

Minutes

Section 208 Area-Wide Water Quality Advisory Board Meeting

November 19, 2013

1pm

Cape Cod Commission Conference Room

3225 Main Street, Barnstable, MA

Present: Wendy Northcross, Sheila Vanderhoef, Robin Wilkins, Robert Lawton, Virginia Valiela, Robert Churchill, Paul Niedzwiecki, Andrew Gottlieb, Kristy Senatori, Erin Perry, Nate Keenan

Executive Directors Update

Completed Stakeholder Meeting 2: Technologies & Approaches

- Meeting in each of the watershed groups
- In process of incorporating comments and suggestions in to technology fact sheets

Held the last 2 meetings of the Technologies Panel – 10/28 and 11/6

- Continued discussion on technologies matrix
- Discussed 3VS Model for Cape Cod
- Discussed USGS/APCC Sea Level Rise Study

Met with RLI twice – 10/17 and 11/7

- Timeline needed for piloting
- Creation of an ad hoc monitoring committee

Launched the second Cape2O game – ur in charge!

- 900+ signed up to play
- Several schools engaged
- Causes that won: Falmouth STEM Program, Algae Drone, CARE for the Cape & Islands

Held an end of game event on 11/13

- Over 100 attended
- Presented overview of game and awards
- Previewed the APCC video – Saving Paradise
- Discussed 208 planning to date – CCC, DEP, EPA
- Previewed next 6 months of a stakeholder engagement process

Conducted affordability workshop with the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors – 11/6

Met with the Water Protection Collaborative on 11/13 to provide an update on 208 process

Staff and AECOM have continued work on:

- Technologies matrix
- Scenario development
- TBL model

Andrew Gottlieb mentioned that the Collaborative will be issuing an RFP over the winter to look for someone to do south side monitoring.

Wendy asked if someone wanted to respond to the RFP, does that mean they can't be on the ad hoc monitoring committee.

Andrew didn't think there would be a conflict

Paul said the committee might not start until after the RFP is closed and the consultant is chosen.

Stakeholder Meeting 3

Paul described the stakeholder process to date:

First meeting (September) – baseline conditions

Second meeting (October-November) – technology options

Third meeting (December) – problem solving, applying information from the first two meetings to each watershed

We are looking to come to consensus with the stakeholder groups about how we should be looking at the watersheds.

In the next 6 months we'll roll the 11 watershed groups up to the 4 subregional groups and conduct a series of meetings that includes DEP and EPA at the table. DEP and EPA have agreed to do this.

In transition we'll be holding a stakeholder summit in February where we hope to have all of the stakeholders in one room.

As we move in to the four subregional groups we'll transition from talking about the jurisdiction of the problem to talking about the jurisdiction of solution – shared watersheds, economies of scale, and efficiencies of certain technologies.

This follows the idea of watershed governance, stakeholders interacting with regulators.

Two teams at the Commission worked on two individual approaches in each watershed:

- The traditional approach (Tom Cambareri and Water Resources Department)
- Non-traditional approach (Scott Horsley, Heather McElroy and AECOM)

This allowed us to generate a maximum collection footprint and minimum collection footprint, along with alternatives for each watershed, as bookend scenarios. We will work with stakeholder groups to come up with the middle ground scenario.

Erin Perry presented the watershed calculator (excel spreadsheet) to the group.

Wendy Northcross suggested a slider be added so that you can see how the numbers are changing.

Paul said that one of the questions that comes up often is how you permit a scenario that uses these alternative technologies. This is where we need flexibility from DEP and for them to consider moving toward watershed permitting. We also need them to give us a period of time to monitor and see if some of these things work.

If you select some of these projects and monitor but they aren't working in the time period allocated, then you might need to default to the backup plan and increase your sewer footprint, which is the alternative bookend in this process.

This will help create environmental stewardship in the watershed – people will pay more attention if a bad action causes an increased payment.

Wendy Northcross said that we need a watershed communications strategy.

Paul replied that watershed associations could develop in each watershed and that this may help with permitting too.

Wendy asked if DEP allows watershed permitting now.

Paul said no. This reinforces the importance of monitoring - DEP needs confidence in the monitoring approach, and there has to be a management structure in place that DEP has confidence in.

Andrew said that they've been thinking about this for 25 years conceptually, but no one has asked for it.

Paul said the set of solutions needs to be clear before talking much about format.

Bob Churchill asked what the worst part of Bass River is and Paul responded Fallons Pond.

Bob asked if they would they open the old railroad bridge.

Paul said that's being talked about. There are definitely opportunities for enhanced natural attenuation.

Jay Detjens gave a preview of www.CCH2O.org, which goes live next week.

Jay said that we want to use this website as a portal for anyone who wants to start engaging in the planning process that we have been working on.

We were trying to keep it simple, clean, and easy to digest.

5 pages total:

- Landing page
- Problem description
- Learn about your local watershed
- Solve the problem
- Learn more

Paul said that it acquaints people with process of identifying solutions.

Virginia asked what the goals are of these games.

Paul replied that it is to bring more people to the discussion and to try new ways of outreach. It's a way to educate people about the problem.

TBL model

Paul described the Triple Bottom Line Model which will be used in the spring to evaluate options.

It helps to illustrate the environmental, social, and financial impacts of investments in water quality. You can visually see the cost, performance, and community benefits of solutions and how they compare to one another.

This is different from the 3VS model we are working on with EPA because it looks at specific solutions. 3vs looks specifically at the cost of doing nothing.

Wendy said it will be extremely helpful if people can play around with it. You'll be able to self-select and test your own scenarios.

Robin asked if construction workers were included in stakeholder groups.

Paul said yes there are some, but there is no specific seat for homebuilders. We have presented twice to the homebuilders association. They understand the problem and how it will impact their livelihood. We could make this a permanent seat on the 4 subregional groups. They are up to speed on the issue.

Virginia asked if we have you included people in the fertilizing industry. They were at the first meeting in Falmouth, but haven't been added to group.

Paul said that this could be made a permanent seat too. We had a separate stakeholder group as part of the Fertilizer DCPC process. This could be incorporated in to the subregional groups. They should have a seat.

Next meeting is December 17th at 1pm, CCC Conf Room.