 500, 1,000, 1,500, and 2,000-foot boundaries.
- Scott notes previous discussion of using science to determine where to place the setbacks but notes he hasn’t seen any “hard-fast” rule about where to place the setbacks. The biggest factor is time-to-travel. If we want results sooner, the systems along the shoreline are the ones to go after. If we can affect nitrogen in 1-3 years, out of the 30 years of the CWMP, that is “pretty interesting”.
  - Rob Steen notes that, as there will be additional 5-year updates in the future, using the 500 feet setback can be a good starting point that can be reviewed and determine if the setback should be expanded. He notes this is up to the committee to recommend and ultimately up to the Town Council to vote on.
- Councilor Clark asks about the small strip on Grand Island and whether increasing the initial setback distance would eliminate the strip.
  - Rob Steen responds that yes; at a certain point the strip does disappear.
  - Chris notes data presented to the committee which notes the addition of 52 parcels at 1,000 feet. Even at 2,000 feet there are some parcels that get added.

- Scott notes, in the interest of time, to keep both 500' and 1,000' on the table, as it doesn't need to be decided immediately.
  - Zee Crocker notes this is a blunt instrument but is a good start. He agrees with Rob about reviewing this at the next 5-year update and allowing technologies to develop and potentially come down in price.
- Rob O'Leary inquires about the other towns who Scott mentioned are looking at a similar approach. What distances are they looking at?
  - Scott responds that Tisbury and Wellfleet are both in the process of determining their numbers, including a meeting the next night. They have health regulations on other triggers, but not setback distances.
- Rob Steen inquires about the 10-year period identified in the document for properties connecting to sewer. There are 2 ways to handle cases where this I/A regulation would impact you, but sewer is also being brought to your property at some point. The first way is to not require an I/A be installed if the property is receiving sewer in "X" amount of time. The second way is to put the I/A in and receive a 20-year waiver for needing to connect to sewer. The second feels derogatory towards nitrogen removal goals, which resulted in the first option being presented.
  - Scott notes that the marginal cost for when someone has to replace their system is approximately \$25,000. When someone is already digging up their yard, it makes sense to use that as a trigger. There is an opportunity to reduce costs when the yard is already being dug up.
  - Rob Steen notes his curiosity on the committee's thinking on the best way to handle properties anticipated to receive sewer and if the approach with not requiring an I/A is preferred, what is the period of time the committee feels is appropriate.
  - Scott clarifies that if a house is being built and sewer is coming in 10 years, they have to put in at least a Title 5, which is approximately \$20,000. For another \$25,000 a lot of the problem is solved.
- Dan asks if Scott's idea is in lieu of sewerage.
  - Scott responds it is possible, or for a period of time as Rob Steen suggested.
  - Rob Steen indicates his thought is for existing homes. If they are due to be sewerage in a certain period of time and their septic system fails or inspection fails, or some other trigger, the question is how long before sewer these should be allowed and through what mechanisms would the septic system be allowed to be utilized, such as a tight tank or more frequent pumping. There is an understanding that if sewer is coming next month, the property would not be required to upgrade. Similarly, if sewer is coming in 30 years, they would be required. There is a point between those two which makes the most sense. This point is one of the things desired from the committee. The other way to

do this is requiring an immediate hookup but being granted a waiver from sewer for the life of the system. This may hurt us when it comes to nitrogen removal and timing.

- Lousie O’Neil asks to clarify that Scott is talking about new homes while Rob Steen is talking about existing homes.
  - Scott confirms this, and boils his thoughts down to anytime a person has to dig up their yard, that’s a good time to install an I/A.
- Kelly Collopy, Communications Manager, Department of Public Works, notes that 75% of the phone calls she receives from the Health Division are about existing homeowners who are anticipated to receive sewer and their system failed. She has generally seen the Health Division/Board of Health allowing the septic system to continue to be used for 1-2 years. More often than not, it will be the existing home in this situation, not new builds.
  - Scott asks what the Board of Health/Health Division does to maintain the system while allowing it to be used.
  - Kelly responds that there are several factors, especially the nature of the failure and how soon sewer is expected. She has heard of requiring extra pumping.
- Councilor Starr notes that the Board of Health occasionally require a 2,000 gallon tight tank with an alarm system. He also notes he has seen them allow the septic system to continue to be used for 7 years. He expresses concerns about how long a tight tank is able to be used. The Board of Health works out a solution with each person who comes in with a “sob story” (only use is in the summer or less occupancy, etc.).
  - Kelly adds that there does not seem to be a trend, and it is very subjective.
  - Butch Roberts notes that it seems once an alternate system is installed the property is ahead of the game. Give them some time after sewer is available to at least address nitrogen.
- Scott notes the use of a tight tank brings the nitrogen down to 0mg/L. If this is a reasonable approach for a set number of years, that is better than any I/A system. He questions how long this would be allowed under Title 5.
  - Griffin notes there are certain Title 5 restrictions in this regard.
  - Kelly notes that most conversations she has about time extensions are in the range of 2 or less years.
  - Dan notes the extension is self-enforcing. If the tank isn’t pumped, you’re screwed.
- Scott requests to bring the Board of Health in soon, and request they come with estimates of how often this occurs and what they allow. They are public health experts, and we won’t override them.
  - Dan notes that this depends on whether the Board of Health is making decisions based on public health bases. On these issues they tend to not. If someone can’t afford the

upgrade or connection to sewer, they allow a variance even though it has nothing to do with public health. They are regularly weighing in on these matters.

- Scott notes this is important because we don't want to propose recommendations that aren't going to work and go against what the Board of Health is dealing with on a daily basis.
- Griffin notes that in addition to the discussion about new builds and existing builds, the first hollow bullet includes the transfer of ownership. These are additional triggers.
  - Butch Roberts indicates this is important
  - Tom Cambareri notes this addresses most of the new builds.
- Zee agrees with Butch's point about getting ahead of the game, which ties into Tom's point about time-to-travel. There may be some math to be done with water usage and implied load. He likes the approach of allowing the delay of connecting to sewer as it also balances out the fact that something is being done.
  - Amber asks if Zee believes there is a formula to determine how long the time delay could be.
  - Zee responds there could be a formula.
  - Rob Steen notes the last bullet on the page addresses funding, which will be discussed later in the meeting.
- Scott asks Rob Steen if there is anything additional to discuss on the first bullet.
  - Rob Steen responds that he believes there is a good grasp on it. His interpretation is an overall comfort with the first bullet except the debate about 500' and 1,000' setbacks. A discussion with the Board of Health is needed about the 10-year allowance when anticipated to receive sewer.
- Dan poses the question of what is gotten from this, assuming the recommendations go through?
  - Scott responds that the data on the number of systems is available, which can be translated to kilograms of nitrogen.
  - Dan asks what that does for "you". If the capacity has been exceeded by 100%, what does this do?
  - Zee responds that it addresses problems 30 years early.
  - Dan asks what is accomplished 30 years early.
  - Zee responds that it removes nitrogen a lot sooner.
  - Dan notes, as has previously been discussed, this is arbitrary. When the committee goes before the Town Council, who are a policy-making body, they are going to want to know what the basis for the decision is and how it is justified. He is not saying anything is right or wrong, just that this is stuff that needs to be thought of. If the justification is "we're removing nitrogen" the question will come up of "to what end", does it get us below a threshold, or to a certain number.

- Scott responds there are two main points. The first is time-to-travel, which would be faster. He has previously said that he would spend more money to improve water quality sooner. The second point is the MEP report being imperfect and only the best available estimate. We probably need to do more than what is in the CWMP. He notes changes in climate will also affect this.
  - Dan notes on the first point by assuming a steady state of nitrogen moving through the system. In this example, there is 50 mg/L of nitrogen coming through. The house at 500' removes one house's worth of, which he exemplifies as 1 mg/L.
    - Scott responds this is why numbers are needed.
    - Zee responds that the process is cumulative
    - Tom responds that if the recommendation isn't in place, then it will be 20-30 years before anything happens. The CWMP is a 30-year plan and throughout it there is monitoring that occurs. Without doing anything the monitoring is a waste of money. If a substantial number of I/As could be installed near the shore, there might be some indications at the 5-year updates of the CWMP.
    - Dan responds that the key word is "might". This would ask people to spend real money to do something that might give a benefit.
    - Zee responds there is equal uncertainty that the Town will reach Phase Three of the plan because there isn't enough money. The certainty of getting some stuff done is certainly worth the uncertainty of getting a lot of stuff done later.
    - Dan responds the amount being done sooner may not make an impact on the waterbody.
    - Zee asks what then the best action would be.
    - Dan responds it is to sewer. He notes he is not against it but is being a devil's advocate as he knows these questions will come up.
- Rob Steen notes that this debate has been had multiple times internally and is happy this committee is getting a chance to take a bite at the apple.
- Kelly notes that, in addition to the questions posed by Dan/Town Council, an important aspect will be public communication and outreach. There is going to potentially be a number of new councilors or councilors going into an election season, so it will be important to be prepared with facts and data, not just "we think" or "this feels". There will likely be resistance to asking people to spend more money who weren't expecting to spend money now, if at all.
  - Scott notes the facts and data can be brought, including time-of-travel, then translate the number of parcels to kilograms and relate it to nitrogen removal requirements.
  - Rob reminds that whatever is done with I/A systems is in addition to efforts in the bogs, ponds, and other alternatives. All of these are cumulative and have an eye on Phase Three which may not even need to be done. At this point it is the value of the I/As, with

the value of the ponds, with the value of the bogs, with the value of the aquaculture, etc. It is all additive to see if there is input or not.

- Rob O’Leary asks how many parcels are actually affected by the regulations, not just captured. Only those properties who initiate the triggers of transfer or failure would be affected. Is there any estimate on what that may be?
  - Rob Steen responds there is no readily available data. The talking points are written in such a way, to Rob O’Leary’s point, that this would only be required when certain triggers are initiated.
- Griffin notes, on the discussion about the 10-year time extension if the property is anticipated to receive sewer, a large portion of the properties within the 500-foot boundary will be sewered within the next 10 years. Approximately 740 of the 1,892 will be sewered by Phase Two. They would almost immediately get opted out.
  - Scott notes another option is to require, through Board of Health, that all systems within 500 feet are upgraded within “X” years. This is what MassDEP did with Title 5.
  - Dan asks if this is the case then why are there still cesspools?
  - Scott notes that it is what the regulations say. The main reason is because all the “logical” towns are opting to do a watershed permit instead.
- Butch Roberts notes that the previous point may be why the committee should look at doing 1,000’.
  - Scott notes to keep it at 500’ or 1,000’ for now.
  - Dan asks what is needed to make a decision.
  - Scott responds the time-of-travel and calculation of kilograms, compared to the reductions through I/A systems.
- Dan notes there also needs to be a realistic assessment of how many properties will actually initiate the trigger and upgrade.
  - Butch suggests using historical data from Board of Health or somewhere else.
  - Scott notes statistics of townwide septic failures at an average of 36 per year.
  - Rob Steen clarifies the number is townwide.
  - Scott agrees but notes an assumption could be made about the percentage of town where these triggers are initiated and apply it to these properties.
  - Rob Steen agrees we could make an estimate but wouldn’t stake much on it. There are a lot of variables to this. He suggests assuming a percentage of the area.
  - Scott notes the availability of the septic system failures and that property transfer numbers could be retrieved.
  - Amber notes this could be overlaid with the setbacks, but it is uncertain of how much detail the data would consist of.

- Griffin suggests making basic assumptions that if there are “X” number of failures in town then take that as a percentage of all parcels in town.
- Scott asks for assistance from DPW in completing these calculations.
  - Rob Steen responds that the DPW will work on it.
  - Scott requests it will be good to know the percentage of areas of the whole town and the percentage of the number of parcels.
  - Tom requests the data presented on a map by each watershed.

Scott requests Rob Steen to summarize the second major bullet on the list of talking points. Rob Steen summarizes the second major bullet, noting it came from a discussion that occurred after the last meeting with Councilor Clark. The idea behind the bullet is that if someone has a cesspool today, it needs to end immediately as it is not within Title 5 regulations. He notes a coincidental conversation with Tom McKean, Director, Barnstable Health Division, who is keeping up to date with the committee and wanted to provide additional context on cesspools. Tom McKean provided information that cesspools in Town come in two varieties. Variety one is a single cesspool, which is an automatic failure. Variety two started in the 80s with a practice of allowing properties with failed cesspools to install a leeching system behind the cesspool. Variety two, according to the Board of Health, is a Title 5 system.

- Dan notes he took that approach himself, explaining that the cesspool becomes the septic tank.
  - Rob Steen notes the “tank” would leak a lot.

Rob Steen continues, noting that Tom McKean indicated being onboard with the recommendation to focus on single cesspools, while the others are considered Title 5 and would have to be dealt with independently, if at all.

- Scott asks if there is a known number of cesspools, which he recalls Tom McKean not having readily available.
  - Rob Steen responds that Tom McKean knows what properties utilize a Title 5 system or I/A system since the mid-90s, as that is when his record keeping system was operational. He does not know the information before the mid-90s and what may have fallen through the cracks since then. Rob Steen notes the second hollow bullet of the second solid bullet addresses this as it proposes doing an inventory by default, then going to inspect properties where the septic system is unknown. Rob Steen concludes by summarizing that there is not a list of known cesspools in town.
- Councilor Starr asks if Tom McKean is permitted to go on the property and inspect the system.
  - Rob Steen responds it is his understanding that Tom McKean has this ability according to the regulations.
  - Dan notes that Tom McKean has limited resources to be able to accomplish this task.
  - Rob Steen responds he understands, and Tom McKean noted this as well.

- Scott asks if we can get an estimate by the date of when Title 5 was established, which Dan notes is 1978 and there was a period of transition to a septic system more than a cesspool.
  - Griffin responds that the issue is a lack of available data without a manual review of every property in town.
- Tom Cambareri asks how much nitrogen comes out of a functioning cesspool.
  - Scott responds that it is not much more nitrogen than Title 5.
  - Rob Steen responds that in a septic tank there is a theoretically higher residence time than in a cesspool. Septic tanks are taking some nitrogen, but cesspools at full “perc rate” just put everything back in the ground. Based on conversations with Tom McKean, it’s assumed that a failed cesspool still retains some waste which could potentially have a worthwhile residence time.
- Scott notes the importance on this topic is not necessarily about the difference between cesspools and Title 5 but is about the number of cesspools that would be upgrading.
  - Rob Steen responds that the debate is relevant because if a cesspool makes no significant difference to Title 5, there’s no point in going independently after cesspools
  - Dan notes that this becomes a policy discussion of “is the juice worth the squeeze?”. He notes it is a big effort to go after cesspools.
- Scott notes this is where we need to bring the Board of Health in as they are on the front lines.
  - Rob Steen responds that in his earlier conversation, Tom McKean indicated he was in favor of going after single tank cesspools because they are already failures according to Title 5. In Tom McKean’s mind, he does not feel he can go after the cesspool/leeching field approach as it is within regulation.
  - Zee notes Tom McKean likely won’t have the resources to do this and suggests it should be done on a trigger approach such as a real estate transaction.
  - Kelly notes that the reason most of the existing cesspools are present is because they get passed from family to family and not triggering the inspection process.
  - Zee notes that if there is a property transaction, we should know what the system is based on the report that comes back.
  - Dan suggests a regulation pertaining to a deed change could make sure the inspection process is triggered, as that is necessary even when transferring to family.
- Scott reiterates his desire to have an estimate from the Health Division of the number of cesspools that would be caught in this trigger so that it can be justified.
- Butch asks to confirm that the search for cesspools would be townwide.
  - Scott confirms this is correct.
  - Rob Steen responds that, as it is written in the draft talking points, it is townwide.

- Amber asks to confirm the number being sought is the number of files that would need to be researched to know how many cesspools exist.
  - Scott responds he is looking for the best estimate from the Health Division.
  - Rob Steen responds that Tom McKean has been asked and is resistant to answer the question. He does not know the number, and any estimate would only be through a process of elimination.
  - Zee notes that the final delivery needs to be something that is relatively simple. To Dan's point, we need to deliver something that we can show will make a difference. There may be a mosaic encompassing the parcels closest to the water, which can be shown to make a difference, but it may also need to say that anywhere in town with a failed cesspool should be upgraded to new technology. He notes this is away from the argument of not needing to do something because the existing plan reaches above the target. By putting in new Title 5 systems, they are essentially polluting machines for the next 30-50 years so why should that be allowed? To him the cesspool idea is a good start. The decision was made to upgrade to Title 5s and not allow cesspools anymore.
  
- Tom Cambareri asks what happens if a cesspool is located outside of a nitrogen sensitive area.
  - Zee responds that the entirety of Cape Cod's south side is essentially the nitrogen sensitive area. The nitrogen sensitive area is beyond what we are going for with the watershed permit.
  - Rob Steen responds that everything on the south side of Barnstable is within the CWMP.
  - Dan responds that MassDEP has defined nitrogen sensitive areas.
  - Kelly responds that MassDEP has a map that shows nitrogen sensitive areas and a separate category which has the potential to be a nitrogen sensitive area.
  
- Tom notes that Zone 2 is regulated under Title 5 to have a certain nitrogen load. Other nitrogen sensitive areas are in the area of private wells. With the talking points suggestion that adds coastal waters. He is being a devil's advocate and asking if there's a cesspool outside of a nitrogen sensitive area, is the best available technology needed?
  
- Scott remarks, in regard to the 1,000' feet buffer, another reason to consider is that the triggers will be slower to make change, so it will be worth casting a wider net. If we are going to propose this to Town Council as making a significant difference, we will need a wider net.
  
- Rob Steen asks if there are any other discussions needed for the cesspool idea. He remarks that he doesn't hear a lot of support for it and asks if the committee should drop the idea.
  - Zee responds that we should get to focused areas where something can be delivered to Town Council that is relatively straight-forward. In his mind the 500' buffer is a good start. He believes the math will not show a gigantic impact but is a good start. We may want to look at applying the cesspool idea only to properties within the 2,000' buffer

zone. He agrees with having some sort of pass or extension if someone were to install a system then get sewer within a set amount of time.

- Tom notes that he feels the topic of cesspools appear to distract from the main objective of nitrogen reduction in watersheds and the identified areas.
  - Butch notes it is the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan and there is more to the Town than just nitrogen sensitive areas.
  - Tom notes this gets into the issues of setbacks to ponds and similar. He hopes the Board of Health would already be requiring upgrades in those setback areas.
- Rob Steen again asks if there is any further discussion on the cesspool topic.
    - Scott requests the topic is not taken out from the talking points, but we can move to the next bullet.

Rob Steen summarizes the third major bullet, which pertains to cost. There was an attempt to utilize previous discussions from Zee and figure out additional funding opportunities. The debate was had internally about requiring someone to take on additional costs with an upgrade to I/A systems. As the Town would be requiring this to achieve nitrogen goals, is it appropriate to have some mechanism to shrink the delta between the cost of a Title 5 and an I/A? A possible solution is to have the Town buy tanks in the middle, depending on the regulation. Another solution is an additional tax program that would benefit those who do not itemize and allow them to get an advantage.

- Scott asks if the town has the ability to offer a tax abatement.
  - Zee responds that, according to Mark Milne, Director, Barnstable Finance Division, that it is not possible without approval from the state legislature. However, that doesn't mean there isn't something that can be done.
  - Rob O'Leary responds that it also doesn't mean you won't get it if you ask for it.
  - Dan notes it is a specialized process.
  - Scott notes that Falmouth is pushing to change this so that it is not based on income. He is uncertain what the status of this effort is. Falmouth was working with their representative to file legislation. He notes that the tax credit should be the other way around, giving the tax credit to the people who can't afford it. Right now the credit goes to those who can afford it.
- Rob Steen asks if the committee agrees with the broad concept that there is value in trying to find a way to compensate for the delta if we are mandating I/As where Title 5s previously existed. He devil's advocates that when his cesspool died and a Title 5 system needed to be installed, there was no financial assistance, the State just said you have to install Title 5. What is the committee's thinking about this?
  - Councilor Clark asks about the AquiFund and whether they would assist in this regard.
  - Rob Steen responds that they provide low-interest loans, which the committee may determine is enough.

- Scott responds that the tax credit is better than the loan because it's essentially money in your pocket, while the loan has to be paid back.
  - Zee notes there is an existing law signed by the Governor. People should be taking advantage of this, and the Town should be advertising this. Direct outreach could be made to full-time residents and narrow it down by the age of the septic system or other factors. This is outside of offering any incentives. He notes previous calculations showed about half the town being eligible for the credit.
  - Kelly responds that the Town does heavily advertise the tax credit through the Barnstable Water Resources website, the Homeowner's Sewer Connection Guide, and during public information sessions.
  - Zee suggests this information could go out with the tax bill.
- Scott notes that Wellfleet was successful in getting an SRF loan for EIA upgrades, which was recently rescinded as the state did not want them using SRF. However, there is a sister program known as the Community Septic Management Program which has \$5 million on the IEP list. Scott spoke with Erin Perry from the Cape Cod Commission, and they are trying to figure this out. He notes his opinion that SRF funds should still be able to be used on private property, citing New York and the IRS indicating it is permissible. He asks who in town should be looking into the Community Septic Management Program.
  - Dan responds that Mark Milne, Director, Barnstable Finance Division, would be the place to start.
- Rob Steen summarizes his understanding that there is an appetite for advertising the available programs and helping people take advantage of the programs. There does not seem to be an appetite for creating a new program to offset costs between Title 5 and I/A Systems.
  - Scott responds that if it was do-able it would be nice, but he doesn't know what it would be. The question is how we help those people who don't get the \$18,000 in tax credit.
  - Rob Steen responds that this comes from the \$91,000, which Chris notes comes from the Barnstable Clean Water Coalition. Presumably this is pro-rated for incomes below \$91,000 so that some portion of the credit is received.
- Kelly Collopy asks to clarify the \$91,000 and how it is calculated.
  - Zee responds that it is based on the 5% income tax in Massachusetts. \$4,500 per year, times 4 years is the full \$18,000.
- Zee notes that there is a discussion about regulations that could be put in place, such as the 500' setback or cesspools or whatever else the committee decides. There is a discussion for incentives. There is a long-term opportunity to examine the idea of SRF funding for Phase 3. To him, Phase 3 is a planning opportunity. If we are able to lower the cost and prove that alternative systems are 25% of the cost of sewer for that area, it is beneficial to look at potential levers to make this happen. Working on it sooner rather than later puts us ahead of the game.

- Butch notes that, by taking it one step further, you can address the 47% of town that is not currently addressed in the CWMP and start a program that can be applied in those areas.

Rob Steen uses the segue to summarize the final bullet. He emphasizes it is not a DPW bullet, it is entirely his. The idea comes from previous discussions about time-to-travel. There is a desire for parcels with the most immediate impact, and Rob was thinking of the other side of the coin, areas that will have the longest travel time or delay between impact and affect of the waterbody. If there is a 30-year travel time, it's 30 years between us acting and the impact to the water. Phase 3 is approximately one septic lifetime away, in years 20-30 of the CWMP. We are currently in year 5 of the CWMP. This harks back to previous conversation about being allowed to replace Title 5 with Title 5. He asks if we should identify the Phase 3 area and start having them utilize I/A systems. This affects nitrogen "today" so when everything else is done there may be benefit arriving at the estuary. It also gets people used to utilizing I/A systems. Phase 3 has always been discussed as looking at evolving technologies, in combination with alternatives, to see if they can do enough to offset some of Phase 3. Phase 3 is the most difficult to sewer as it is far away and is topographically difficult and not dense. He acknowledges it goes against the limited approach with 500' setbacks, but the essence is flipping the time of travel and helping "flush" the system.

- Zee responds he thinks it is a good idea to go after this area. He remarks that the travel time only begins after the project completion, and it's 30 years of time to travel in those locations. This may also fit in with the SRF funding questions, which the State may be willing to consider.
  - Griffin notes that Phase 3 is approximately 2,000 parcels.
- Tom asks where Phase 3 is located
  - Rob Steen responds it is basically Marstons Mills.
  - Griffin responds it is the upper Three Bays Area and a portion of West HyannisPort.
- Tom asks what portion of Phase 3 would be included in the setback discussions.
  - Chris pulls up the CWMP phasing map, which Rob Steen identifies the yellow area being Phase 3, with the Marstons Mills River running up the middle.
  - Zee notes that some of the setbacks would overlap with Phase 3.
  - Rob Steen notes there is an overlap between the setback conversation and the Phase 3 conversation, but the topic is on the table for discussion.
  - Zee notes that, to Butch's point, not all the Indian Ponds are being addressed.
- Tom suggests going after nitrogen that will be hitting the embayment in 30 years and seeing what comes out of that in the 5-year updates.
  - Rob points out that this was the basis for the suggestion to get an area with longer times of travel to be addressed now as opposed to waiting. It's not full removal, but there is some removal.

- Griffin notes the start of Phase 3 is, coincidentally, the life expectancy of a septic system.
- Tom asks if Rob Steen is proposing the new discussion item as an alternative to the CWMP
  - Rob Steen responds he is not, it's an "and". When areas with short times of travel are sewerred, there is an immediate effect. When areas with longer times of travel are impacted, there is remaining nitrogen in the groundwater that needs to be flushed out. If we can get to the nitrogen now and remove some of it, there might be impact faster.
- Scott notes he believes this is a great idea. He suggests different triggers could be implemented in different areas. He goes back to using triggers when the yard is being dug up such as a brand-new house, additions, or a failed system. At that point the marginal cost is lower, and if the person is able to utilize the \$18,000 tax credit the numbers come down again to get some good benefits.
  - Zee notes we could incentivize just the Phase 3 area to balance it out and accelerate the process. To him, doing this would get a generation ahead of actually getting the impact.
- Rob O'Leary asks how failed systems are determined.
  - Griffin responds there are several triggers such as a backup resulting in an inspection or when going through the mortgage process will also trigger an inspection.
- Rob O'Leary asks if an inspection would be required if constructing an addition or adding bedrooms
  - Griffin responds that adding a bedroom would not require an inspection.
  - Chris responds that the list of failure triggers from the state, written in plain language, contains 7 possibilities: Backup of sewage as a result of clogged soil absorption system; Discharge through ponding, surface breakout, or damp soils; Liquid level in distribution box above outlet invert; Liquid depth in cesspool less than six inches from inlet pipe or remaining available volume less than half one day's design flow; System requires pumping more than four times per year; Tank made of metal unless provided with a certificate of compliance or tank is cracked/structurally unsound; or Soil absorption system extends below high groundwater elevation
  - Kelly notes that these will ultimately be found with a property transfer or an issue occurring where a technician is called out.
- Scott notes he likes the property transfer trigger, as that data is available. He requests the data on those and also pro-rate it with the different buffer distances.
  - Griffin responds we should be able to find property transfer data for at least the past 5 years.

Scott transitions the conversation to the next meeting and the topics to be discussed. Scott's sense is the talking points document is fairly on target, not hearing much pushback from the committee.

- Rob Steen suggests the next meeting includes Tom McKean, Director, Barnstable Health Division, and Tom Lee, Chair, Barnstable Board of Health and have these discussions. This allows additional time for the committee to finalize the talking points and have the Health Division/Board of Health present to weigh in. At the end of the meeting, the talking points would be formalized.
- Zee notes the meeting could be split, with half dedicated to discussing the points and the other half hammering out draft language. He thinks the topics can be what can be addressed from a regulatory standpoint, what can be addressed from an incentives standpoint, and longer-term impacts looking at how to lower the cost but accelerate the treatment. That, to him, is largely Phase 3 and theoretical but could be triggered to start.

Scott adds that the talking points document does not need to be rewritten until after the next meeting when we meet with the Health Division/Board of Health. From there we can go into detail.

- Rob Steen asks Councilor Clark about the timing of the 5-year update report. Much of the report discusses what has been done in the last 5 years. There will also be a report about what the committee is discussing. He asks if it makes sense to give the “new” stuff to Town Council, then review the other stuff as desired. He asks if we are crafting orders or creating a workshop discussion or some other mechanism.
  - Councilor Clark responds she will discuss with Councilor Tamash about the preferred method. She notes the agendas are getting jammed up with various discussions. She understands this discussion is time sensitive. The report is an action item.
- Scott asks to confirm that Rob Steen envisions the Town Council looking at these recommendations, then recommending the Board of Health to make the changes.
  - Rob Steen responds that some of it is uncertain whether it is Board of Health or not. That is a conversation to be had at the next meeting. The council will say what they want to do, then delegate them to the relevant agency which it lives with.
  - Councilor Clark recommends utilizing the Legal Department for this.
- Dan clarifies a point made by Zee on the last bullet item. Both “in lieu of” and “in addition to” have been used to address Phase Three and implementing I/A technology. These are vastly different, and it is worth thinking about.
  - Scott responds that he interprets these actions as being in addition to. In 10-20 years, we will find out either the I/A systems don’t work as well as we thought they would or are too expensive and need to sewer, or we find out I/As work better than we thought and save the town a bunch of money. There is not a known answer to this, but the proposal provides a good starting point.
  - Zee responds that his approach is “in lieu of, if it works”.

- Zee adds that this discussion only pertains to alternative septic systems. The other activities, such as the restoration of the Marstons Mills River system, are low-hanging fruit with a potentially much lower cost and quicker benefit. He does not want to miss the opportunity. A headline of the group should be “we need to continue to pursue alternative technologies, whatever they may be. Climate change is happening and will only create additional problems in the ponds and estuaries.
- Councilor Starr asks if the watershed where Phase 3 is located needs 100% nitrogen removal.
  - Rob Steen responds that there are aspects of the plan that show that it is correct. The argument is the combination of all the alternatives will make an impact, but the magnitude of the impact is not known. The CWMP has always been written as providing data to MassDEP to show outcomes from the alternatives. A counter argument is the timing of samples being before any new development, with nitrogen making its way down, therefore MEP is undershooting.

#### **Public Comment/Questions**

No matters were heard.

#### **Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair**

- Councilor Starr notes he would like to discuss Braggs Lane at some point. 65% of the nitrogen needs to come out, and if we put in I/As now we could cover that and never need to sewer it.
  - Dan responds that sewers and I/A don’t do the same thing. Sewers take out 100% of the nitrogen.
  - Councilor Starr notes that we don’t need to take out all the nitrogen.
  - Dan responds that it takes the nitrogen from each home. We would need to take out 100% of the nitrogen from the areas we’ve identified.
  - Griffin responds that we would need to expand the area. Some math could be run to see if that is possible.
  - Rob Steen notes that if a target is 65% nitrogen, it is 65% of the existing nitrogen. It is 100% of any new nitrogen.
  - Griffin notes that the plan is based on what MEP said had to be removed.
  - Amber clarifies that the removal is within the sub-watershed to Millway.
  - Griffin notes there are two sub-watersheds that need to be addressed there.

#### **Adjournment**

Scott Horsley, Chair, entertains a motion to adjourn. Councilor Clark moves to adjourn the meeting. Lousie O’Neil seconds. The meeting is adjourned at 8:00 PM.

*Respectfully submitted by Christopher Gadd, Communications Assistant, Barnstable Department of Public Works*

# Addendum 1: Proposed Meeting Topics

All meetings are subject to change. Official agendas will be posted to the Town of Barnstable's Website in accordance with Open Meeting Laws.

Meeting Held/Topic Discussed
Next Meeting/Topic
Future Meeting/Topic

- Meeting #1 (Held Tuesday, October 22, 2024)
  - Introductions and overview of Town Council & DPW wishes for the committee.
- Meeting #2 (Held Monday, November 18, 2024)
  - Opportunity to ask questions from assigned homework to get up to speed on the current CWMP.
- Meeting #3 (Held Monday, December 16, 2024)
  - Presentation on Enhanced Innovative & Alternative Septic Systems.
- Meeting #4 (Held Tuesday, January 28, 2025)
  - Presentation on Growth
  - Presentation on Accessory Dwelling Units
- Meeting #5 (Held Tuesday, March 4, 2025)
  - Presentation on Additional Alternatives such as dredging and cranberry bog restoration
    - Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works
  - Presentation on overall approach to funding of the CWMP
    - Mark Milne, Director, Finance Division
- Meeting #6 (Held March 31, 2025)
  - Discussion with Board of Health/Health Division on relevant policies
    - Tom McKean, Director, Health Division
    - Tom Lee, Chair, Board of Health
- Meeting #7 (Held April 22, 2025)
  - Discussion of the view of the CWMP through the lens of the Local Comprehensive Plan (LCP)
    - James Kupfer, Director, Planning Board
- Meeting #8 (Held May 19, 2025)
  - Formulation of recommendations to be made to Town Council
- Meeting #9 (Held on June 16, 2025)
  - Continuation of Formulation of Recommendations
- Meeting #10 (Scheduled for July 15, 2025)
  - Continuation of Formulation of Recommendations
- Meeting #11 (Tentatively August)
  - Update on Water Pollution Control Facility nitrogen reduction upgrade and effluent disposal evaluations
    - Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works
- Meeting #12 (Tentatively September)
  - Review of feedback from Town Council on proposed recommendations
  - Around this time the goal is to make presentations to Town Council
- Meeting #13 (Tentatively October)
  - Final recommendations, discussions, and any other related topics.
- Meeting #14 (Tentatively November)
  - Hold for final discussions.
- Meeting #15 (Tentatively December)
  - Potentially not needed
  - CWMP must be submitted to MassDEP in December 2025

## Addendum 2: Potential Policy Discussion Items

### Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

- *Information on ADUs was presented by James Kupfer at the 01/28/25 Meeting.*
- ADUs recently became codified under Massachusetts Law
- Specific questions pertaining to ADUs include:
  - Can sewerage and I/As incentivize ADUs, and vice versa?

### Grinder Pumps

- *A request for this practice to be discussed was made by a resident through the DPW staff.*
- The current practice for grinder pumps is the first pump is purchased by the Town then becomes the responsibility of the property owner.
- Specific questions pertaining to grinder pumps include:
  - Should the existing practice be formulated/continued as is?

### Innovative/Alternative (I/A) Systems

- *Information on I/A Systems was presented by Zee Crocker at the 12/16/24 Meeting.*
- Enhanced I/A systems are approaching general approval by MassDEP, and the committee could evaluate recommending I/A systems as part of the CWMP.
- Specific questions pertaining to I/A systems would include:
  - How to determine the usage of specific technologies
  - When could I/A systems be required to be used?
  - How could I/A systems be implemented & funded?
  - Would I/A systems be used in specific watersheds or across town?

### Private Roads

- *A request for this practice to be discussed was made by DPW Staff*
- The current practice for private roads is for the Town to obtain an easement for sewer installation.
- Specific questions pertaining to private roads include:
  - Should the existing practice be continued as is?
  - Alternatively, should the Town take the road?

## Sidewalks

- *A request for this practice to be discussed was made by DPW Staff*
- The current practice for sidewalks is to not include them in a CWMP project, instead submitting them as their own individual project.
- Specific questions pertaining to sidewalks include:
  - Should the existing practice be continued as is?

## State Revolving Fund (SRF) and 0% Interest Loans

- *Information on SRFs and 0% interest loans was presented by Andrew Gottlieb at the 01/28/25 Meeting.*
- Town Council is workshopping potential changes.