

COMPREHENSIVE WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

December 7, 2007 –4:00 pm  
Meeting Room A, Town Offices, Chatham, Massachusetts

**PRESENT:**

CAC: Phil Christophe, Fred Jensen, David MacAdam, John Randall, John Raye, Burt Segall,  
and John Payson

CAC members not present: Didi Lovett, Bob DePatie, Chuck Pollard, Scott Tappan

TAG: Bob Duncanson, Bill Redfield

Others Present: Nate Weeks (S&W), Chuck Bartlett

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm.

**Minutes**

Minutes of the October 25, 2007 meeting were approved with the following correction:  
Delete “y” from the word “ready” on page four.

Minutes of the November 7, 2007 meeting were approved with the following correction:  
Add “a” before the words “similar program” on page 3; change meeting time to 2:00 pm.

**Continuation of discussion by CAC members of Stearns & Wheler’s responses to the written comments submitted by CAC members regarding the Preliminary Draft of the CWMP.**

(For purposes of brevity, the questions/concerns expressed by each CAC member will be noted in summary form with the *response and related discussion shown in italics*; page #'s refer to the Oct. 17, 2007 Draft Response to CAC Comments Memorandum)

John Payson: RE: Page 20, Item 65

- John Payson asked about the status of Article 2 of the Water and Sewer Regulations. *Bill Redfield explained that Article 2 provides a mechanism for determination of design sewage flow using Title 5 design criteria and any modifying Board of Health Regulations. Article 2 will be in effect when the Administrative Consent Order is lifted. To connect to the sewer, a property owner must apply to the Water and Sewer Department. Flow allowances may be adjusted for commercial properties in the future.*  
*Nate Weeks explained that planning for flow and loads in the DCWMP has been done based on average water consumption figures combined with peaking factors.*  
*Nate Weeks stated that Stearns & Wheler does not recommend that any town monitor actual sewer flow from individual properties. Sewer use should be “regulated”*

- through zoning bylaws that limit the intensity of development on a parcel, i.e., number of seats in a restaurant, number of employees, etc.*
- Bob Duncanson stated that sewer regulations should not take the place of zoning regulations. He further explained that Article II of the Sewer Regulations was passed to ensure that design (not actual) sewer flows will be based on Title V and Board of Health restrictions/regulations.*
- Chuck Bartlett noted that the Friends of Chatham Waterways spearheaded consideration of a "Growth Neutral Policy" (which was codified as Article II of the Sewer Regulations) because of concerns about the potential impact of sewerage in the town. The purpose was to alleviate fears that the sewer would allow increased development. Chuck Bartlett indicated that the FCW is comfortable with the "growth neutral policy" as adopted by Town Meeting in the Sewer Regulations.*
- Bill Redfield stated that the Board of Health Regulations have not changed significantly in recent years, requiring 10,000 square feet of upland per 110 gallons/day of wastewater design flow.*
- Bob Duncanson reiterated that the Board of Health only has control over the number of bedrooms in a house, not the size of the house. The house cannot have more bedrooms than would be allowed under Title V and local regulations.*

- Discussion turned to other redevelopment issues. There was discussion about possible redevelopment of the Sou'Wester property.  
*Bob Duncanson explained that the primary concern of the Board of Health would be nitrogen load. Once the current nitrogen load is determined (based on Title 5 design criteria), if engineers can achieve an equivalent nitrogen load with more intense development, then it may be possible for the Board of Health to grant greater density. This is based on the increasing sophistication of on-site wastewater treatment technology. However, the actual level of development that occurs is a function of Planning Board and Zoning Board approvals. It was reiterated that we should not attempt to use the wastewater plan to determine zoning issues.*
- Discussion turned to water usage.  
*The town does not limit the amount of water that any property can use (however, the Town does have an aggressive water conservation program), this is controlled by pricing. Similarly, the town will not limit the amount of actual sewer discharge from a property provided the discharge is in compliance with the Rules & Regulations of the Sewer Department.*
- John Payson asked about the flows allocated to the Frog Pond Laundromat.  
*Nate Weeks indicated that these flows had been included in the calculations for the CWMP.*  
  
*Bob Duncanson indicated that the TAG, the Water & Sewer Advisory Committee, and Stearns & Wheeler will be responsible for setting priorities regarding the implementation of the plan.*

John Payson indicated that his questions had been satisfactorily discussed and addressed.

Scott Tappan asked about the impact of sewer connections on assessments.

*Bill Redfield indicated that the betterment/financial decisions have not yet been made, but that assessments may increase as there will be increased value in the property (i.e. the property is “bettered” by connection to municipal sewer), although all will eventually equalize as the project is completed.*

Fred Jensen:

- Page 1. Fred Jensen suggested that the voters might benefit from seeing an example of how implementation might proceed.

*Bob Duncanson will develop a conceptual idea of how a 20-year effort might occur.*

- Page 5, question 18 – It was suggested that the study might exchange sewer-sheds 13 and 14.

*Nate Weeks indicated that they will take a look at this and determine if it would be a good idea.*

- Page 6, question 22 – OK

- Page 7, question 28 – Fred Jensen asked about sewershed 16 being included in Phase 1 as it encompasses part of Stillwater Pond.

*Bob Duncanson indicated that this will be reviewed with S&W. He noted that it is likely that the project will begin in more developed areas of town. Sewersheds chosen for Phase I was based on maximizing the nitrogen removal in cost-effective manner to meet the nitrogen removal goals. It was also noted that this sewershed is downgradient of Lovers Lake and that the level of development is relatively low.*

- Page 8, question 30 – Fred Jensen suggested that the text should comment on the range of costs which a property owner can expect to incur when connecting to the collection system.

*Bob Duncanson indicated that this information is now available through the recent survey and it will be incorporated into the final version of the plan.*

- Page 8, question 35 – Fred Jensen questioned the percentage change in I/I costs from the “Final Needs Assessment Report (August 1999)” (at 18%) to the current Table 9-8 which shows an I/I Total for the Sewershed Total which is 58% of the Average Existing Sewershed Total.

*Nate Weeks indicated that it is important to provide for long-term needs and indicate that standard engineering has been used to develop this table. We are designing for the worst-case scenario and for a lasting good result. Fred Jensen asked if there would be cost savings if we assumed a lower I/I percentage. Bill Redfield indicated that any such savings would be primarily in excavation cost savings rather than in savings from reduced pipe sizes.*

Bob Duncanson indicated that the TAG would like to have a sense of the committee's position relative to the preliminary draft and the changes discussed in recent meetings. He noted that the earliest MEPA submission date at this point would be the first two weeks in January (with publication in the Environmental Monitor in mid-January), but most likely later given the holidays. Publication in the Monitor would initiate a 30-day public comment period during which the Cape Cod Commission would conduct a simultaneous review.

Scott Tappan made the following motion:

*That the CAC endorse the preliminary CWMP draft with revisions discussed at recent meetings and that the draft is submitted to MEPA at the earliest possible submission date.*

The motion was seconded by Phil Christophe.

David MacAdam indicated that he had an issue with the lack of a financing plan and said that he could not endorse the plan without that information. Phil Christophe said that the financial plan will be developed by the Board of Selectmen and the Town Manager and is not meant to be part of the CWMP.

(Due to other commitments, Fred Jensen had to leave the meeting and turned the moderating responsibility over to Vice-chairman Phil Christophe.)

Burt Segall indicated that the Executive Summary of the CWMP should be used as an instrument for communicating with the community and should contain information about individual cost expectations/ranges. Total project costs must be looked at in a temporal way, i.e., how much per year, how much in betterments, how much impact on the tax base.

Bob Duncanson indicated that the financial policy decisions are still to be made by the Board of Selectmen. He added that the Town Manager had prepared a fiscal analysis several years ago which included costs on a monthly or yearly basis.

Bill Redfield indicated that cost information is not meant to be included in the CWMP but will be included in separate informational brochures to be provided to the public.

Burt Segall indicated that we are now moving into the next phase of the project. DEP is not concerned with costs but is concerned with the time element and whether the project will achieve the required nitrogen levels.

Bob Duncanson said that DEP is interested in the Town's commitment to accomplishing the plan and desired goals. Nate Weeks added that DEP has reviewed a draft of the report and sees the Town's commitment in terms of how much can be completed each year, i.e., miles of pipe or dollars expended per year.

Bob Duncanson indicated that completing the project in 8 to 10 years, as had been suggested by the Non-voting Taxpayers Association, is not realistic. He indicated that during the MEPA

review process, some may urge quicker completion of the project but that a 20-year project span is a more reasonable plan for financial and community impact reasons.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

In favor: 4

Opposed: 3

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Thursday, January 10, 4:00 p.m., Annex Meeting Room, George Ryder Road