



**Town of Wareham  
Board of Health**

**Meeting Minutes**

**September 15, 2010**

**Present: Guy Campinha  
Diane Allen  
Dr. Tom Gleason  
Dr. Lisa Irish  
Robert Ethier, Health Agent**

**4:05 p.m.**

On tonight's agenda is a public hearing in regard to the Wareham Nitrogen Consensus. I believe this is the Action Plan that was proposed. And then we are also I believe, to discuss the By-Laws that they were talking about adding. So, we will get under way. Our thoughts and correct us if we are wrong, is that someone was going to be a presenter to present this and we were delighted to hear that. And then there is quite a crowd and I am sure everybody has a comment. So, we will have a comment period. I would like to keep it to what it is. Keep it focused on what it is. So, I guess whoever is going to be the speaker will tell us what the plans are, what direction we are going in, what the ideals are and we will go from there. If you wouldn't mind, when you do come up, please identify yourself.

**DB:** I am David (015), the Clean Water Committee.

**EP:** I am Edward Pacewicz, the Chairman of the Clean Water Committee. Just as an introduction, the Clean Water Committee (017). Based on that report and the consensus, the Committee developed a By-Law. I hope you all have copies. The Clean Water Consensus meeting developed this particular by-law to implement portions of the report that you have in your hands right now. The idea of this by-law is to establish a standard in which (018) 10,000 gallons which is currently being used by the State. And the State decided not yet as a policy but have implemented Nitrogen net zero in several large developments. So, the Clean Water Committee took out the specific standards and developed the by-law to be submitted at this town meeting. The consensus meeting was unanimous on this particular section, dealing with the standards. And as you may or may not know, we had a broad spectrum of individuals who attended this consensus meeting from all sides of the issue. Also, as part of the report you will see the consensus (037) to do something about this in the Fall or the Spring of 2010 or 2011. The Clean Water Committee decided to take action first and developed this to get this on the road. As you can see, it sets up standards for Nitrogen net zero. Nitrogen net zero means that if you are adding Nitrogen to a

particular water shed, you have to remove (041) so that there is zero net increase in Nitrogen. Are we all aware of the problem with Nitrogen? Okay. It is pretty straight forward. There is offsets. There is room for the Board of Health to make determinations of what they would consider to be Nitrogen net zero. As you can see (047). What has happened? Why do we need this by-law and why now? 815 Main Street, which is a 40-B development that's established their discharge at 9,950 gallons, fifty gallons under the 10,000 allotted. What does that mean? That means that an average Wareham resident who is paying \$25,000 for a septic system, if I can use a pun, your money went down the toilet to the tune of \$1,225,000. What does that mean? They paid 1 million, and I am talking about 49 units. 49 homes paid \$1,225,000 to hook up to sewer. 815 Main Street came in and the amount of Nitrogen they took out of the water, 815 Main Street put back in to the water. So, we just wasted \$1,250,000. If you listened last night to the Board of Selectmen's meeting, Walmart is moving in. Walmart is 9,600 gallons of discharge daily. Again, just under the 10,000. That means that the sewage that is taking place in the Town right now is going to be offset by the amount of Nitrogen that is being introduced into the system through watersheds by Walmart. Another million dollars wasted by the residents of Wareham. That is over 2 million dollars and 2 projects that we are talking about right now, that are happening right now. We can't allow sewer to be put in and on the other hand new construction to add Nitrogen where the sewer is taking Nitrogen out. We are not getting it. You are taking it out of one hand and putting it with the other. This by-law is designed to lower the standards from 10,000 gallons to 3,300 gallons and if they are above 3,300 gallons, they have to go to Nitrogen net Zero. The same way they would have to go to Nitrogen net zero if they were over 10,000 gallons. There has been a lot of discussions about regulations and when and where we should have them. It was the consensus of the Clean Water Committee that we should try to get a standard passed first. And then work on the regulations. The discussion involved the ideas that there is no sense working on regulations if we are not going to get the standard passed. So, lets get the standard passed and then we can work on the regulations. I know the Clean Water Committee, depending on which way the Board of Health would like to go, would be very willing and able to try to assist the Board of Health in drawing up these regulations. I am sure there are other parties that we could call on to draw up some of these regulations and implement this particular by-law. My committee directed me and Mr. Begley to come to the Board of Health. We are looking for your support on this by-law. It is an issue that has to be addressed and the sooner it is addressed, the better off we all will be. Thank you. If there are any questions.

**GC:**

I don't think there are any specific questions. One thing that I am missing is 2 million dollars. Where did we lose 2 million dollars? In revenues generated by hooking up to the sewer plants or where is that money.

**EP:** Okay. The money is what the individuals paid to hook up to sewer. Approximately \$25,000 down in Oakdale and Cromesett per resident. Now you take a resident paying \$25,000 and multiply it by 49, which is the number of units at 815 Main Street, you come up with \$1,250,000. So, we paid \$1,250,000 to take out the Nitrogen in Oakdale and Cromesett and 815 Main Street put the Nitrogen back in. So, we didn't make any headway.

**GC:** As far as Nitrogen loading goes?

**EP:** That is correct. Now you take the second million dollars that is involved with Walmart. Walmart is moving over to West Wareham. They are going to be discharging 9,600 odd gallons per day. You take the same idea. People over in Tempest Knob, Parkwood, the rest of them, were paying to take the Nitrogen out of the system, out of the watershed and Walmart is putting it back in. And unless we have some of guidance in between there to limit them, we will never, ever get ahead of the Nitrogen loading problem because as more people go on sewer and construction goes along unabated, without any regulations, we are just offsetting each other. We are not helping to correct the problem.

**GC:** What is the capacity at the treatment plant? What's available? So, in other words, if you told Walmart and the project at 815 to tie in, would they be able to tie in?

**EP:** I don't think so.

**GC:** So, that wouldn't accomplish anything. So, we would have to find some other way of getting the nitrogen out.

**EP:** That is correct and that is why we are dealing with off sets.

**GC:** This doesn't address that. The only options they have is to take a cranberry bog off line to tie somebody in net zero or whatever the Board of Health deemed to get to that point. So this is the one that you rely on, the Board of Health. In other words, the Board of Health would say, okay. We can't get you there. However, we are going to develop something to make net zero.

**EP:** One of the issues that I did not put on there was the idea of (888) nitrogen net zero. Maybe should have tried to put in a package treatment plant. As a result of that package treatment plant, in order to off set to get to zero, they took out a residence home in their area. ( on sewer) and put it into their plant. So, the off set took place is that they were taking out nitrogen from other sources that already existed and putting into their plant. So, it was getting cleaned down and instead of being 35 parts to a million, it was 5 parts to a million. As they did that, they came to a point where it was zero. In addition, they took bogs off line. The whole idea of package treatment plant, especially on some of these large developments is, the way we see it, should be (899). For instance, 815 Main Street.

**TG:** What is the cost to the developer of the package treatment plant?

**EP:** I have no idea. It would depend on the size. But I can tell you right now and I gave you the figures, what it is costing the resident.

**GC:** A package plant to me is a very, very doable and probably in my

opinion, just my opinion, would be the most sensible way to go. You are talking about Walmart. This is nice, don't misunderstand me but I would like to (899). If net zero is a Town approach, not to be pigeonholed into any specific, if we knew that we had to get the net zero on any development that is over your 3,000 threshold, if that is what they accepted. Then we would have to look at alternative methods, like a treatment plant. Walmart, fine, do your thing but here is what you got to put into the ground when you get there, which may mean treating their individual waste water to get to that net zero or whatever it may be. Same thing with 815 Main or any other large development. Because it seems to be the way to go. Some of the larger developments that I have been involved with in Foxboro and other places, they put in 45,000 gallon per day treatment plants, 25,000 gallon per day treatment plants, whatever the case may be, to meet that need. I am comfortable with something like that but that is just an opinion and it is just my perspective. But anyways.

**EP:** That is why we left it open, so that the Board of Health could make a determination. I personally am totally in favor of it, especially in some of the areas that we have in Wareham, like Shangri-La, that are way out (909). It wouldn't make sense to put a pipe all the way up there. The cost would be prohibitive. The answer to that is a package treatment plant. And the idea of the developers now taking responsibility for cleaning up versus the residents having to clean up their mess, is what (919) what is driving all of this.

**GC:** Well, the developer, once he leaves, we take on the residence and we take on all the (921), our infrastructure, our school systems, we get the tax base for that house and whatever that case may be. It certainly doesn't interfere with their children. It doesn't take care of cleaning their water. The issue is far greater than just the nitrogen when we allow development in the Town of Wareham. So, that is another whole issue. But I would like to see some type .... And I will tell you, I am not a big fan of alternate systems because I do not have enough data. I don't have any general .... I called the DEP and there is none that is generally accepted. So, that concerns me. Because everything technically is kind of up in the air. So, I am not a big fan. I am not saying that they don't work but I am not a big fan. There is not enough data in my opinion. But nonetheless, that's why in large developments, I think that we should really look at treatment plants. So, yes. I can agree with that portion of it. I am just not comfortable with the entire package. But this portion of this package, treatment plants, absolutely. I think something needs to be done. I think we all agree with it. We are not going to ignore it.

**EP:** Just a comment on the part of the alternate septic systems. Barnstable County has a test site and they have extensive data of over several years on how these alternate septic systems do work.

**GC:** They do. I do not disagree with you. However, is the data complete? There is the possibility that the home owner haven't been following it

through. From all the reports, you call the Boston DEP, all the reports aren't there. So, they just don't know and to make an alternative system work, the data has to be there. In other words, the quarterlies have to be done and they are not being done with any consistency. They do it the first year but the second year, third year, fourth year, there is no mandate. There is no treatment plant operators on those. I mean, it goes on and on and on. So, as far as I am concerned, they don't work because they get lost in the shuffle. So, in the big picture, it doesn't do it for me.

**EP:** I would agree with that if you are talking about individuals. I totally agree with that.

**GC:** There is developments that they put all these into development and then the home owner is responsible for that plant and it doesn't get taken care of. They take it off line because of whatever the reasons may be. So, I am not a big fan of alternate because you are asking the homeowner to still be responsible.

**EP:** In the discussions that we had with the Clean Water Committee the first alternative we felt that would be the municipal sewer system. The second best was in fact, the package treatment plant. That is the one that (938) removing nitrogen. And the third, which is the last alternative, is in fact, the individual alternate septic system. So, I agree totally with you on that. We are aware that package treatment plant out there in Fairhaven seems to be working real well out there. What this by-law is going to establish is the standard that the developers will have to meet, so that we can start to gain on the nitrogen problem instead of just not making any headway, which is costing the citizens and residents of Wareham an awful lot of money.

**GC:** The estuary project, where is that? Do we have any .... I thought there was supposed to be a final draft a long time ago.

**RE:** I just spoke with Brian Howes from, he is the estuary project coordinator for UMASS Dartmouth. He said that after the realignment of the watershed and everything that they had to do to make the final draft complete and more accurate, he expects that within the next two months we will have the final copy of the final draft. You might ask Corinne if that is actual. Is that true?

**UNK:** I am hearing it for the first time.

**RE:** I had a conversation with him just last week and he said that we can expect it no later than two months from now. So, we are hoping that is true. I don't know how much that will change this. I don't know if we can expect much of a change with the realignment of the watershed, which will have some impact on the nitrogen in different areas of the Town of Wareham. But certainly, I don't know that the decision should be made after that report comes out or if a decision such as in this case, after the report comes out or before. I don't know that it is going to change much and we don't know and he didn't elaborate on that with me.

**EP:** I just want to make a comment on that. (961) But as far as I understand

it, the actual numbers in the draft report, they wanted a 55% reduction in discharges from septic systems and they want a 1/3 reduction in discharge from the power treatment plant. To the best of my understanding, that is not going to happen. Those are not going to change. And remember, we are talking about a town wide by-law here, not only just the (river). 99% of Wareham is either covered by the Wareham River Estuary watershed or the We-we-Antic River watershed. There is really very little left out by Wareham that is not part of either one of those two watersheds, both of which are impaired both by the Federal Government and the State Government (970). The We-we-Antic River is going to be a little bit different than the Wareham River. But we are addressing a significant loading aspect of nitrogen, which is in fact due to development of septic systems.

**TG:** Who is responsible for supervising the package treatment plants?

**EP:** That would have to be, monitoring I would say the Board of Health supervising. I would expect that they would have to have a plant manager.

**TG:** Is that the Town's responsibility or the developer's responsibility?

**EP:** That would be the resident's responsibility along with the developer to establish that. They would have to be paying some type of a fee. The same way we pay a fee to get on sewer here. They would have to pay a fee also.

**TG:** Who does their testing to make sure that they are meeting their goal?

**EP:** That would be part of the regulation that the Board of Health established. Whether you want an annual test or not.

**TG:** But who does it?

**EP:** The developer and then report to you.

**GC:** If the treatment plant was a mandate and of course it is going to be is it is us or whoever it was, there are other issues involved because now you are asking for a discharge permit to the ground water. Usually if it is going to be over 10,000 gallons, DEP steps in. They develop a plan and they have to follow that plan. So, whoever the developer is, he will establish that and follow it and he will take care of everything. Then when he transfers over to the homeowners, I don't know what happens but somebody at that point still is going to be responsible to have the treatment plant operate, the maintenance, the testing and all that. That is regulated by the Department of Environmental Protection.

**TG:** The question is, does that fall back to the Town?

**GC:** To DEP. It goes to the Department of Environmental Protection with a cc to the Town. So, you will make sure. Once you get over 10,000 gallons they own it. Because you are asking to discharge water to the table.

**TG:** And we are changing that to 3,300 and then.....

**GC:** Yes a grey area between 33 and 10.

**TG:** So, DEP takes over at that level?

**GC:** I don't know. We will have to ask them or tell them this is our prior law and there is a discrepancy there and I can't answer that question. So, the

question I had about the municipal plant, so 3 – 1 is really not a viable option for a developer because if there is no room to connect somebody else to the treatment plant, then that is not a viable option.

**EP:**

Today, it might not. Tomorrow is could. Or we could have another plant. We could redesign the current plant to (1003) which would increase the capacity of the plant. There are several way that they could do that which would make it a viable option. That's why we put it in there. One of the things with the plant currently going on right now, is the permit only allows so much discharge into the river. According the CEN the (1007) they said the plant could handle more than 1 million but they can't discharge into the river more than 1 million gallons a day. So, if you look at an alternative, probably (1009), which Plymouth has done. You bring up the capacity of the plant without altering the permit or discharging (1010).

**RB:**

Thank you Mister Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Bob Brady and I have been very close to this subject matter for a few years now. I also was part of the group discussions that have taken place over the last 6 months, give or take. And just a quick thanks to the coalition for having allowed a venue for many of us to sit as (1015) as did others. The concern, the main concern first and foremost is that we were all of the consensus that there were a lot of boards, committees and commissions that all needed to get up to speed relative to this consensus. I don't know how many of you have had the opportunity to read through this. It is very comprehensive and it includes any and every sort of issues that were raised through the last six or seven months. And we were also assured that until such time as the Board of Health, the Planning Board, Conservation Commission, Zoning together and any other officials, leaders or otherwise would be most up to speed with this consensus. Now, while we heard that the final report is probably not going to differentiate much in the language other than the change in the delineation of different zones and different (1021), we all are in agreement that we need to manage our nitrogen loading, not just in Wareham but across the region. And I was of the mind set at least, as one who signed this consensus, that okay, now we have a fairly good outline of exactly or most exactly all the issues that we will be facing today, tomorrow and for generations to come. And in that, I was led to believe and signed on to the fact that we are going to have a number of formal open meetings for any and all of us to participate in with boards like your own and others, to make certain that we cross all our Ts, dot all our Is, everybody is on the same page. So that when the appropriate time comes when all the (1025), are on the same page, then that would seem to be the best time to go forward, to sell a nutrient loading management plan to the Town of Wareham, to the voters and to the enforcement. Now, without picking this article apart because I just got it for the first time, it would seem to me that before we start mandating certain standards, they first need to be realistic. They second need to be fully vetted in that, what is it going to cost the citizens of Wareham to

possible need to increase the department work load in just say, the Health Office for example. To impose a standard without having fully recognized the true cost of enforcing, permitting, monitoring, etc., seems extremely premature to me. While yet principally I agree that a lot of what we discussed for the last 6 months, needs to become part of a management plan for Wareham River. So, I am bothered that it has already appeared as a warrant article. We were led to believe that it was never going to do so without .... Clearly this is the first time from what I am gathering, that while a couple of you did purchase a (1030), this is the first time the document has officially appeared before you. To be expected, of 40 some odd pages, to be expected to act on a proposed warrant article, I just think it is again, way premature. Again, there are some things of interest quickly leafing through that I have some concerns with. But I think I will save those for maybe Town Meeting floor if that is the place. Thank you for your time.

**CP:**

Thank you. I am Corrine Peterson. I am with the Coalition of Buzzards Bay. I just want to take a moment and follow up with Mister Brady's suggestions. To give you a quick summary and brief outline of the presentation that has been brought to you. This is not a Coalition of Buzzards Bay document. This was the culmination of 6 months of work from citizens of Wareham. Although we did sign this document. And so to briefly back up and what the Coalition's role was and what the participants roles were in this process. It was born out of the fact that the Town of Wareham several times in the past tried to pass a nitrogen reducing by-law at town meeting and they were unfortunately fail with the Town. But it was clear to the (1045) and to the Coalition, one, that the Town of Wareham knew that they had a problem. Two, they were trying to solve but finally they just couldn't agree on what was the best way to get perspective in solving this problem. Whereas the Coalition had worked together with a couple of key interested people in town and invited 6 people over 6 months and to talk about the problem and come up with various solutions to that problem. The Coalition (1049), we were fortunate enough to hire a professional facilitator, David Straus, who is a summer resident of Wareham. He helps facilitate these discussions and make sure that we all had a basis for understanding and talk about solutions to these problems. The problem came from several different sources. But there were two major sources, cranberry bogs and waste water. We will talk about waste water right now. The Town is really doing a good job at eliminating forces of nitrogen through the comprehensive waste water management plan that the Town in currently implementing throughout Town. Yes, we need to address new development as well. There are existing sources that the Town needs to address. There were 3 (1050) new sources of nitrogen. One was your larger development. Those developments that are on ground water discharge permits, permitted by the State, either 10,000 gallons per day or more. The State permits those. There is your mid-sized development that the Town of Wareham sees the most, is 10 homes, between 10 and



30 home sub-division. That's about 33 hundred gallons to 10 thousand gallons per day of waste water. Those being permitted on Title V septic systems are the source of where all the new nitrogen is coming from. And then you have your smaller developments here. Your single lot, your single lot family, single family home development. The group agrees that the standard needs to be nitrogen zero. These developments should meet a nitrogen zero standard. I will read to you just briefly what the group agreed to in this document. Just very quickly. (Reads portions of the document). Those are the things the group agreed upon. It is the Coalition's position that there are a lot of details that need to be thought through. This by-law is the right place to start for this particular issue. But I think some issues have been raised here, such as what are the options to off set their nitrogen loads. The by-law does not state that it has to be in the same watershed and so, if I can just explain to you what I mean by that. The off set needs to occur in the same water shed. If you put 5 pounds in the Wareham River, you need to find 5 pounds to take out of the Wareham River somewhere. If you are loading in that water shed you need to take it out of that water shed. One of the options was to hook up to the water treatment facility. It might not be appropriate to allow the developer to pay the sewer, homes that are already to be sewerred. The Town's already working on that problem. The developer can not get credit for doing something the Town is already going to do. It comes down to a resource issue for this Town. We need to think through those issues and how we are going to enforce. This by-law is a good start. The Coalition's recommendation is that we take the next 6 months and work together, the Board of Health, the Planning Board, developers and the Town and sit down and look at this by-law and see if it works and actually meets the regulations. But to implement this by-law and then present the whole package together, Board of Health, everyone on board during Spring town meeting. Any questions?

**GC:** Are you pulling the warrant off this town meeting or are you going forward with this?

**CP:** This is not the Coalition's by-law. We don't have a by-law. It is our position that the Town Board of Health and the Planning should develop a by-law (1251). This is a citizen's by-law and the by-law should be a Town by-law, coming from you folks.

**UNK:** I have a question about the impact of the cranberry bogs.

**CP:** What we did was we split into two task forces, the waste water task force and the cranberry task force. One of the things that we learned about cranberry bogs from the cranberry task force discussions is that we really don't know what the contributions are from the cranberry bogs. There are different types of cranberry bogs. The only data we have is from 1995 and it was a really limited study. We need a comprehensive study to really figure out how much nitrogen is coming from various types of bogs. If there are new construction cranberry bogs, there might not be so much nitrogen from those cranberry bogs. It might come from

another source such as septic systems. We recommended study.

**GC:** The monitoring will always come from the homeowner or the taxpayers because they are going to be ultimately responsible. Once the system, you own that property, whether it is an association or individually, ultimately the responsibility becomes yours. Once the developer leaves, because he does his thing. You agree upon a system, he puts it in, he goes away. So, ultimately you are or that association is responsible.

**UNK:** But the Town still has to have somebody to monitor it.

**GC:** Absolutely, but we put that cost on the homeowner. For me to come out, you are going to pay for that. So, ultimately it will be in the fees.

**CP:** There may be an opportunity to partner with Barnstable County, because they are monitoring every alternative septic system that goes in on Cape Cod. They are already doing it. And they has the resources of staff going out there and inspecting these systems. So, there may be an opportunity as to how the Town of Wareham could partner and use those resources that have already been established.

**GC:** They send someone out to monitor these systems? Do they do the actual reporting to the DEP or to the local towns?

**CP:** Barnstable County will go out and monitor. They are trying to develop a long term data base for how these systems are functioning.

**GC:** Technically, monitoring never goes away.

**EP:** One issue that was discussed was an impact fee for smaller developers, which would be a fee paid to the Towns to help reduce nitrogen. As far as the cranberry bogs, just to add to that. There is huge amount of data on septic systems. The State had done all kinds of tests and studies. They have got it narrowed down pretty much as far as you are going to go with it. There was very little data on the cranberry bogs. That's why we decided to address the septic system because the data is available. The State has already done all of these studies. After we get sufficient data on the cranberry bogs, we will be coming back to address that issue also. Again, we get back to the regulation. This is only a standard which is nitrogen net zero and it is pretty open as far as how to off set it. If we get the standard passed at this town meeting, we can work on the regulations. The regulations are not going to be part of the by-law. The by-law only has to establish the standard and that is what this by-law does. I would agree that we have to make an amendment. Don't know how we missed it but it should be within the receiving watershed as Corinne pointed out. We will make that amendment on town floor. This is only to establish a standard which would be a by-law.

**UNK:** I just have one comment to that. Why not wait until they have all the data. Why just take one piece of data and come up with this policy.

**GC:** Just the time table. When we finally get the final draft, I guess it has to go into final, what is the time table on that compliance? Does anyone have an idea? My understand is 5 – 10 years but I don't have anything concrete. I have nothing in writing. My sense here is the urgency, like we really need to get this done. I am sure we do need to. I think we all agree that we have an issue and we need to address the issue and we are

going to get the issue addressed. I am just concerned that we are just you know, saying we have to do it right away. I tend to agree with what Corinne said and Mr. Brady said, maybe we should all get together and review all this stuff, really hash it out, with all the boards. But I think we have more information to make better decisions on and do it at the Spring Town Meeting. I think that more people get involved, we can make a better decision.

**EP:** The longer you delay the more nitrogen you are adding. That is why the urgency. The longer the delay the less impact the sewer is going to have and the more impact new construction is going to have as far as nitrogen loading.

**TG:** Personally, I agree there is an urgency and I support this as a goal but to implement where you are not sure of the technology, you have no monitoring system in effect, in the long run you may just be aggravating the system all the more. You have to have a monitoring system in place.

**EP:** (Further explanation of monitoring systems.)

**DA:** Myself as a Board member, I feel that I need to do more research into this whole .... I mean we just got this book today to read this and to go look and talk with this. The Chairman said other boards would be the right and just thing to do. So, I can't see myself making a decision at this point.

**RB:** It is very important for everybody here to understand that the impairment to the Wareham River effectively was caused by us, Wareham and the sewerage of a lot of neighborhoods be it Cranberry Highway, Indian Mound Beach and the science back then did not know that by taking all of that effluent, concentrating it into this plant, they didn't know what nitrogen loading was doing to the (0142), effectively caused how bad Wareham river is today. It cleaned up because the science finally learned and look what we have done. We have caused x millions of effluent a day to be treated and discharged. It is killing the Wareham River and it did. Yes, we have got to improve the plant 20 something million to now treat and remove nitrogen. It has cost us money. We have recognized that the two sensitive areas are the Wareham River and the We-we-Antic River. Therefore those neighborhoods bordering those more sensitive areas really should be municipally sewerage. I will bet you most of those systems don't even meet minimal Title V. I wish that instead of pushing this forward **for** this October Town Meeting, that we agree that April makes sense. The Clean Water Committee in its efforts had scheduled a number of meetings with the Board of Health, the Conservation Commission, the Planning Board, etc., and go through this proposal/draft, together with this report, hopefully together with a final draft or a final report from DEP and gear up for April's Town Meeting to have at least a standard or whatever it may be but also rules, regulations, enforcement mechanisms, the resources needed to do that. So you monitor enforcement but somebody has got to monitor it. I really think this needs to be thought through a little bit further than just pushing this forward for October and

that's is what I would encourage any Clean Water Committee to do. In the meantime, I do not see that much significant influx in nitrogen loading between now and April.

**RE:**

I just want to say that I think the Clean Water Committee did an excellent job and the Coalition has done an excellent job. I think some of the statements made here tonight are important and make a lot of sense, that we probably should wait. I just have a question to ask you. Is it fair to say that what we are doing so far with the sewer in the areas on the water and all along the beaches and some of the systems like Mr. Brady said are not up to Title V and most likely aren't up to Title V, is it fair to say that we are going in the right direction though, even though we are not going to act right away until we get the final report on the estuary report? Would you say that we are still in good shape here? I mean, it is not going to be detrimental to the Town to wait 6 months or a year to get all the information, to put it all, to act out on all the information at the same time.

**CP:**

The Town is headed in the right direction, with the upgrades that we saw, the treatment plan, and the planned sewerage. We saw a management plan that the Town is almost done implementing. With that, I also want to say that, that is not going to be enough. Additional sewerage is going to have to be part of it. About 55% additional sewerage is going to be required above and beyond what the Town has already planned for in order to restore the Wareham River. We are only talking about the Wareham River. We have no such studies for the We-we-Antic. That study still had to be done and is years and years away. I wouldn't want to wait too much longer that the 6 months regarding the Wareham River. The Board of Health is doing a really good job at targeting cesspools and bringing them up to Title V compliance.

**GC:**

I want to thank everyone who came this evening and participated because it is a very important issue to all of us here in Wareham. It is a serious problem and it is not just here, it is everywhere. It is good to know that we are stepping up to the plate and trying to get someplace with it. I personally agree with the things that I have heard here tonight as far as six months, whatever it takes. I would rather see it done at the Spring Town Meeting, get more people involved, more input, better decision making and I see a lot of work went into this. But there are some things that we could probably eliminate that would add to confusion. Because as a taxpayer at the Town Meeting, not totally understanding or having the opportunity to have this type of discussion and asking to vote on something, I am not sure it is the best thing to ask of them because they don't have the knowledge to make a decision. And then the short time we have to educate them at the Town Meeting, is not probably not the proper form. And it just isn't going to happen. So, I think if we took more time to educate, get educated through the different boards and invite townspeople, because they ultimately need to be involved too. It is their pockets that is going to be affected. I think we can come to a better decision that is going to benefit the Town of

Wareham. So, I would move, or I would make a suggestion that we not (wrap around) this until probably Spring or whatever and that we have a better chance to put a better proposal together. That would be my suggestion. It is only a suggestion. I don't think I could endorse this on the floor and say this is something I want to go forward with, for the reasons I have stated. And not to diminish your efforts because they are commendable. It always takes somebody to be the leader and force things to happen. And that is good. But like I say, I don't think on the floor at this particular Fall Town Meeting is where this should be presented. And that is just my opinion and you can ask the Board Members. I got the consensus in listening to them and their comments, that that is probably how they feel also. And that would be our position. There has to be more public knowledge. One of the things I am concerned about is that people are not getting the information. I don't hear things about conservation. I think there is a whole host of education that needs to go on. Thank you very much for coming.

(Board Members agreed with Chairman as to holding off and further discussion)

**DA:**  
**GC:**

I make a Motion.

There has been a Motion made to adjourn the hearing, seconded and the hearing is closed.

Prepared by: J. Reed  
Date: October 18, 2010

Signed and dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Guy S. Campinha, Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

Charles S. Gleason, M.D., Member Charles S. Gleason

Diane E. Allen, Member Diane E. Allen

Thomas L. Gleason, M. D., Assoc. Member Thomas L. Gleason MD

Lisa T. Irish, Assoc. Member Lisa T. Irish

10/18/10