

COMPREHENSIVE WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

May 15, 2008 –4:00 pm
Selectmen's Meeting Room, Town Offices, Chatham, Massachusetts

PRESENT:

CAC: Phil Christophe, Fred Jensen, John Randall, Burt Segall, John Payson, John Raye, and Scott Tappan

CAC members not present: Didi Lovett, Bob DePatie, David MacAdam, Chuck Pollard

TAG: Bob Duncanson, Bill Redfield

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

Item 1: Minutes

Minutes of the April 24, 2008 meeting were approved with the following correction: Remove paragraph 1 on page 4.

Item 2: Draft Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan

Fred Jensen asked Bob Duncanson to provide a brief overview of highlights of the plan. Bob Duncanson stated that there were a number of changes made following the comment period last fall. Additional financial information has been included, i.e., estimated costs for individual property connections. He also noted that specific details about an actual implementation schedule/plan were not included to allow flexibility to the town. Issues to be considered in developing the implementation schedule/plan will include, but not be limited to, environmental need, proposed development/re-development projects (i.e. private participation in infrastructure construction), tourist/summer traffic impact(s), and public construction projects (i.e., the expected work on Route 28 by Mass Highway).

Fred Jensen asked about reasonable advance notice to property owners regarding construction. Bob Duncanson indicated that there will likely be at least a two-year advance notice based on the need to appropriate design and construction funding at Town Meetings.

Phil Christopher noted that the report seems to be well written and responds to questions asked earlier. He expressed concern regarding competition for contractors in the future as other towns also become involved in similar construction projects. He suggested exploring the possibility of completing some of the construction efforts "in house."

John Payson asked about differences in estimated hook-up costs from Table 9-8 and 11-2 of the report. Bob Duncanson explained that Table 9-8 addresses Phase 1 costs while Table 11-2 includes the entire project, including build-out estimates, resulting in a lower estimated per-property connection cost.

Fred Jensen asked about the decision-making process for setting (implementation) priorities. Bob Duncanson indicated that decisions would be made jointly by the TAG, our consultants, and the Town's Water and Sewer Advisory Committee.

John Raye stated that the plan is well written and is improved from the earlier draft.

John Randall made the following motion, seconded by Phil Christophe:

That the CAC endorse this draft of the CWMP and recommend that it be accepted by the Board of Selectmen and others responsible for plan implementation.

Discussion:

John Payson expressed concern that the report was still in draft form and additional time is needed to research alternative solutions. He indicated that he could not support the plan at this time.

Vote: The motion passed by a vote of 6 to 1.

Fred Jensen indicated that there is still time to submit questions or concerns regarding the plan during the review period. Comments may be submitted to MEPA until June 6. The Cape Cod Commission has not yet indicated a closing date for its comment period.

Bob Duncanson explained that on June 13th, the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs will issue a decision on the adequacy of the DCWMP/DEIR in meeting the MA Environmental Policy Act and whether additional issues need to be addressed. Any issues will be addressed as part of the development of a Final CWMP/Final EIR. The FCWMP/FEIR will be reviewed by the TAG/CAC and then submitted to MEPA and the Cape Cod Commission, this will initiate another round of public review (public comment period, public hearing) most likely in the fall. Following sign-off by MEPA, the CCC will finalize its review of the Plan as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI).

Scott Tappan asked if there will be any Federal review of the plan. Bob Duncanson indicated that Federal agencies (EPA, National Park Service) receive the DCWMP/DEIR and FCWMP/FEIR and they can comment if they feel it is appropriate (the complete required distribution list is included in Vol. 1 of the DCWMP/DEIR). Other agencies can request the document(s) as part of the MEPA process.

John Payson asked about the revised TMDL's (south-side embayments). Bob Duncanson responded, based on a recent inquiry to DEP, that the revised TMDL document has not yet been finalized by DEP.

There was brief discussion about cost estimates but it was agreed that the report itself does not focus on implementation issues. All funding will need to be approved by Town Meeting over a 20- to 30-year period.

John Payson again questioned the exploration of alternative solutions. Fred Jensen indicated that Sterns & Wheler has explored many alternatives and provided information about their suitability, both technologically and fiscally, to solve the Town's nitrogen problem.

Item 3: Discussion of Proposed statement by the CAC in support of the DCWMP/DEIR at the May 22, 2008 hearing.

Burt Segall provided an outline of suggested points to provide information to those attending the hearing. Included were the following:

1. **Who** we are (a history of the CAC and its work);
2. **Support** for the various elements of the project including expansion of the treatment plant, construction of a collection system and how this will be done over time;
3. **Why** the CAC supports the project, i.e., to protect the environment, protect public health, and protect Cape Cod's sole-source aquifer; and
4. **Why** alternative solutions are not feasible.

John Raye expressed support for this approach and suggested adding information about "Adaptive Management" to the statement as plans and construction projects may change in the future in response to technological advances or other unknown factors.

John Payson expressed concern about long timelines in analyzing the success of the project. He also questioned the ongoing dispute between SMAST and DEP regarding figures used in the study. (*RAD note – the current dispute between SMAST & DEP does not involve "figures used in the study", the dispute centers on access to the data and model by those outside of SMAST*).

Burt Segall indicated that what Chatham is doing is not unique and will be done in phases, allowing us to evaluate what has been accomplished as the project progresses. We live in a fragile environment and the approach we have chosen is good.

Scott Tappan expressed support of Burt Segall's approach and the addition of information about adaptive management.

Fred Jensen agreed to meet with Burt Segall to complete the outline and prepare a statement for the public hearing.

John Randall made the following motion:

That the CAC endorses the development of a support statement to be written by Fred Jensen and Burt Segall, following Burt Segall's outline and including mention of "Adaptive Management", for presentation at the public hearing.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

There was brief discussion of the value of individual treatment systems. Bob Duncanson stated that this information is included in the appendices of the report but the "IA" approach was

deemed inappropriate because of seasonal impacts, management difficulties, and performance issues. The “IA” approach was not recommended for those reasons.

Bill Redfield indicated that the approach chosen is good and that if new technology is developed to better enhance the digestion of organisms, we can adapt our project accordingly.

Item 4: Discussion of suggested written response to Don Edge of the Summer Residents Advisory Committee

Bob Duncanson indicated that he has sent material(s) to the Chairman, including a copy of a letter from Bill Redfield to the SRAVC outlining the rationale for a 20- to 30-year construction period.

Bill Redfield indicated that his letter had been sent in response to a telephone conversation with Don Edge after which he provided an outline of information about a variety of issues included in their discussion.

After additional discussion of previous communications with Don Edge and the Summer Residents Advisory Committee it was agreed that no additional information was needed.

Bob Duncanson indicated that it would be appropriate to send a summary note indicating that the issues raised by the SRAC (shorter Phase 1 implementation period/water reuse) has been discussed by the CAC and that the CAC is aware of Bill Redfield’s letter. Fred Jensen agreed to send this note.

Item 5: Discussion of Article 36 – Alum Treatment at Stillwater Pond and Lovers Lake

Bob Duncanson indicated that the consultant has been asked to proceed with the permitting process for alum treatment of Stillwater Pond and Lovers Lake. The Town is seeking state grants to assist in paying for the treatment.

Item 6: Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 pm.

Notes by
Marie Williams