



BARNSTABLE
Water Resources



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

Meeting Minutes

Date: October 14, 2025

Location: Selectman's Conference Room, Town Hall

*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):

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

Committee Members Absent:

Glenn Snell; Paul Neary, Town Council

Others in Attendance:

Dan Santos, Director, Department of Public Works; Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of
Public Works; Kelly Collopy, Communications Manager, Department of Public Works; Christopher Gadd,
Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works; Jack Campo, Citizen, Hyannisport

Others in Attendance (via Zoom)

Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works

Agenda:

Call to Order

Scott Horsley, Chair, called the October 14, 2025 meeting of the Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan Ad Hoc Committee to order at 6:00 PM. The meeting of the committee was held in-person with committee members attending in the Selectman's Conference Room, Town Hall. A member of the Department of Public Works (DPW) Staff, Rob Steen, attended via Zoom.

Prior to the Call to Order, Zee Crocker left the room.

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 September 15, 2025 meeting minutes. Councilor Clark moves to approve the minutes. Butch Roberts seconds. The committee unanimously votes to approve the September 15, 2025 meeting minutes.

d) Next Meeting

Prior to determining the next meeting date, Scott Horsley, Chair, opens the discussion by inquiring with Councilors Clark and Starr about the report to Town Council. Councilor Starr responds the ask has not been made yet. Scott notes previous discussions indicated going in front of Town Council in November. Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, notes the November timeframe was the original goal. He notes the Town Council election is on November 4 and the five-year update is due in December.

Scott continues with the scheduling of the November meeting date/time. Chris provides several possible meeting dates and times. After some discussion, it was decided that the next meeting of the committee will be on Tuesday, November 18, 2025 at 6:00 PM in the Selectman's Conference Room, Town Hall.

Rob O'Leary joins the meeting in-person.

Zee Crocker returns to the meeting.

Continued Review of Proposed Policy Recommendation on Innovative/Alternative Technology Implementation

Scott Horsley, Chair, opens the discussion by noting there is one significant item on the agenda, but he will also be bringing up a few items during “Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair”. He notes that the agenda item as written should be renamed from “Innovative/Alternative” to “Nitrogen Reducing”. He notes the technology has gone through several names, including Innovative/Alternative, Enhanced Innovative/Alternative, and BANRT (Best Available Nitrogen Reducing Technology).

Scott inquires about the status of the motion that was approved at the last meeting regarding a request to the Town Manager to pursue contracting with the Association to Preserve Cape Cod (APCC) to evaluate financing options for Innovative/Alternative (I/A) Systems.

Tom Cambareri joins the meeting in-person.

- Zee Crocker notes his belief that Scott Horsley was working on this initiative.
 - Scott responds that he worked on it to bring it to the committee and is unsure of what else needs to be done. He reminds the committee of the basis for the request, which is utilizing the Community Septic Management Program and how to go about accessing those funds. The Association to Preserve Cape Cod conducts special projects for towns, which is part of the suggestion.
- Councilor Clark offers to talk with Mark Ells, Town Manager, at their next leadership meeting, scheduled for the following morning.
 - Dan Santos, Director, Department of Public Works, notes that he has already talked with Mark Ells about this. The Town is not interested in paying Andrew Gottlieb for something that he should be doing as part of his job. In other words, we, the Town, can find out the answers to the questions as opposed to paying someone to find the answers.
 - Scott notes he made some calls to educate himself prior to bringing this to the committee and did not get very far. That was the impetus for reaching out to Andrew Gottlieb. He reached out to people at MassDEP and the Massachusetts Clean Water Trust who indicated the contract with Andrew Gottlieb is a good idea. There was an indication that MassDEP is working on guidance. He feels financing is an important part of the discussion. He has reached his level of knowledge on the topic and asks if Dan has any insight on who may be best to reach out to.
- Rob O’Leary asks, if the Town does pursue this, which entity in the Town would be responsible for it, He also opines that the Cape Cod Commission may recognize this as a Cape-wide issue, not just Barnstable, and be able to assist as that is what they are supposed to do.
 - Scott notes he spoke with the Deputy Commissioner of the Cape Cod Commission who indicated they would investigate it but did not know much more than Scott. Scott also spoke with Mark Milne, Director, Finance Division, about this. Nobody has been able to

provide clarity. There is a possibility the question could be directed to the Cape and Islands Water Protection Trust Fund. He notes that upon reading the legislation which formed the Cape and Islands Water Protection Trust Fund, the term “innovative and alternative septic systems” is included in the legislation, suggesting the ability to approve funding is already there. Scott continues by noting that the Community Septic Management Program is allocated \$5 million, but that is through the whole state, so additional funding is needed.

- Dan responds that he will talk with Mark Ells and Mark Milne again about the request. Mark Ells has good contacts in the organizations who can be prompted for an answer to the question. The Town understands the question and there is a desire to have an answer, but the Town did not feel it made sense to pay someone for the answer
- Councilor Starr asks for a refresher on the question being asked
 - Dan responds that the question is about how the Town can access the \$5 million set aside in the Community Management Septic Program.
 - Scott responds the question is also about how the Community Septic Management Program takes the place of the State Revolving Fund to provide financing to Towns. Additionally, how can the Cape and Islands Water Protection Trust Fund offer loan forgiveness. Lastly, how is the existing program fund increased.
 - Dan reiterates that he will speak with Mark Ells and Mark Milne about this effort.
 - Scott requests an update on this at a future meeting.

Scott moves the discussion to the language presented at the last meeting for the draft proposed policy recommendations. He asks Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, where this language stands and any suggestions for moving forward.

- Rob Steen recollects that at the last meeting it was decided to review the packet for an additional month and reconvene for a discussion on the language presented. If the committee has no edits, they could vote to adopt the language for the recommendation to Town Council.
- Scott notes, regarding the 1,000 feet from nitrogen sensitive waterbodies, that there appears to be good support for that detail, but additional thought may be needed for the question of “1,000 feet from where” and in which watershed. He recalls the discussion was for outside of Phases 1 and 2. It would include Phase 3.
 - Louise O’Neil reads a portion of the September 15, 2025 meeting minutes, page 4, in which Scott asked about any consideration that had been given to ponds that are connected by groundwater and not surface water.
 - Scott notes a later discussion about ponds.

The draft proposed policy recommendations are displayed on the screen in the room

- A discussion to clarify the applicability of this language to Phases 1 and 2 of the CWMP. Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, notes the language is written for anyone within 1,000 feet who is not anticipated to receive sewer as part of Phases 1 or 2 of the CWMP.
- Tom Cambareri notes that this language would encompass the Stages of the CWMP, which is good.
- Zee asks for clarity on the “ADDITIONALLY” item under the first proposed recommendation.
 - Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, responds that this item says any property which does not hit one of the triggers, such as failure of the system, is required to upgrade their system within 20 years. Essentially, everyone upgrades according to the identified triggers or within 20 years.
- Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, inquires about the two “SHALL” items under the first proposed recommendation, and that his interpretation is that the language currently says regardless of if it fails, it doesn’t need to be upgraded until the property is changed or expanded. He suggests adding an “OR” before the second “SHALL” to clarify these are separate triggers.
- Scott asks if there is any discussion on the triggers themselves.
 - Councilor Starr asks what the “Expansion” footnote refers to
 - Chris responds that it refers to Title 5
- Zee asks if there is an idea of how many properties this would affect annually. He recalls an approximation of 5%.
 - Griffin responds that the numbers were presented at a previous meeting, but he does not have them readily available. The 5% is townwide of properties that were sold in a year.

Scott asks, procedurally, if this committee votes to make the recommendation.

- Councilor Clark responds it does.

Zee notes there was a previous discussion about properties in Phase 3

- Scott responds that this recommendation would apply to Phase 3 as it is a nitrogen-sensitive area.
 - Griffin clarifies this would not cover all of Phase 3, just properties within 1,000 feet of nitrogen-sensitive waterbodies.
- Zee notes the previous discussion related to broadening the regulation to be inclusive of all of Phase 3

- Griffin responds that this was an option earlier on.
- Rob Steen responds that he had brought the discussion on expanding this recommendation to include all of Phase 3 to the committee. After some discussions with the committee, the sense was the presented language was more important, and if desired the committee could re-visit the Phase 3 option. He offers to add back the Phase 3 language if desired.
- Zee notes that, in addition to voting on this, we need to characterize the scope and size of this effort. He notes previous questions from Dan which asks if the number of upgrades is too few to matter. How we bring this to Town Council and showing this will be a first step is important.
 - Scott remarks that this should include the numbers previously reported.
 - Zee agrees and adds that another important number is regarding cost and the financial burden being put on these property owners and how they will pay for it.
- Butch Roberts indicates his understanding that the 50 properties per year that meet one of the triggers is across the whole town.
 - Griffin notes he does not have the numbers in front of him but the 50 is in the right ballpark.
 - Tom Cambareri notes the previous efforts utilized 5% as the number of properties townwide that would hit one of the triggers. This 5% was then used to calculate the number of parcels within the 1,000-foot regulation.
- Scott notes his recollection that there is an additional conversation to be had about the cost, and he had suggested a consideration to cost-share this effort as the Town does with sewers. He notes this is being considered in other towns. The cost would be the same whether you are on municipal sewer or a decentralized system.
 - Zee reiterates that money needs to be included as part of this proposal. Back-of-the-envelope math shows 60% of the affected properties would qualify for the State Tax Credit. There may also be a cost such as the sewer assessment.
 - Kelly Collopy, Communications Manager, Department of Public Works, notes that if a property owner is mandated to upgrade their system, they are eligible for support from the Cape Cod Aquifund.
- Scott notes it may be worthwhile adding information about financing and cost-sharing to the recommendation.
 - Rob Steen asks if this splits the recommendation into two separate proposals. Is there one recommendation to adopt the language in front of the committee, and one recommendation to create a financing plan for this effort. Alternatively, is the recommendation contingent upon being able to do the financing element. Town Council may be amenable to the technical solution but hesitant about the cost, or vice versa.

- Tom Cambareri remarks to “make the first case and let it ride”
 - Butch notes his agreement with this.
- Zee asks the Town Councilors present for their opinions.
 - Councilor Clark notes there is an upcoming election and the Council will change.
- Zee asks if a presentation that does not address the financial cost is appropriate for Town Council.
 - Councilor Starr asks what the difference in cost is between installing sewers on a property and installing nitrogen reducing technology on their property.
 - Kelly notes these costs will vary, just as the cost for sewer connection varies. There are many items that factor in the cost of installing sewers and will likely factor into the cost for I/A technologies.
- Scott asks what the cost range is for sewer
 - Kelly responds that from their contacts at the Cape Cod Aquifund, there is a range of \$7,000-\$12,000 for the cost to install sewer. This does not include the Town’s sewer assessment, which is capped at \$10,000. She notes the two completed projects had an assessment below the \$10,000 cap.
 - Griffin notes that a good assumption is to use the full \$10,000 sewer assessments for future projects and calculations.
- Scott notes the average cost for an I/A system is \$55,000. Using the numbers from the prior discussion, there is an approximately \$30,000 difference.
- Councilor Starr asks to confirm that not everybody qualifies for the \$18,000 State Tax Credit
 - Zee responds that approximately 60% of the town is a full-time resident and 60% of those earn at or above the qualifying income for the full credit, which is \$91,000.
- Kelly notes that the Aquifund offers interest rates of 0%, 2%, and 4%. Only sewer connections are eligible for the 0% rate. Other loans, such as those for I/A systems, would have to be at a 2% or 4% rate.
- Griffin notes that the \$55,000 that Scott mentioned is for the entire septic system with an I/A. The I/A upgrade is roughly half of it.
 - Scott notes there are some areas, such as Shubael Pond, that do not need a full replacement.
 - Griffin agrees, and notes many will be able to reuse the septic system, just with a new I/A component.

- Scott asks if there are two separate recommendations being made, which he assumes is the case. He feels like the recommendation presented should be moved forward regardless. He notes Tisbury has a similar regulation without a regulation about financing.
- Brian asks if, when sewerage was first brought to the Town Council, whether there were two separate recommendations about mandating sewer, then a recommendation about financing, or was it a single package.
 - Rob Steen responds that the Town Council had to adhere to the Total Maximum Daily Loads set forth by the State. This effort is different in that the plan already addresses the TMDLs. While this will help with meeting the TMDL, an argument can be made that it's not needed because the plan already addresses the TMDL. The comparison is not apples to apples.
 - Councilor Clark responds that she recalls it came to the Town Council as one package. The recommendation came from Mark Milne to make the sewer assessment \$17,000, which then was motioned down to \$10,000.
 - Griffin notes that the CWMP ultimately addresses both the technical and financial elements. It was brought to the Town Council as a single package
- Tom Cambareri notes it took several years for the CWMP to get to, and through, Town Council. The recommendation presented needs backup information as with any ordinance presented to Town Council. He notes that the finance information should be included as part of the rationale, and not the recommendation itself.
 - Councilor Clark opines that it should be part of the same package.
 - Zee notes a 5-year revisit could be added to this recommendation and develop a finance sub-committee to figure out how to pay for these systems. He opines that these systems will likely be a larger part of the solution over time.
- Councilor Starr asks if the Stages of the CWMP would be included in the 1,000-foot recommendation
 - Tom responds that the Stages would be included for areas that fall within the 1,000-foot boundary.
 - Griffin confirms this and notes the Stages are currently not identified in Phase 1 or Phase 2.

Scott entertains a motion to accept the recommendation. Brian Moves to accept the recommendation. Zee seconds the motion. Scott opens the floor for further discussion.

- Butch notes that at the last meeting there was discussion about expanding this to every property in town that is not being sewerage. He asks what happens to that discussion if this recommendation is passed.

- Scott responds that a discussion will be had about ponds at this meeting. He remarks that the conversation was had, but it was pulled back to 1,000 feet as a starting point.
- Zee opines that this needs to be part of an adaptive plan, just like the CWMP. There is hope that this could be expanded over time to be more inclusive of ponds and the rest of town.
- Scott notes there is an additional factor that most of the systems are provisionally approved, not generally approved. There could be some trepidation from the public which may be lessened with the general approval of systems in a few years. He opines this is a good starting point and is a good compromise to get things started. Another advantage is the approximation of a 2-year flow time for groundwater within 1,000-feet, which makes it more likely to see some benefits.
- Butch notes that the groundwater is still being loaded with nitrogen
 - Scott agrees with this assessment but recalls Zee's phrase to not let perfect be the enemy of good.
 - Zee notes that the committee won't get this perfect, and the CWMP isn't perfect. We need to address some of these things and the 1,000-foot rule would help a lot of areas.
- Councilor Clark asks those in the room with industry knowledge whether there is any concern about increasing the number of I/A septic systems being installed and the demand for services.
 - Scott responds that, at the number of systems being discussed, there should not be a problem.
 - Zee responds that, from everything he sees, it is achievable.
- Councilor Clark emphasizes that when this is launched, the private sector needs to be ready to address the need.
 - Scott notes that Councilor Clark's point falls in with the second recommendation of DPW and Board of Health working to create a list. He believes there are two systems that would meet the need at this point, NitROE and NITREX. There is likely a third technology coming along.
- Tom asks about the status of urine diversion (UD) technologies
 - Scott responds there is a conference at MASSTC about urine diversion where additional information on the topic will be discussed.
- Tom asks to confirm that urine diversion has not been approved as a Best Available Nitrogen Reducing Technology
 - Zee responds that the State has not approved it yet.
 - Scott notes it's not listed as being provisionally approved, but it has received plumbing approval, so they can be installed. He notes that it could be up to the town to make the decision.

- Griffin responds that the technology is not ultimately a disposal system.
- Scott responds that urine diversion or a composting system could meet the intent at some point.
- Rob Steen notes he is looking forward to the conference, but when looking at urine diversion, there was an assumption that it would remove 90% of the nitrogen. However, additional studies on it have only shown 50% removal. If urine diversion is adopted, the disposal of urine will still need to be addressed. There is a concept to take the nitrogen out of urine and sprinkle it on a lawn, which he argues is not taking the nitrogen out of the watershed.
- Brian notes he has heard of technologies which turn urine diversion products into nitrogen products.
 - Rob Steen responds there is a phosphorus version of this, primarily done in Europe. The technology comes with its own set of questions.
 - Scott suggests the mention of the technologies is reasonable, but the effort of the current discussion is to address the presented recommendations.
 - Tom agrees with this and notes he was curious. He believes the recommendation is fine the way it is.
- Rob O’Leary asks if other communities on Cape Cod are tying regulations to 1,000 feet or are they encompassing the whole community.
 - Scott responds that, in Wellfleet, the current regulation applies to the entire watershed, but there has been pushback to go to a distance-based approach. Tisbury is dealing with a similar issue and considering a distance-based regulation. He does not believe that other communities have done this approach yet.
 - Councilor Clark notes there seems to be a consensus around using distance with these regulations.
 - Scott adds that the maps provided by Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works, showed many systems close to the shore which this regulation would pick up. He also remarks that the two-year travel time is interesting, especially for those who will not be around to see all the benefits of the plan.
- Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, requests clarification on the motion at hand.
 - Scott responds the motion would be for “all of it”, with additional information about financing cost-sharing.
 - Zee notes additional work will be needed on the numbers, at least to assist in estimating the impact.
 - Griffin responds these numbers will be included when the presentation is given to the Town Council.

- Louise O’Neil notes that the packet of recommendations includes additional recommendations, such as about Accessory Dwelling Units.
- Scott suggests the motion should be for points 1 and 2 only.

Brian withdraws his original motion and moves to approve points 1 and 2 of the proposed draft policy recommendations as what will be presented to Town Council as a recommendation. Rob O’Leary Seconds. Scott opens the floor for further discussion.

- Scott suggests adding a line at the end recommending that Town Council look at financing options and cost-sharing options to implement the recommendation.
 - General agreement is heard from the group on this amendment.

Scott closes the floor for discussion. The committee votes in favor of the motion, with one objection. The motion passes.

- Scott notes we will likely revisit this for more detail and hopes to have more information about the financing element from Dan at the next meeting.
- Brian makes a note that the presentation to Town Council will not occur until any new councilors are seated.

Public Comment/Questions

Scott Horsley, Chair, opens the floor for any public comments or questions.

Jack Campo, resident of Hyannisport, notes that since 1968 he has been a resident, both full-time and seasonal, of the area. He has served in various roles of the Hyannisport Civic Association. When the CWMP first came about in 2018, a discussion was had with Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works, about the expansion of sewer into Hyannisport. At the time, it was determined that expansion into the area would not be done as the area is a seasonal community. Mr. Campo notes that things have changed since 2018. He introduces the question of adding Hyannisport to sewer expansion. Phases 1 and 2 of the CWMP bring sewer close to Hyannisport. There is a private homeowner who paid to extend sewer down to their property, and so there is now a foothold. Hyannisport is not as seasonal as it used to be. There is data that shows there are twice as many year-round residents as in 2018. The beaches have been shut regularly, including Fortes Beach and Keyes Beach, due to fecal contamination. He does not know if there are existing cesspools or septic systems in that area that are contributing to the issue. He notes there are many old properties in the area. He notes the CLF lawsuit looks at impacts on waters that join Hyannis Harbor. He notes that Squaw Island is another matter and would be a great place for I/A systems. Referring to a map of the area which shows the existing CWMP plans, he asks why Hyannisport would be left out.

- Scott asks to confirm that the area in white on the map uses Septic Systems.
 - Jack confirms it is.

Jack notes his understanding that going out to Squaw Island is a long way and again suggests using I/A systems. He adds that if there are topographic concerns in Hyannisport than implement I/A systems. The density of housing on the water is considerable. He adds that the residents of Hyannisport pay the most in taxes but put the least amount of burden on the Town. It is mostly retirees who live there year-round.

- Scott asks for clarification on why the area was left out of the CWMP.
 - Griffin responds that the CWMP was ultimately designed in the Lewis Bay Watershed, which encompasses Hyannisport, to achieve the TMDLs. There was not a need to expand into all of Hyannisport to achieve the TMDL, so a line was drawn at a topographical point.
- Scott asks for additional information on the beaches being closed and what causes them, assuming they are likely due to stormwater and pathogens, rather than septic issues.
 - Griffin responds this is largely correct. Keyes beach is entirely sewered around the area. He does not know the issue directly.
- Jack notes his desire for the expansion into Hyannisport to be reconsidered. He recalls something about seasonality in 2018.
 - Griffin responds that there was a combination of considerations that went into the decision. The plan aims to get the “most bang for the buck”. Areas with higher water uses and higher nitrogen being put into the environment are most influential to the CWMP. There is also a fiscal responsibility. This becomes a policy discussion about spending additional money to expand the program.
- Scott asks if MEP considered this area to have less load because of the seasonality.
 - Griffin responds the loading is based on water use, which was in the Town’s consideration as well.
 - Scott notes it’s possible that this area is contributing a larger load than it was at the time of the model.
 - Griffin notes that this is possible.
- Tom Cambareri notes it was probably excluded as part of the MEP solution for nitrogen removal for similar reasons as Grand Island and parts of Cotuit that are near the bay.
 - Griffin notes that during the planning process there were areas identified as needing nitrogen removal, which were later expanded to achieve the TMDLs. This is how the CWMP came to be, and any additions would become a policy decision.
- Jack concludes his comments by noting that Betty Ludtke is the Town Councilor and is a strong supporter of expanding the sewer into Hyannisport.

- Scott notes that if the nitrogen load, as determined by water use, has changed, it may be worth considering.
 - Griffin responds that numbers would have to be re-calculated but assumes the updated model run would not show a need to sewer that area. The original plan included a buffer. To achieve the TMDLs, this is likely not needed. There could be other reasons the community would have for this expansion, and it would be with the community to make those decisions.
- Jack notes his assumption that the TMDLs do not factor in proximity to water. He also notes the 1,000-foot distance for I/A Systems, which would include the entire area. Hyannis Harbor is being increasingly polluted.
 - Zee Crocker notes that this is a reason the 1,000-foot recommendation would be important to Hyannisport. The preamble for the presentation on recommendations needs to include potential benefits, which includes the learning experience. While this may not directly impact this 5-year plan, we can look at future 5-year updates with the knowledge and data from this effort. This includes cost of installing I/A and flow. This is especially pertinent for Phase 3. He relates Mr. Campo's issue with his own issue of the area around the Centerville River, which is technically fine, but is not actually fine.
- Scott asks if there is a known number for cost-saving if Phase 3 were not done.
 - Griffin responds there are planning-level estimates based on road miles.
- Scott clarifies to ask whether calculations about cost savings from not increasing effluent disposal or additional upgrades of the Water Pollution Control Facility.
 - Griffin responds that this number is not known. He notes the trigger for an additional upgrade to the WPCF to achieve direct potable reuse is dependent on other factors, not Phase 3 of the CWMP. If the regulations don't change, there may not be reason to install the additional upgrades and advance the medium-term solution of effluent disposal to the long-term solution.
- Tom asks if Halls Creek is nitrogen sensitive
 - Griffin responds it is not. This area is in the Lewis Bay Watershed.
 - Zee notes that Halls Creek is a separate sub-watershed.
- Jack notes Halls Creek is one of the areas supposedly being affected by the effluent, according to the CLF lawsuit.
 - Griffin responds that the MEP identified Halls Creek as not nitrogen sensitive.
 - Zee notes it has a small footprint, having few houses that contribute to it.
- Brian notes his understanding that some beach closings are a result of nitrogen effluent coming from the WPCF.

- Dan asks where the understanding comes from.
- Brian responds that it is his understanding.
- Dan asks if this is documented or if it is what Brian thinks.
- Brian responds it is what he thinks.
- Tom adds that the effluent is a contribution that goes into Stewart's Creek.
 - Dan notes his understanding of this. He disagrees with the beach closures being a result of effluent disposal.
 - Scott notes this is likely more due to stormwater and pathogens.
 - Griffin responds there is no evidence of effluent causing the beach closures.
- Scott asks if this issue is something the committee would discuss
 - Dan responds this is an issue for the committee. The DPW would not take this on because there is an existing plan which does what it is supposed to do. If this committee feels there are other reasons to expand the sewer system, that could be a recommendation. There is a need for data to make this recommendation, including a re-run of modeling and water use, which would be good amount of research done by the DPW.
 - Scott suggests adding this to the longer-term agenda discussion. If this committee does continue, this issue may be discussed again.
 - Dan notes this issue is linked to similar issues identified by the DPW early in the process with requests for sewer expansion that is not part of the CWMP. It is with this committee and the Town Council, not DPW. He adds that any expansion of sewer needs to go through the Massachusetts Environmental Protection (MEP) Agency for a Notice of Project Change, which is a significant effort to achieve.
- Tom notes that sewerage this area also takes away capacity and resources from the Water Pollution Control Facility
 - Scott notes that if Phase 3 is reduced or eliminated, it frees up resources for other areas.

Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair

Ponds

Scott Horsley, Chair, notes a conversation he has had with Butch Roberts about ponds and their relation to this recommendation. He requests that Butch re-iterate his thoughts and questions.

- Butch notes that nitrogen I/A systems are known to primarily help seawater. There is some indication that cyanobacteria are sensitive to nitrogen and will grow as a result. There is a likelihood of phosphorous removal systems becoming more effective. There needs to be as much as possible to remove as much nitrogen as possible from the system, regardless of whether it is around a pond or not. There was a lot more cyanobacteria this year, which he sees as a continuing trend.

- Brian Hughes, Vice Chair, asks if the increase in cyanobacteria is partially due to the drought
 - Butch responds he does not know, especially as there are multiple variables.
 - Griffin Beaudoin, Town Engineer, Department of Public Works, responds that Amber Unruh, Special Projects Manager, Department of Public Works, would be able to give a more informed answer. He notes there is likely a link between increased cyanobacteria and the drought, noting the water table is lower and there is less volume in ponds.
 - Scott notes that heat is a factor as well.
- Scott notes that he spoke with a colleague from Horsley Whitten Group who also works with the Brewster Ponds Coalition. The Brewster Ponds Coalition is considering doing pilot work on phosphorous removing I/A systems. There are some technologies already, such as the FujiClean system on Long Pond, installed by Jane Ward. The problem is these technologies are likely provisionally approved, or even in the pilot stage. There is additional involvement with installing systems at that stage. His colleague suggested potentially doing a pilot, or having the town do a pilot, for phosphorous removing I/A systems. He adds that part of Phase 3 of the CWMP is getting sewer up near the ponds. We need a kickstart on those areas.
 - Butch responds there needs to be kickstart to the technologies. There are some existing systems that could make good pilot cases. He notes that some ponds have houses that can be identified as contributing to the problem, such as on Shubael Pond and Long Pond (Marstons Mills). Putting pilot systems around those ponds could result in a good return on investment, as well as potentially reducing future sewer costs.
- Brian notes that he watched a recent Conservation Commission meeting, and during it a commissioner noted a simple technology consisting of a bale of hay being put into a pond and leaving it for a few weeks. This apparently removes phosphorous.
 - Zee Crocker notes this is called “Barley Straw”. It has been done in England. The Conservation Commission rejected it.
 - Butch notes his understanding that the Conservation Commission did not reject the technology but rejected having someone other than the town managing the project.
 - Zee notes there is literature available on it.
 - Brain notes it seems like an “amazingly simple” thing to try.
 - Tom Cambareri notes it has been tried several times, including in Harwich approximately 15-20 years ago.
 - Griffin responds that Amber Unruh has investigated the technology and can be asked to provide additional information at the next meeting. He notes a potential concern about the scale of the technology, especially for larger ponds. It may be ideal for small ponds.
 - Rob Steen, Assistant Director, Department of Public Works, adds context by noting that at the initial writing of the CWMP, nitrogen-reducing I/A systems were not as advanced or effective as they are now. This 5-year update focused on nitrogen-reducing I/A technology. It can be

assumed, if a group chooses to put the effort in, that phosphorous-reducing I/A systems could be ready for the next 5-year update and next time the committee is formed. It is a good conversation, but there is a 5-year runway to get technology advancing.

- Scott asks if the Town wants to be proactive with moving the phosphorous removing technologies along.
 - Rob Steen responds that the Town is not a great scientific body as it's not wired to do.
 - Scott clarifies he was not suggesting Town staff do the research & development, but instead the Town sponsor pilot work. There is grant money out there, and Barnstable seems to be one of the most interested in ponds. The Town has already invested money with the University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth School for Marine Science & Technology (SMAST) on ponds. He agrees that the technology for phosphorous reducing I/As is not as far along as nitrogen-reducing I/As but is wondering if there could be a recommendation to the Town Council to be proactive in developing the technologies. He agrees with having Amber speak at the next meeting on pond technologies, including I/A systems.
 - Brian agrees with Rob Steen that the Town should be more managerial in the approach and identify outside entities to do this work.
- Zee provides a modified approach where a select number of ponds are chosen and work to better identify where the flow is coming from, which is doable. There are not many systems out there for phosphorous removal and more research needs to be done. There needs to be an identification of where to put these systems. He notes a concern with the ongoing decimation of the scientific community.
 - Scott notes that two of the sites from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) that he uses for work and are currently inactive.
 - Zee emphasizes that this work can't be done without science. That doesn't mean we can't identify where the flow comes from in the ponds.
 - Griffin notes that this has been done at a few ponds in Town already, through the Ponds and Lakes Management Program.
 - Zee adds that on a small pond with a half-dozen systems, there may be opportunity for more/better monitoring. He notes phosphorous is hard to track.
- Scott requests this to be put on the agenda for the next meeting, with Amber presenting information and a discussion to be had about potential approaches. He again asks if the committee wants to make a recommendation to the Town Council for this. He believes this is linked to the motion that just passed.
- Tom notes an additional concept, Permeable Reactive Barriers (PRB) around ponds. These are put on the recharging side of the pond and have been done at Ashumet Pond with success. PRB technology is getting more advanced and more efficient to install.

- Scott asks if there is a “Reader’s Digest” version of information for this technology that could be sent to the committee.
 - Tom responds he will look for one, noting that the one he knows of from USGS is still fairly technical.
- Brian asks if these barriers are to prevent nitrogen from flowing into the pond or out of the pond.
 - Tom responds it depends on what nutrient is being targeted. A barrier addressing phosphorous may be made with iron. A barrier addressing nitrogen may be made with carbon.
- Brian reiterates his question of whether it prevents the nutrient from entering or exiting the pond.
 - Tom responds it is to prevent nutrients from entering the pond.
- Councilor Clark asks if these regulations would be through the Board of Health
 - Scott responds it may be too early to make that decision
 - Councilor Clark notes it may be necessary to get an opinion from the Town’s Legal Department.
 - Griffin notes his assumption that Councilor Clark is referring to the motion that was already passed and through which mechanism it would be implemented. If this is the case, he notes that the DPW will work with the Town’s Legal Department to determine the best path forward.
 - Councilor Clark confirms this is what she was referring to.
- Councilor Starr asks about the Floating Treatment Wetland in Long Pond, Marstons Mills, and whether the project has been completed yet.
 - Griffin responds it is a pilot project, so it is relatively small. Amber can provide an update at the next meeting.
 - Scott notes that MassDEP put a similar project in Eagle Pond
 - Kelly notes there is some good educational material on the project at Eagle Pond.
- Lousie O’Neil asks for an overview of what Floating Treatment Wetlands are.
 - Griffin responds that it is a floating wetland, consisting of a small barge that has plants on it, with root systems going into the water. The idea is the plants take up nutrients from the water.
- Louise asks about removing it for the winter
 - Griffin responds that it does need to be taken out so it doesn’t freeze, and the plants are harvested to get the nutrients out.

- Lousie asks if this is the same approach being taken on the Charles River in Boston.
 - Scott confirms it is. He notes the system in Eagle Pond uses wine corks to float.

Potential Continuation of Committee

Scott notes a discussion with Councilor Starr and invites him to explain.

- Councilor Starr introduces his idea that the committee should not be sunset and instead continue. There is a wastewater management committee in Falmouth. There are issues that will come up that we may not wish to wait for the next iteration of this committee for. Additionally, there are issues the committee has not discussed that have to do with water quality.
 - Scott notes this is an interesting idea.
 - Lousie notes this will help keep the momentum
 - Tom notes he believes it is a good idea
 - Griffin notes that the DPW Staff will do what the Council asks.
 - Lousie notes the meeting schedule could be more flexible
 - Brian notes the problems and technologies are evolving continuously and won't wait for the next 5-year update.
 - Scott suggests adding this to the agenda for the next meeting
- Rob O'Leary asks who created the committee
 - Griffin responds the committee was formed by Town Council.
 - Councilor Clark clarifies that it was created by the Town Council President.
- Tom notes the Town used to have a Water Quality Advisory Committee for several years but has since gone defunct. With the number of water resources issues undertaken by the Town, he sees it as beneficial to have a citizen committee for them. This would also lead into the next 5-year update and recruiting new faces.
 - Councilor Starr notes there was an initial CWMP Committee which abruptly stopped. He notes there were great meetings with a lot of education.
- Councilor Clark notes the scope for this committee is the CWMP and is not as broad as what is being suggested.
 - Tom Cambareri notes the scope could be tweaked
 - Scott notes that this committee could be morphed into the new committee
- Zee opines that the idea of continuing the committee is a good idea, but it should be a smaller group to look at issues periodically (3-4 times per year).
 - Louise notes it will be good to look at issues in the town as they arise and listen to feedback.
- Scott suggests everyone thinks about this and it will be revisited at the next meeting, with a potential vote.

Update on Effluent Disposal

Scott inquires with Rob Steen for an update on effluent disposal, with a potential presentation at a future meeting.

- Rob Steen responds that he can give a quick update today. The town is pursuing effluent disposal in three paths: short-term, medium-term, and long-term. The short-term path focuses on extending the current permit at the Water Pollution Control Facility. The current permit is 4.2 million gallons per day (MGD) of treatment and 2.7 MGD Max Day of effluent disposal. There is a discussion being had with MassDEP about regulating max day versus average day, with the hope to be regulated on average day.
- The long-term approach relates to the Water Pollution Control Facility Nitrogen Removal and Headworks Upgrade Project, which is set to begin construction soon. At the conclusion of the project, the plant will use a 4-stage Bardenpho and Membrane Bio-Reactors (MBR) and ultimately remove contaminants down to the virus level. It will not catch salt, which includes PFAS. If a regulation for PFAS is introduced, it's likely the Town will look at an additional treatment stage, either Granulated Activated Carbon (GAC) or Reverse Osmosis (RO). If the decision was to go with RO, the plant would produce, effectively, distilled water. At that point, reuse would be a necessary conversation. The State does not have regulations to support direct potable reuse. Initial conversations have started with the State, but this is easily a 10-year effort.
- The medium-term solution is actively being worked on with the modeling of effects on different sites that may be available or leveraging the existing site. None of the work is ready for public consumption as it is still in the "sausage making" phase.
- Brian asks if part of the discussion includes re-siting the existing Water Pollution Control Facility.
 - Rob Steen responds it is not part of the plan.
- Scott asks, when compared to the phases of the CWMP, when the short, medium, and long-term will occur.
 - Rob Steen responds that the short-term approach will get the Town to the end of Phase 1 and into Phase 2. Medium term would then pick up. There is uncertainty about when the long-term approach would fall as it relies on State regulations and other factors.
- Scott asks if it is reasonable to assume the long-term approach to occur sometime between Phases 2 and 3.
 - Rob Steen responds, as himself not as a DPW representative, that is a reasonable assumption.
 - Scott notes that, generally, the approaches on effluent disposal can line up with the phases of the CWMP.

- Rob Steen responds this is generally correct, although the short-term approach will likely go into Phase 2. Again, this depends on other situations.
- Scott asks if the regulatory approach were to go extremely well, and work in the Cranberry Bog and Mill Pond were to go well, is it possible to avoid the long-term need.
 - Rob Steen responds that this is the reason why he brought up the recommendation for Phase 3 of the CWMP and I/A septic systems. The CWMP has always anticipated Phase 3 to be the most difficult to sewer for a variety of reasons. Realistically there will need to be sewer along Shubael Pond and Long Pond Marstons Mills, unless significant progress is made with phosphorous-reducing I/A systems. The CWMP has always talked about Phase 3 becoming a hybrid approach as a possibility. There is good work happening from the Department and the Committee that potentially makes a hybrid approach happen. This does tie back into the effluent conversations and the cost conversations. However, there can be no promise of that right now.
- Scott asks if additional discussion is wanted by the committee to get a better understanding of the status of effluent disposal.
 - Tom notes this is a big issue
 - Butch notes it would be very interesting.
 - Councilor Starr expresses interest in knowing what the other sites are.
- Scott asks Rob Steen if it's possible to get additional details at a future meeting
 - Rob Steen responds he would like to let Mark Ells continue to work on his conversations with the State and understand where the conversations may lead. These conversations are essential to figuring out next steps.
- Tom asks if a list of the approaches and their steps could be shared with the committee.
- Scott suggests a presentation to review the material more slowly and provide a chance for questions that will be beneficial. He notes the tasks with the State are cutting-edge but filled with uncertainty about when the answer will be given. He notes Councilor Starr had asked about potential sites.
 - Dan Santos, Director, Department of Public Works, notes that the sites identified in this effort are similar to previous efforts for effluent disposal.
 - Rob Steen notes his concern that this is not with this committee. There have been 17 sites that have been looked at. At the end of the day, all 17 will not be touched, and likely very few will be touched at all. There is a potential for firestorms to come from a discussion on the 17 areas before additional work is conducted. He understands the committee's scientific curiosity but sharing the information in a public meeting when the material is not ready for public discussion, it may alarm people.

- Tom notes a presentation from Rob Steen to the Town Council about effluent disposal, which is a good starting point, and perhaps a bit more detail could be shared. He opines this discussion falls into what the committee was formed to do. He notes the caution from Rob Steen of using the committee and potentially opening a Pandora's Box but adds that the approach from the DPW seems well reasoned and notes the committee's interest. He notes Falmouth's recent ENF on outfall and wonders if that had any impact on the Town's approach to effluent disposal. He also notes the lawsuit from the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) on effluent and the speed of the groundwater.
 - Rob Steen responds, regarding the CLF lawsuit, to clarify that the lawsuit is about the permit the Town holds for effluent disposal. CLF believes the Town should have a NPDES permit through the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). EPA believes the Town is regulated by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and should hold a Groundwater Discharge Permit through MassDEP. The Town cannot get a NPDES permit from EPA. CLF is claiming that, at some point, groundwater discharge is the same thing as a direct surface water body discharge. This is what the CLF lawsuit is regarding.
 - Rob Steen responds, on the matter of outfall, that a study was done in years past that studied outfall on both the north and south sides of Barnstable. Cost estimates from this, in 2020 dollars, were approximately \$320 million. On the south side, it would be necessary to go 12,000 feet to achieve the required depths. On the north side, it would be necessary to go 4,000 feet. Due to the estimated costs, as well as political, social, and other concerns, ocean outfall is no longer considered as a viable option for the Town.
- Rob O'Leary asks about the recommendation being passed through the committee and what the timeframe is for moving forward.
 - Scott responds that he was under the assumption that the committee's work would wrap up in the next month or so. He is now hearing there is less of a deadline.
 - Councilor Clark asks what the DPW needs from the committee to fulfill their obligation.
- Rob O'Leary expands his question, noting that the discussion of effluent disposal is a large and politically complex issue. He wonders if focusing on this issue messes up the committee's goals for the short term. He wonders if the topic is outside of the committee's scope and if it undermines what the committee is trying to do with the recommendations.
 - Scott responds that the recommendations ultimately feed into the discussion on Phase 3 of the CWMP. If the recommendations presented and other work can be accomplished, it's possible that there could be less needed for long-term effluent disposal. It could be a major advantage to work towards understanding potential avenues for avoiding elements of the long-term effort. He is only suggesting thinking about it. He is less concerned about where the effluent disposal sites are and more about how it could impact Phase 3 of the CWMP. He agrees that he doesn't want effluent disposal to take over the committee.

- Brian notes that the first order of business is to get the recommendation presented to the Town Council and have a vote on it.
 - Dan notes that this recommendation is not linked to the 5-year Update. This recommendation does not change the CWMP, the Town still has the plan in place. This recommendation is “in addition to”.
- Tom notes uncertainty about how in-depth the committee needs to get on effluent disposal. There are other elements of the CWMP that the committee has not yet discussed. If the committee does sunset at the end of the year, he has a desire to talk about the issues that are relevant to the implementation such as effluent disposal and grinder pumps. He asks what the other issues are that, as a committee, we can say were discussed. He asks if there will be a final report.
 - Griffin responds that the DPW will be producing a final report. The intent of the committee was to advise the Town Council on the development of the Adaptive Management Plan, which is the final report. There are elements discussed by the Committee that will be in the plan, and there are aspects that are more administrative and updates on progress to date of the CWMP. At the end of this, the report informs the next five years of the CWMP.
- Scott asks if the five-year update will include elements of effluent disposal.
 - Griffin responds there are 30-40 items that need to be included in the report. One of them is an update on progress of effluent disposal. He notes that effluent disposal is included in the annual report as well, which is sent to the Cape Cod Commission and MassDEP.
- Tom asks if the committee can be provided with a list of the topics for the five-year update so the committee can review.
 - Griffin agrees with this and notes there is a pre-existing outline in the approvals for the CWMP. That report needs to be submitted in Year 5, which we are in now. The Year ends at the end of the fiscal year.
 - Kelly notes that the annual reports are posted on BarnstableWaterResources.com, which can give an idea of what is reported.

Several overlapping conversations occur

- Scott notes that in Addendum 1 of the minutes, it is stated that the report must be submitted in December 2025 and asks if that is the correct deadline.
 - Griffin responds that the deadline is in Year 5 of the CWMP, which we are in.
 - Kelly responds that the original intention was to have the report done for December 2025.

- Scott asks to confirm that the committee is not held to the December 2025 end date.
 - Griffin responds that is the DPW's understanding. The goal is to conclude the effort in the near-term and avoid a rush closer to the deadline. There is a lot of work to be done on the report.
- Councilor Clark asks what the DPW staff needs from this committee to flesh out the report.
 - Griffin responds that the committee has touched on the items that the DPW wants to. There have been some tangential discussions, such as grinder pumps, that there was a desire to discuss from a policy perspective. A lot of the report is administrative such as updates on progress. Policy changes, such as a recommendation from the committee, would at least need to be mentioned and noted whether there is additional work needed or if it was approved by the Town Council.
- Councilor Clark asks if there are any voids that the DPW Staff anticipate
 - Dan notes that if the committee had come up with anything that materially changes the CWMP, that would be included. So far, the committee's work has been on things that were anticipated in the original plan, such as alternative technologies.
- Councilor Clark clarifies her question of "as the deadline approaches, is there any unfinished business that needs to be addressed".
 - Griffin responds that the report continues to be advanced. If any holes are identified as needing input from the committee, they would be brought forth.

Rob Steen notes he must leave, but prior to his departure he wishes to give a moment of credit to Chris Gadd, who has put a lot of time and effort into crafting the recommendation that was approved at this meeting. The committee responds with words of thanks and applause.

Rob Steen left the meeting.

Scott refers to the list of possible meeting topics included in the meeting minutes. He notes that "Private Roads and Sidewalks" are included on that list and does not recall discussing it.

- Griffin responds it is not necessary for the adaptive management plan. It is a policy item related to the CWMP that has not had a group working on it, hence why it was included on this list.
 - Brian asks if Griffin wants the committee to work on the issue.
 - Tom asks if the committee could be updated on the issue.
 - Griffin responds that a briefing on this issue could be given, and a decision made about the committee weighing in
 - Scott notes he sees this as a Planning Board/Department issue. This committee does not have the expertise that they would have.

- Brian notes that several months ago there was a presentation on public and private roads which was comprehensive.
- Dan responds that the Town Manager has a plan now for public and private roads. This overtook the need for the committee to review the topic. There is a prioritization list of roads to take from private to public.
- Louise notes that grinder pumps are also on the list.
 - Scott notes a discussion was had on grinder pumps.
 - Brian notes the discussion on grinder pumps did not come to a resolution.
- Councilor Clark asks if aquaculture has been included as a discussion
 - Griffin responds that it was brought up during Amber's initial presentation.
 - Scott notes a request for Amber to see if there have been increases in shellfish. There was some issue getting the data from the Division of Marine Fisheries.
 - Griffin responds that the information can be gathered and reported at the next meeting.
- Scott notes that the Cape Cod Commission has a technology matrix with proposed credits, which MassDEP may have agreed to. He notes that Wellfleet had the data and is doing more than 20 years ago. He is uncertain what the benefit is.
 - Councilor Clark speculates that the water quality would be worse if aquaculture was not used in Town.
- Councilor Clark notes that upcoming Town Council meetings are on November 6, November 20, December 4, and December 11. She offers an opportunity to provide an update to the Town Council, assuming it matches DPW's expectations.
 - Scott notes the next meeting of the committee is on November 18. He suggests aiming for December 4 or 11. Due to other commitments, he is only able to do December 11.
 - Councilor Clark notes this can be conveyed to the Town Council President for the purposes of agenda setting
- Scott asks if the presentation to Town Council would be the final aspect of the committee.
 - Councilor Clark responds that it would be, unless the recommendation is made and approved for the committee to stay active.
 - Scott responds he assumes the committee would need to still meet for the review of the 5-year update.
 - Louise notes that after the presentation, the Town Council may want the committee to continue and keep the momentum going.
- Scott asks how long the presentation will be
 - Councilor Clark responds it is however long Scott would like it to be.

Adjournment

Following the meeting's agenda, Tom Cambareri requests additional edits to the September 15, 2025 meeting minutes, having not been present when they were approved.

- After Tom reads his suggested edits, Scott Horsley, Chair, requests that he send them via email to himself and Chris Gadd, Communications Assistant, Department of Public Works, to formulate an amendment of the applicable minutes.
- Tom Agrees with this approach

Scott entertains a motion to adjourn. Councilor Starr moves to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Clark seconds. The meeting is adjourned at 8:03 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 (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 (Held on October 14, 2025)
 - Final recommendations, discussions, and any other related topics.
- Meeting #14 (Scheduled for November 18, 2025)
 - Hold for final discussions.
- Meeting #15 (Tentatively December)
 - Potentially not needed
 - Committee concludes on December 31, 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?