



BARNSTABLE
Water Resources



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

Meeting Minutes

Date: September 15, 2025

**Location: Department of Public Works Conference Room, 382 Falmouth Road,
Hyannis, MA 02602**

*This meeting is being recorded and will be posted for future viewing on the Town of Barnstable's
Government Access Channel:*

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

Committee Members Present (In-Person):

Brian Hughes, Chair; Tom Cambareri; Zee Crocker; Louise O'Neil; Butch Roberts; Glenn Snell; Kris Clark,
Town Council; Gordon Starr, Town Council

Committee Members Present (Via Zoom):

Scott Horsley, Chair

Committee Members Absent:

Rob O'Leary; Paul Neary, Town Council

Others in Attendance:

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 Manager, Department of Public Works; Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant,
Department of Public Works; Liberty Jackson, Intern, Department of Public Works

Agenda:

Call to Order

Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, called the September 15, 2025 meeting of the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan Ad Hoc Committee to order at 5:01 PM. The meeting of the committee was held in a hybrid fashion, with committee members attending both in the Department of Public Works Conference Room at 382 Falmouth Road in Hyannis and virtually via Zoom.

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

- a) Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, entertains a motion to approve the August 12, 2025 meeting minutes. Councilor Clark moves to approve the minutes. Zee Crocker seconds. The committee votes to approve the August 12, 2025 meeting minutes.

Roll Call: Louise O’Neil (Abstain); Glenn Snell (Yes); Butch Roberts (Yes); Tom Cambareri (Yes); Zee Crocker (Yes); Brian Hughes, Vice Chair (Yes); Scott Horsley, Chair (Yes); Kris Clark, Town Council (Yes)

d) Next Meeting

- a) Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, opens the discussion by inquiring about possible meeting 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, October 14, 2025 at 5:00 PM in the Selectman’s Conference Room, Town Hall.

Review of Proposed Policy Recommendation on Innovative/Alternative Technology Implementation

Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, opens the discussion by commenting that the committee is mandated to submit recommendations to the Town Council to help guide the next five years of the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan (CWMP), which he provides brief reasoning for.

Councilor Starr joins the meeting in-person

He notes his recommendation that, in addition to the existing sewer expansion and the topic of innovative/alternative septic systems that the committee is currently reviewing, we recommend Town Council move to return cranberry bogs back to their original state. Priority should be given to those bogs near properties that are not currently, and are not planned to be, sewerred. He also recommends removing nitrogen compounds from stream banks and other proven and effective methods of removing nitrogen from groundwater. He brings this up as the recommendation for I/A Septic Systems addresses nitrogen at the current point sources. It does not reduce the nitrogen that is already in the groundwater.

- Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, asks what Brian means when he refers to removing nitrogen sources from stream banks and asks if Zee Crocker has any details.
 - Brian responds that he does not have the specifics, only that it was mentioned in a previous meeting.
 - Zee indicates he is uncertain what would be involved with this action.
 - Rob notes his uncertainty about what would be involved, assuming it would entail physically removing the soil and replacing it with non-nitrogen-rich soil.
 - Zee adds that the reference may be focusing on properties near streams that the committee wants to address. If the recommendation is to put a requirement within 1,000 feet of a waterbody, the recommendation should also include 1,000 feet from a stream.
- Rob notes that he and Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, have worked to compile the recommendations over the last year.

Chris hands out a packet of recommendations and questions to those in attendance

- Tom Cambareri asks if what Brian read is an introduction to the packet of recommendations.
 - Brian responds it is an introduction to it and in addition to it. The committee has been focusing on the point sources but nothing that focuses on cleaning up existing groundwater. He proposes recommending actions to look into this and address it.
- Tom asks if this is something that will be handed out or voted on today.
 - Brian responds there is nothing to be voted on yet.
 - Rob responds that the assumption is the document Chris handed out is a collection of what has been said at previous meetings, put into a format that shapes a recommendation which could be brought to Town Council for a vote. He assumes that what Brian read is a preamble to the recommendation.
 - Brian clarifies that what he read is an addition. He believes it is vital to the committee's efforts as only addressing point sources is not enough to remove nitrogen.
- Zee notes he has an existing project in the cranberry bogs and fully agrees with Brian. If there are recommendations for the Town Council, one of the key things should be the action that can

remove the most nitrogen, the soonest, at the lowest cost. This would be the ongoing cranberry bog restoration and potentially others. However, there is a lot to talk about in the existing packet regarding I/A technology.

- Brian notes he does not mean to hijack the conversation, only to get the idea out there.
- Scott Horsley, Chair, refers to the recommendation document and notes a previous discussion on how to determine what the 1,000-foot setback is measured from.
 - Chris notes the recommendation refers to Title 5, as indicated in footnote 1.
 - Scott clarifies his question to be if we are measuring from the high-water line, low-water line, etc.
 - Councilor Clark notes that mean low water is usually used as the standard for measurement.
 - Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works, recommends using the MassGIS Property Lines Data Layer. This is something that is very accessible, including through the Town's property maps system. There could be disputes over some property lines and whether they are impacted by the 1,000-foot buffer.
 - Tom notes his agreement with this approach, as using mean low water can lose some room
- Brian asks Amber in regard to the GIS suggestion if it is acceptable as when you access it through the Town website it says the GIS map should not be used to make property boundary determinations.
 - Amber notes this is true, but if a different approach is taken you would have to accurately define everyone's property line. Additionally, mean water lines change over time.
- Rob notes that the 1,000-foot boundary the committee has decided on is not based on science and is the committee's opinion. If the difference between the GIS map and the mean water line is 5 feet, you are still capturing a good number of properties, especially as an initial effort.
- Scott asks, regarding the suggestion of parcels within 1,000 feet of surface water that feeds into a nitrogen sensitive waterbody, whether consideration has been given to ponds which aren't connected by surface water but are connected through groundwater.
 - Rob responds that this is written as the committee said it. The idea of including ponds did not occur to him. If the committee wishes, ponds can be added.
 - Scott notes that it will be helpful to clarify water feeding into a waterbody either through surface water or through groundwater.
- Zee suggests adding language to the effect of "at a later date it should be examined and potentially recommended I/A systems within 1,000 feet of all ponds." To him, the future will be based on the availability and effectiveness of phosphorous removing systems.

- Rob notes that his hope is at the next 5-year update phosphorous I/A systems will be a viable tool. He notes at the onset of the CWMP nitrogen I/A systems were not yet viable, and now they are.
- Butch Roberts notes a recent presentation he attended which indicated that some ponds are already unable to remove as much nitrogen as is being put into the groundwater. He doesn't see why this shouldn't be a town-wide requirement, as opposed to limiting it to 1,000 feet. There is still nitrogen being put into the groundwater. Why not say Title 5 Systems don't work and need to be replaced. This would still be based on the triggers.
 - Councilor Starr expands on Zee's statement that phosphorous I/A systems should be coming through quickly. Making someone put in a nitrogen I/A system then making them switch to a phosphorous I/A system does not seem to be a good approach.
 - Butch notes we wouldn't be making people switch at this point.
 - Councilor Starr responds that phosphorous systems would be more efficient. If you are upstream from a pond, it is better to put in a phosphorous system in 5 years than to put in a nitrogen system now.
 - Brian clarifies the replacement is when a system breaks or the title is transferred.
- Zee suggests a possible recommendation to identify zones within ponds and lakes that are the contributing areas. The area is likely to be a fraction of the pond, not the whole pond.
 - Rob asks if this would be based on current understanding or if a study should be done at each one. He notes previous studies that disproved understandings and assumptions near Shubael Pond
 - Zee responds it should be a study, which shouldn't be too hard.
 - Rob asks if it should be done on great ponds or all ponds. He notes there are over 150 ponds in town.
 - Zee responds it should be done on all great ponds
 - Rob notes he is not disagreeing, just trying to get more details
 - Zee notes this is just one suggestion and isn't perfect. To him, this is a version of the 1,000-foot boundary where we focus on the areas known to be contributing to the problem.
- Butch notes we know Title 5 Systems are contributing nitrogen into the groundwater table and that's a problem. He reiterates that he doesn't believe they should be allowed to be installed in town. He agrees that we will want to utilize phosphorous systems when they are ready. Speaking hypothetically, he asks if someone were to install a nitrogen system then would we require them to upgrade to a phosphorous system? He doesn't see this being a problem.
 - Louise O'Neil asks to clarify that Butch is suggesting removing "1,000-feet" and "nitrogen sensitive waterbodies" from the recommendation.
 - Butch responds this is correct.

- Zee notes it sounds like Butch is attempting to “go big or go home”. He opines that this committee has worked to engineer an approach that is manageable enough to start the process, which he feels is more likely to be adopted by the Town Council.
- Brian notes there are three options on the table: (1) All Ponds, (2) Ponds that have been studied individually, or (3) 1,000 feet. The 1,000 feet approach seems to be the easiest.
 - Rob clarifies that Butch is saying to get rid of any delineation and just require I/A systems everywhere in town.
 - Butch responds this is correct.
 - Rob notes this is how it was done with the change from cesspools to Title 5 septic systems.
- Tom notes we have to figure out what the nexus for the town is in the face of the nitrogen-sensitive area regulations.
 - Zee notes this is likely to get challenged legally.
 - Tom agrees but adds there is enough science to show that nitrogen is bad for the aquifer and therefore the Town. This approach would be an additional level of resources above the CWMP, and would be asked of the homeowners, not the town. It is a difficult situation.
- Scott opines that it sounds great to make the plan more expansive, but he remembers what Zee has frequently said about not letting “perfect” be the death of “good”. He believes the draft 1,000-foot idea is a really good starting point and notes that some technologies don’t yet have general approval. There is likely to be pushback on that but is happy to know the Board of Health is willing to move forward with this idea. This is a good starting point and has a relatively fast response time. On the topic of cost, he notes a conversation about a possible financial opportunity that will be brought up later in the meeting. While the draft language may not be ideal for everyone, it is a really good starting point.
- Councilor Clark asks if the proposed recommendations would be a Zoning Proposal.
 - Scott responds these are likely to be a Health Regulation.
 - Rob responds it will most likely be a Health Regulation.
 - Councilor Clark notes that a Zoning Change requires two-thirds of the full council to approve.
- Rob asks Councilor Clark, as her precinct is not anticipated to receive sewer and the proposal from Butch would require I/A systems everywhere, what are her thoughts as a councilor about how people may react.
 - Councilor Clark responds that any councilor will hear “we don’t want to be inconvenienced”. The justification needs to be made very clear and with paths for financing.

- Rob agrees with Butch that, in an ideal world, a Title 5 System would not be allowed to be put back. His guess is there will be a hard enough effort to get the 1,000-foot approach through Town Council.
 - Butch responds that part of his thinking is that if the Town Council has the opportunity to modify or shoot down the recommendation. If this happens and momentum is lost, the approach will never come to fruition.
 - Zee suggests part of the recommendation includes Town Council pursuing the Legislature to allow for tax incentives. We've heard these have to be through the State Legislature. This will take several years to accomplish. It becomes a tool to use when and if it's needed. This may be a good start to Butch's approach. Whatever the solution is, it will cost money.
- Rob moves the discussion onto the third recommendation, which pertains to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU). He notes this came from the Board of Health/Health Division. He adds that the ADU recommendation is not locked into the 1,000-foot buffer and would apply townwide. There is a little of what Butch is looking for in recommendation number three, based on individual choice.
 - Councilor Clark notes this is a good point.
 - Butch responds this is very good.
 - Brian notes this does help encourage ADUs
- Butch suggests at least including information about the recommendation throughout town in the preamble of the recommendations.
- Zee notes the ADU recommendation could be sweetened by allowing for both an ADU and/or additional bedrooms. The only requirement would be not going over the 660 limit. This provides even more flexibility for people.
- Brian asks if the extra bedroom approach would have to be a zoning change.
 - Zee notes his assumption that it would be handled by the Board of Health
 - Rob responds that he is uncertain
 - Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works, responds this is normally calculated by the septic system for a single-family unit.
- Councilor Starr notes that once sewer is installed there is no limitation on bedrooms.
 - Griffin responds that this is currently correct.
 - Brian disagrees with there being no limitation on bedrooms as when he was going onto sewer, he was told they had to limit the bedrooms to the previous amount under a septic system.

- Councilor Starr notes this is incorrect, and he's seen units with multiple bedrooms after connecting to sewer.
- Rob notes he is less familiar with the Board of Health requirements but understands that once sewer is installed, the bedroom limitation goes away.
- Griffin notes his understanding that there would be no restriction.
- Zee notes you can go down Strawberry Hill Road and see the changes immediately.
- Tom agrees with Zee, and notes that when sewer went in at Common Fields in Barnstable Village around 1979 a similar effect occurred where houses started getting bigger because people weren't restricted by their septic system anymore.

[Amended 11/18/25 to correct the date from 1989 to 1979 and change "lots" to "houses"]

- Councilor Starr opines that Board of Health should look at putting a limit on the number of bedrooms allowed, suggesting the Title 5 allowance plus one. He notes there is also a flow neutral policy and can't, through the CWMP, produce more effluent than the plan allows.
 - Zee notes that this recommendation would be the allowed amount under Title 5 plus two, with an ADU. In his mind, wastewater should not be zoning control. Additionally, bedrooms are a blunt instrument. There are houses that have 6-7 bedrooms but 17-20 bathrooms. Zoning needs to be tackled but can't be done by this committee.
- Tom asks where the 660 gallons per day (gpd) comes from and wonders how it is derived from the 440 gpd.
 - Zee notes that there have been several looks at this, and in certain zones this is actually 330 gpd. This came from the State Regulations which were modified. Tom McKean and Tom Lee from the Health Division and Board of Health were at the meeting when they referred to the 660 gpd. The devil is in the details so it should be figured out.
 - Rob reiterates that the proposed recommendation comes from the Board of Health
 - Zee notes that the discussion should, as previously suggested, focus on load and not flow. Systems should be categorized by their load, so an amount of 10 mg/L could be used and there would be higher confidence in the calculations.
- Chris adds a response from Tom McKean to questions posed after the last meeting pertaining to the 440mgd/660mgd question as follows
 - Please note that it is presently allowable for limited circumstances, specifically on small lots with proposals of less than 4 bedrooms within Zone II nitrogen sensitive areas as per Section 310 CMR 15.217. Please also note that there is a variance provision provided within the Town of Barnstable Code entitled Article XV Protection of Estuaries. It provides each applicant with the ability to propose innovative-alternative technology in order to exceed the flow restrictions. However, there is no option provided within the Town of Barnstable Code entitled Chapter 232 Wastewater Discharge, for an applicant to introduce enhanced Innovative/Alternative (I/A) technology as an option to provide

additional wastewater discharges (i.e. to construct additional bedrooms) within a GP or WP Districts of greater than 330 gallons on parcels of less than 1.33 acres in size. These two districts cover approximately 60% of the Town. The Barnstable Health Department receives inquiries each month and applicants are faced with this roadblock issue. To fix this problem, this Committee could propose to the Town Council adoption of an amendment to this Code - to provide a variance provision similar to the variance provision provided in the Estuary Protection Code.

- Griffin adds that ultimately the I/A approval process from MassDEP allows for a greater load per acre. 660 gpd has been traditionally used for nitrogen systems. On the MassDEP website there is reference to 660 gpd for Nitrex. There is not a reference for Nitroe, but no reason is given, and the assumption can be made it will be 660 gpd too.
- Tom asks to confirm this is the regulation through the state, noting that many towns on the cape utilize 330 gpd. He believes the Town should point to the state regulations and the numbers should be reconciled.
 - Brian asks if the town regulations override the state in this case
 - Councilor Clark and Griffin responded that this is correct, and the town can be more restrictive than the state.
 - Tom again notes that most towns on the Cape have taken this approach as these communities came up with a nitrogen loading formula before the state did.
 - Zee notes it is a very complicated kettle of fish. He notes an intricacy when looking at water usage where the actual numbers barely reach 330 gpd by almost half.
 - Tom notes this is because of the actual flow being less. He asks if we were to allow for the 660 gpd, is that based on the engineering approach or are we actually allowing 330 gpd.
 - Zee again notes that it should be regulated by milligrams per liter.
- Scott opines that this draft is pretty good. He hears several good ideas but wants to move forward with something that will have acceptance. He asks Councilor Clark about her thoughts on how this would be accepted by the Town Council.
 - Councilor Clark responds that it depends when the recommendation comes to the Town Council. There is an election in a few months that will change the landscape for the Council.
 - Scott opines that what is drafted seems good and could go further but is a really good start.
- Zee suggests Tom work to reconcile the numbers. Otherwise, there will be lawyers involved. If we are doing this, we need to justify it. We need to understand the granularity of the numbers.
 - Tom agrees with this.

- Rob asks if the best approach is for the committee to review the recommendations over the next month, then it can be voted on at the next meeting in October.
 - Zee notes his agreement with that and that assistance may be needed from DPW
- Rob asks Councilor Clark about their feelings on bringing this to Town Council prior to or after the election.
 - Councilor Clark responds it doesn't seem there will be a choice, that this will not be ready prior to the election.
 - Brian notes it seems silly to give Town Council a recommendation a few weeks before the election.
 - Councilor Clark adds it will seem rushed and do no favors for the committee.
- Councilor Starr asks how these recommendations might be rolled out to the public and whether a forum would be needed to show maps of where this would take effect.
 - Kelly Collopy, Communications Manager, Department of Public Works, notes the forum is a definite possibility. A communications campaign would have to be put together as with any project. She recalls that when the CWMP began Rob did a traveling roadshow to help get the word out and explain the plan more. There will be a series of events. The DPW has had a lot of success with print mailing. Regardless of how it's done, it will have to be multi-faceted.
 - Brian notes that recent issues in Town have caused concern amongst residents, the more communication that occurs prior to the recommendation, the better.
- Tom asks, as the committee reports to Town Council, whether it is the committee's responsibility to conduct the outreach.
 - Kelly responds it is not the committee's responsibility. The majority of communications would occur after the adoption of the recommendation, though there would likely be communications to let people know in advance of the adoption. She notes a sense of frustration from residents about not knowing when items are appearing before Town Council. The communications would come from the Town/DPW, not from the committee. However, feedback is always welcome from the committee.
- Councilor Clark asks if the draft recommendations should go before the Board of Health for their input. She suggests raising the profile of the recommendations. This will also give the public a peek at what is coming down the pipeline.
 - Rob asks if the committee is ready to take that approach. He agrees with the approach but does not want to go before the Board of Health multiple times because edits were made to the recommendations.
 - Councilor Clark acknowledges this but notes that they are the ones making the decisions and hearing the petitions, it will be worthwhile getting in front of the people who facilitate this and help the Board of Health.

- Zee suggests it wouldn't hurt for Tom McKean and Tom Lee to take a look at the recommendations and weigh in.
 - Scott agrees with Councilor Clark and notes it will be convincing when this goes in front of the Town Council to have had feedback from the Board of Health. There seems to be good traction with the Board of Health.
- Rob suggests we share the current draft recommendations with Tom McKean and Tom Lee, but not the entire Board of Health, to get initial feedback. In the meantime, this committee will work on refining the recommendations. Next month a vote occurs to push the recommendations forward and from there present to Board of Health, get their approval along with other departments including Legal and Finance, then go in front of Town Council. That will give a full suite to Town Council of people who have vetted the plan.
 - Several members of the committee agree with this approach.
 - Zee, in noting his agreement, reiterates that adding bedrooms to the language pertaining to 660 gallons per acre can drum up excitement and help reduce nitrogen. He can also see it leading to mansion-ization and bigger houses where they are not desired.
 - Rob notes, as an observer and not as DPW, that there appears to be a political movement that changed from "we need housing" to "no housing". There is bound to be some constituency that is not happy about this.
- Brian asks to confirm that the committee does not wish to change the 660 gallons per acre to a milligram per liter metric.
 - Rob notes this is what is being discussed for the next meeting.
 - Zee notes this needs to be figured out by Tom Cambareri and what makes sense.
 - Griffin adds that there is some discussion needed with the Town Attorney to ensure the proposed amendment would apply to the correct chapter and go before the correct group. Chapter 232 is a Town Council regulation, not a Board of Health regulation.
- Tom asks if this applies to a zoning district.
 - Griffin responds that it is not necessarily. Chapter 232 does refer to limitations of 330 gallons per acre within Zone 2 areas.
- Councilor Starr notes that Zee made a great point in looking at the financial impact of the recommendations.
 - Rob notes there are two more pages to the recommendations, and Scott has additional financial items to discuss. He requests to come back to the financial items later in the meeting, after the discussion on proposed draft policy recommendations is had.
- Rob notes there were some questions that came up as the recommendations were being made that the committee could weigh in on. One pertains to the stages of the CWMP. The wording of the recommendations utilizes Phases 1 and 2, with no mention of the stages. The DPW has

typically said the stages are probably in Phase 2 but has not made that determination officially. The second question pertains to existing I/A systems already in the ground which may not be compliant with the best available technology list, and what approach should be taken with those systems.

- Tom asks, in regard to existing I/A systems, how it's handled if sewers are brought to their property.
 - Rob responds they are required to connect to sewer.
- Zee opines that the property either needs to be connected to sewer or connected to a system that achieves a specific level of nitrogen reduction. They may get extra time, although there may be a desire to upgrade soon due to the extra costs of monitoring the system. There could be a financial incentive for the people who are trying to do the right thing.
 - Councilor Clark notes that the property owner should not be penalized.
 - Zee agrees, as the property owner is trying to do the right thing.
 - Rob notes that an approach is to let the system run out its natural life and when it dies, select the system from the list of best available technologies, essentially the approach used with Title 5.
 - Councilor Clark notes it will likely be less expensive as technology advances.
 - Zee notes that fully approved technology will be monitored less than these systems. Some of the technologies on the list are approved but not working as well as they should.
 - Tom notes that the "end of life" approach sounds reasonable.
 - Chris asks to confirm that existing systems should be treated essentially as a Title 5
 - Various members of the committee note their agreement.
- Rob asks if anyone would like to opine on the question pertaining to the stages or if the DPW should just deal with it.
 - Councilor Clark responds to have DPW deal with it.
- Zee asks what the costs for the stages are. He notes concern with the Town affording Phase 2 as it exists, let alone with the stages.
 - Rob responds that the information on cost can be sent. The stages need to be done. They are only separated from the Phases because the approach wasn't certain at the time of the initial CWMP. The sewer needs to get out there first, so not before Phase 2. That has always been an internal conversation and Rob wanted to give the committee a chance to opine on it
- Tom asks for clarity about where the stages are.
 - Rob responds it is in Cotuit.

- Griffin responds the Stages are not in Phases 1, 2, or 3. They are technically three separate projects that don't have a time associated with them.
 - Rob adds context that the entire watershed was nitrogen traded. There were conversations about utilizing Joint Base Cape Cod, and the options were left hanging. The alternative options to send it outside of Town seem to be off the table at this point. He reiterates that no committee has ever opined on placing the stages in Phase 2, that has always been DPW saying it.
- Councilor Starr notes that most of the white areas around the stages would be covered by the 1,000-foot recommendation.
 - Rob responds that it is correct, and the question becomes whether the people included in the Stage should be excluded from the 1,000-foot recommendation.
- Scott notes a recent meeting in Cotuit, attended by DPW Staff, and there is a desire to clean up the drinking water and the bay in Cotuit. They are definitely interested in how this fits into the CWMP.
- Tom notes that, looking at the distance from Shoestring Bay, it seems those properties would be included.
 - Zee notes it seems that the properties would be included, but there is additional nuance. It is one of the most critical areas in the town. He notes also that the Town's contribution to the bay is low, around 10%.
- Tom asks where Mashpee is installing their sewers, recalling he heard Mashpee Neck
 - Rob notes he is uncertain
 - Chris notes they are doing sewer along Route 151 for sure.
- Rob asks if the committee wishes to weigh in on question 1, regarding the stages of the CWMP.
 - Zee requests the DPW come up with cost numbers and likelihood and then talk more about it and possible options. He wonders how much of it would be included in the 1,000-foot recommendation.
 - Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works, responds that most of the parcels would be picked up by the recommendation.
- Councilor Starr asks if the stages could physically be done at the same time as Phase 2
 - Rob clarifies that the phases are just a time construct. This would lock the stages into that time construct.
- Griffin notes there are 890 parcels within the stages
 - Zee wonders how many are included within the 1,000-foot recommendation.

- Rob and Griffinn respond that most of them should be within the 1,000-foot recommendation.
- Zee notes this is a big chunk of the total properties impacted by the 1,000-foot recommendation.
- Tom notes it is a far reach as it is across town.
- Zee notes he is not skeptical of the engineering but is skeptical of the cost and other considerations. He wonders if the area could be a small cluster system.
- Chris pulls up a map from a previous meeting that includes the number of parcels in the 1,000-foot recommendation, broken up into the stages.
 - Griffin notes there are about 100 parcels that are outside of the 1,000-foot recommendation.
- Rob continues the discussion by noting several items the committee had previously discussed but were not included in these recommendations and provide an opportunity to discuss them further.
 - Rob notes the first item pertains to cesspools, whether any action should be made to track them down, and a counter-debate about the effort needed.
 - Rob notes the second item pertains to financial elements, which the discussion will return to.
 - Rob notes the third item comes from when Tom McKean was at the meeting and identified a property variance within 100' as low-hanging fruit that could be implemented almost immediately.
 - Rob notes the fourth item pertains to his discussion about Phase 3.
 - Rob concludes that these items do not need to be acted on, but while the recommendations are under review these may come up again.
- Councilor Starr asks for clarification on the third item (property variance within 100')
 - Rob responds that there are existing regulations for properties within 100' of a waterbody. Tom McKean indicated they could add to that regulation a requirement to use I/A systems. This feeds into the broader discussion of the 1,000-foot boundary which would likely pick these parcels up, but there may be some nuance that hasn't been identified by DPW staff. There is an assumption that implementing the 1,000-foot boundary will encompass the 100' variance.
 - Zee notes the 100' may apply to areas outside of those we are talking about.
 - Tom notes the 100' is townwide
 - Chris notes that the 100' applies to environmental buffers, or a similar specification.
- Zee opines, on the cesspool topic, that any cesspools that are found should be upgraded to the best available technology but is uncertain how to make that happen.

- Rob responds that, by definition, cesspools are in failure. It's a matter of inspection to find them. Is it worth attempting some GIS mapping and figuring out where cesspools may possibly be. There were discussions that identified potential reasons why the effort wouldn't be worth the work.
- Tom notes the question arises of penalizing those who have had cesspools, possibly outside of nitrogen sensitive areas, and have them put an I/A system in.

[Amended 11/18/25 to: Tom notes the potential policy of requiring properties with cesspools to upgrade to I/A systems instead of Title 5 Septic Systems in areas outside of nitrogen sensitive areas would penalize said properties.]

- Councilor Clark notes she would be okay with Tom's suggestion.
- Zee notes that a possible change is to modify the ability to "pass on" the cesspool through inheritance.
- Brian notes Zee's approach is similar to how the I/A system discussion is occurring as it includes title change.
 - Zee responds he is largely correct, but currently if the house is passed down to a child the property owner can keep cesspool.
- Rob asks if the house is passed down, is it considered a title change
 - Griffin responds that it is often put into a trust, which is the loophole. If there isn't a mortgage, you don't need an inspection. It's in the details of the transfer where these items come to light.
- Councilor Starr asks if we could add on a requirement to putting in a Title 5 System which would require the physical space needed for an I/A system.
 - Zee notes his assumption that the Title 5 regulations already include an expansion area.
 - Griffin clarifies that the expansion area is for the leaching field, and nothing else could be put on it.
 - Councilor Starr notes there could still be space added between the tank and the leaching field
 - Zee agrees
- Butch asks if someone with an existing cesspool is already going through the effort of putting in a Title 5 system, why not require them to put in an I/A system
 - Tom and Councilor Starr agree with this approach
- Rob continues to the final page of the recommendations packet, which relates to questions for Town Council. He notes the question has been discussed at previous meetings and is presented here for further discussion.

- Brian asks why he, as a property owner, should be asked to subsidize a septic system
 - Rob notes the argument of those not receiving sewer subsidizing the sewer system by way of their taxes. He alludes to constituents likely saying they're not spending a dime for the sewers. This is trying to provide some benefit to those who will never get the benefit of sewer. He notes this is the devil's advocate approach.
 - Councilor Clark notes the cost of sewer was a primary topic during her run for Town Council, with many saying they don't want to pay for "that Hyannis sewer", as they were in West Barnstable. She understands that but is uncertain if the question will be appreciated as a way to benefit. It may cause more "indigestion" from covering the cost at the Water Pollution Control Facility.
- Brian asks if we know the number of septic systems that would potentially be covered by this question.
 - Rob responds it is the white areas of the map
 - Rob, Griffin, and Zee identify the number of parcels in Town as approximately 27,000. Approximately 16,000 are ultimately being sewered, therefore approximately 11,000 parcels that have a septic system and would fall under this policy.
 - Zee notes the question becomes how this could be afforded. He adds that I/A systems will need to be monitored and pumped more often.
- Griffin asks if this was intended for townwide or as an incentive for I/A systems
 - Rob responds this was previously discussed as being townwide, as it would deal with the places not receiving I/A systems. It could also be done in the 1,000-foot boundary.
 - Councilor Clark notes tying the approach to I/A systems could be beneficial and wouldn't disable the funding for the Water Pollution Control Facility.
- Scott wonders if there are two costs associated with transferring from onsite systems to a centralized system. He asks if the sludge disposal cost goes up as more people connect to sewer and is that in addition to the potential loss of revenue.
 - Rob clarifies that the question about free pumping is not for properties being connected to sewer. This is an incentive to those not going on sewer for free pumping. He notes that the costs for sludge disposal and other items do go up as more people connect, but that also brings annual sewer fees.
 - Tom notes that the currently identified 25% of revenue from septic pumping will change vastly once the CWMP is completed and all properties connected.

[Amended 11/18/25 to: Tom notes that the currently identified 25% of revenue from septic pumping will change vastly once the CWMP is completed and all properties connected.]

- Zee notes the costs may drastically change, as it is something we do not control. Currently sludge is brought to Rhode Island for disposal, and there is always a possibility of that getting shut down.
- Rob notes that Andrew Boule, Supervisor, Water Pollution Control Division, is currently looking at alternative disposal options. He clarifies that the presented question is more for residents in districts not getting sewer and trying to get them some benefit.
- Councilor Clark notes a variation on this could be a “septage sale” during the winter, when there is less septage being produced. Perhaps a discount could be given in the winter months.
 - Rob responds he is unsure if people would want to dig up their yards in the wintertime.
 - Councilor Clark notes it hasn’t snowed in the past few years
- Rob wraps up the discussion on the recommendation packet, noting everyone will review it over the next month and we will reconvene in October to further discuss.

Public Comment/Questions

- Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, opens the floor for public comment.

Grinder Pumps

- Kelly Collopy, Communications Manager, Department of Public Works, notes an email received from John Lynch, who previously spoke to the committee regarding grinder pumps.

Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, distributes a printed copy of the email from John Lynch.

- Kelly notes the email reinforces the ideas brought up at the last meeting. This includes considering a credit for properties with grinder pumps and the town negotiating a longer warranty for grinder pumps.
- Brian notes that grinder pumps are something the committee will need to consider.
- Tom Cambareri notes, separate to the email but related, that he also has suggestions to be included on the topics for the recommendations. There was a multitude of topics listed on an earlier agenda for consideration, and a considerable amount of time has been spent on the I/A topic. While the I/A discussion is needed, there are other issues that need to be discussed. He is not sure if everything the committee does ends up being policy recommendations to the Town Council, instead the role of the committee being to look at things that could come up in the next five years. Tom compiled some thoughts and shared with the Chair and DPW staff.

Chris distributes a printed copy of Tom’s recommendation

- Tom clarifies that while the document is titled as a recommendation, it is more of an advisory topic for consideration. He notes that the current CWMP does not have an estimate of the number of grinder pumps that will be needed. To him, that is a major part of the project that will affect different people. His document notes additional information that should be available and may need additional work to assess and evaluate for guidance. The sewer connections are in their infancy. He looked at Chatham's plan which estimates the number of grinder pumps and provides additional information for public education. He notes Kelly did send the available materials on grinder pumps through the Town, but that it could go a step further on assessment and relaying information to residents about the aspects of grinder pumps.
- Brian asks if there is a definitive number of how many grinder pumps will be required for the CWMP.
 - Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, notes we will not know until the designs are completed.
 - Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works, expands on Rob's answer, noting that technical decisions are made during the preliminary design phase. Each road and each property are evaluated throughout the design, so the schematics in the CWMP are, effectively, a guess based on topography. There are 12,000 properties being connected for the entire CWMP and an evaluation of all of them isn't feasible.
 - Rob adds that there are multiple factors that go into the sewer design, including the depth of pump stations, depth of sewer, etc. Changing one can affect the cost and whether other properties would then need grinder pumps or some other solution. He notes a road that was initially proposed as gravity sewer but after further investigation the gravity sewer would be 15-20 feet underwater. After looking at more technical components of this, it became clear that grinder pumps were a more technically feasible approach. If an estimate was made from the beginning, it would not have included those grinder pumps.
 - Tom clarifies that his request is about getting an estimate and applying metrics or something like elevation control to estimate the areas.
- Zee Crocker asks if we know how many grinder pumps have been installed as part of the CWMP to date
 - Griffin responds he does not have the answer readily available but can get it. He estimates around one dozen pumps are installed as part of the two projects currently accepting connections. Stewarts Creek was more substantial as there were portions designed as low-pressure sewers, which require a grinder pump. The homes that required a grinder pump in the two currently available projects needed them because they are low-lying

- Kelly adds that the need for a grinder pump is based off the individual property characteristics, which is something that has been explained to John Lynch.
 - Griffin notes there are some projects currently being designed to utilize low-pressure sewer, as opposed to gravity.
- Brian asks to confirm that we don't have an overall cost of grinder pumps throughout the life of the CWMP
 - Griffin responds that the practice to date has been to purchase the first grinder pump for the property owner
- Glenn Snell asks how much a grinder pump costs
 - Griffin responds they are approximately \$5,000 each.
 - Glenn notes that giving the grinder pump to the resident is very generous
 - Kelly adds that there is documentation given to the property owner from the manufacturer that includes information about service calls and other possible fees. While people are concerned about these fees, it is a nominal cost. The pump has 15+ years of life and minimal upkeep. To Glenn's point, the town is donating the \$5,000 pump and the extra expense is nominal.
- Tom notes that Chatham estimated the cost of a grinder pump to be \$9,000-\$10,000.
 - Griffin responds that he can pull the price from the most recent purchase and share with the committee. He reiterates the estimated price of \$5,000-\$6,000.
- Tom notes that, given the CMWP's size and cost, there could be better communication about the number of pumps and the costs associated with them. He thinks it would be informative to have the initial designs available to the public going forward.
- Councilor Clark asks, regarding the \$17,000 "hookup connection fee" if the cost of grinder pumps is included in that.
 - Rob responds that the \$17,000 is a betterment, not a hookup fee. He clarifies that the \$17,000 was the original suggestion which Town Council brought down to \$10,000.
 - Griffin responds that the grinder pump is ultimately paid for out of the project appropriation.
- Councilor Clark asks if the \$17,000 per parcel estimate has increased.
 - Griffin responds that the estimate was never \$17,000. The \$17,000 is the subsidized estimate, with the actual estimate being significantly higher.
- Zee notes a possible issue is people needing multiple pumps if there is a long stretch

- Griffin refutes this, noting that the pumps purchased by the town are very powerful. They can go hundreds of feet without any problem.
- Zee notes a property owner is still paying for the distance. If a property is close to the road, the cost of connecting their property to sewer will be less.
 - Griffin responds this is no different from gravity connection. It is ultimately based on the circumstances of the property.
- Councilor Clark notes that the Town Council could revisit the sewer assessment fee. There may be an opportunity to look at this as a whole. It could be a recommendation to go to the Town Council.
 - Rob notes that Mark Milne, Director, Finance Division, will be speaking to the Town Council on September 18 regarding financing in general.
- Councilor Clark notes she signed up to attend the OneCape Summit through the Cape Cod Commission. On the second day there will be a session called “Local Progress: Advancing Wastewater Implementation and Improving Water Quality” that will feature Jeffrey Colby, Department of Public Works Director, Town of Yarmouth, Andrew Gottlieb, Executive Director, Association to Preserve Cape Cod, Gary Moran, Deputy Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, and Erin Perry, Deputy Director, Cape Cod Commission. She anticipates the financing element will be an important part of this session. When it comes to financing and equity, she is open to revisiting the sewer connection fee.
 - Rob clarifies that Councilor Clark is referring to the sewer assessment fee. Her wording implies the connection between the sewer main and the private property, which is paid for by the property owner.
 - Kelly notes she is frequently asked about the various costs and people assuming the \$10,000 assessment is the cost to connect.
- Tom reiterates that the topic of grinder pumps is something that the committee should opine on and identify for additional information.

Project Updates

- Rob informs the committee that since the last meeting, the bids for the Water Pollution Control Facility Nitrogen Reduction and Headworks Upgrade Project have been opened. Bids were under budget and within the allocated amount, prompting the Town to move forward with awarding the contract.
- Griffin informs the committee that since the last meeting, the bids for the Route 28 West Sewer Expansion Project have been opened. These bids were also under budget.

- Tom asks about the status of the Long Pond Sewer Expansion Project
 - Griffin responds that RFPs have been received and are in review.
- Zee asks about approximate start dates for each project
 - Griffin responds, for the Route 28 Project, there is a pre-construction meeting in a few weeks. Work is potentially anticipated to start in November.
 - Rob responds, for the Nitrogen Reduction and Headworks Upgrade Project, that construction is likely to start just after the new year.
- Chris notes that as the projects approach, and throughout the project, there will be additional communications such as media releases and website updates.
 - Rob notes he has asked for Chris to stay “bolted” to him for the Nitrogen Reduction and Headworks Upgrade Project and is expecting video snippets to show the public what is going on and the various steps involved in the construction.
- Zee asks if there will be any buildings torn down to complete this project
 - Rob responds most of the additions are built next to the existing buildings, but there are some elements that will come down.
 - Griffin adds that the plant will stay online throughout construction.
- Tom asks if the building from 1935 is being torn down
 - Rob responds it is not.
- Councilor Starr asks about the Straightway Water Treatment Facility Project and the status of it.
 - Griffin responds the pre-construction meeting was held last week.
 - Kelly notes she is helping organize a groundbreaking event for it
- Councilor Starr asks if the cost is still around \$40 million
 - Griffin responds that this is correct but does not have the number immediately available.
- Brian asks how long the Nitrogen Reduction and Headworks Upgrade project will take
 - Rob responds it will be approximately 3 years.

Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair

- Scott Horsley, Chair, provides a recommendation for financing to bring to the committee’s attention. He notes State Revolving Fund (SRF) money was potentially going to be allowed for I/A systems, but MassDEP has indicated to use the Community Septic Management Program in lieu of SRF funds. There are uncertainties about how this would happen. Scott has spoken with Nate

Keenan of the Clean Water Trust, which funds SRF, and senior people at MassDEP. There is guidance being developed for funding of I/A systems, but nobody seems to have good knowledge of how to go about this. Scott reached out to Andrew Gottlieb and noted previous success on financial initiatives related to wastewater. Andrew is on board but wishes to do this in a contracted manner with a scope of work for the Town of Barnstable. Scott reached out to Mark Milne, Director, Finance Director, who indicated the idea would be brought to Mark Ells, Town Manager, but that has not occurred yet. After speaking with Rob, it was recommended to get a formal request as it may require funding to hire Andrew through the Association to Preserve Cape Cod to look into financing for I/A systems. He thinks this would be helpful as his interpretation is nobody has a good handle on this and it is a complicated issue that should be studied more closely.

- Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, asks if a motion would be needed on this
 - Scott responds that he believes so, indicating prior conversation with Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, about this and getting the committee to recommend this approach as it would be more powerful coming from the committee.
 - Rob responds that his thought is for the committee to opine on the approach, then have Scott go, as the chair, to talk with the Town Manager/Town Council. As there is a financial component to the approach, it is a good idea to make sure the committee is fully on board. He notes there is currently no existing funding source for this approach, and a discussion would need to be had about where the funding comes from. He has given Mark Ells, Town Manager, a heads-up about the conversation but has not yet gone into details with him.
- Tom Cambareri asks if this is funding for a Responsible Management Entity (RME)
 - Rob responds this is not.
 - Zee Crocker responds this is for actual I/A system. He notes previous conversations about how to pay for this relating to SRF funding, using public money on private lands, and several other financial conversations that come from this. In his mind this could get wrapped into the conversation of getting a legislative change initiative to understand how to provide different funding mechanisms for alternative technology. He notes Andrew Gottlieb would be the right person for this. He expands that every town on the Cape would have skin in the fight for legislative change. He believes this approach should be included in the recommendations, included on the agenda, and be willing to spend some money to figure out the right mechanisms. This likely won't be a quick action.
- Brian notes that Zee seems to be recommending the entire county be involved with this.
 - Zee responds it is a potential consideration. It may cause additional complexities, so it may be better to approach it from a small scale first.

- Tom asks how Andrew Gottlieb interpreted this approach compared between the Town and the Region. Sometimes one Town does something that other towns grab as a great example.
 - Scott responds he brought this to Andrew Gottlieb through the lens of the Barnstable CWMP. Other towns may have interest. He reiterates that nobody seems to have a good idea of how to make the Community Septic Management Program a reliable mechanism. He indicates Andrew is willing and able to do it. There was not a specific discussion on fees, but he assumes it will not be that much in the context of the CWMP. If the Town heads in the direction of I/As, we should plan for the financing as well.
- Councilor Clark thanks Scott for bringing this to the committee. She motions to request the Town Manager pursue contracting with the Association to Preserve Cape Cod (APCC) to evaluate financing options for Innovative Alternative (I/A) Systems.
 - Louise O’Neil asks if the motion would be made to contract with APCC or with Andrew Gottlieb directly.
 - Scott responds that Andrew would be working on behalf of APCC.
 - Brian opens the floor for additional questions or comments. None were heard.
 - Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, conducts a roll call for this motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Roll Call: Lousie O’Neil (Yes), Glenn Snell (Yes), Butch Roberts (Yes), Tom Cambareri (Yes), Zee Crocker (Yes), Brian Hughes, Vice Chair (Yes), Scott Horsley, Chair (Yes), Gordon Starr, Town Council (Yes), Kris Clark, Town Council (Yes)

- Rob requests Scott touch base and set up a meeting to discuss next steps. He asks Zee if the Town should develop a scope of work for Andrew or let Andrew bring a scope of work to the town.
 - Zee suggests talking holistically and having Andrew develop the proposal.
 - Scott agrees with this. During his conversations with Andrew, they indicated this may require legislation at the State level. One of the end goals is to utilize the Cape and Islands Water Protection Fund and loan forgiveness for I/A systems. Andrew probably has the best perspective on how to scope this out.
- Brian notes there is no known timeframe for this work, possibly extending months or years.
 - Councilor Clark hopes it will not take that long.
 - Brian notes it will have to go through the State legislature which takes a good amount of time.
 - Zee notes it is complicated but a good first step. He remarks that Andrew is an I/A skeptic but a clean water champion, so it will be interesting.
 - Scott notes his opinion that those who are I/A skeptics are becoming less skeptical as there is more data coming out.
 - Zee notes that the skeptics are also looking at the money. Federal money is uncertain.

- Tom notes he read that the Environmental Impact Report for the Sagamore Bridge Replacement was available and, in finding it, on the MEPA website there is an ENF for the Town of Falmouth to conduct treated wastewater discharge into Nantucket Sound. This is currently in review/comment.
 - Zee notes this has been in the works for a long time.

Adjournment

Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, entertains a motion to adjourn. Councilor Clark moves to adjourn the meeting. Zee Crocker seconds. The meeting is adjourned at 6:55 PM

Roll Call: Louise O'Neil (Yes); Glenn Snell (Yes); Butch Roberts (Yes); Tom Cambareri (Yes); Zee Crocker (Yes); Brian Hughes, Vice Chair (Yes); Scott Horsley, Chair (Yes); Gordon Starr, Town Council (Yes); Kris Clark, Town Council (Yes)

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

Amendments

- Page 8: Updating the below item to correct the date of 1979-and “Houses”
 - Original
 - Tom agrees with Zee, and notes that when sewer went in at Common Fields in Barnstable Village around 1989 a similar effect occurred where lots started getting bigger because people weren’t restricted by their septic system anymore.
 - Original Approval: October 14, 2025
 - Amended
 - Tom agrees with Zee, and notes that when sewer went in at Common Fields in Barnstable Village around 1979 a similar effect occurred where houses started getting bigger because people weren’t restricted by their septic system anymore.
 - Amended Approval: November 18, 2025
- Page 15: Updating the below item to clarify Tom Camabreri’s Remarks
 - Original
 - Tom notes the question arises of penalizing those who have had cesspools, possibly outside of nitrogen sensitive areas, and have them put an I/A system in.
 - Original Approval: October 14, 2025
 - Amended
 - Tom notes the potential policy of requiring properties with cesspools to upgrade to I/A systems instead of Title 5 Septic Systems in areas outside of nitrogen sensitive areas would penalize said properties.
 - Amended Approval: November 18, 2025
- Page 16: Updating the below item to clarify Tom Camabreri’s Remarks
 - Original
 - Tom notes the 25% identified will change vastly once the CWMP is completed.
 - Original Approval: October 14, 2025
 - Amended
 - Tom notes that the currently identified 25% of revenue from septic pumping will change vastly once the CWMP is completed and all properties connected.
 - Amended Approval: November 18, 2025

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 (Held on July 14, 2025)
 - Continuation of Formulation of Recommendations
- Meeting #11 (Held on August 12, 2025)
 - Continuation of Formulation of Recommendations
- Meeting #12 (Held on September 15, 2025)
 - Continuation of Formulation of Recommendations
- Meeting #13 (Scheduled for October 14, 2025)
 - 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.