

**CAPE COD REGIONAL GOVERNMENT - ASSEMBLY OF DELEGATES  
NAUSET BEACH GAZEBO  
239 BEACH ROAD  
EAST ORLEANS, MASSACHUSETTS 02653**

**APPROVED JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS - AUGUST 19, 2015**

Speaker BERGSTROM: Good afternoon. Welcome to Nauset Beach. Thanks to our host, the Town of Orleans, we are able to enjoy the beautiful scenery here at Nauset Beach.

Is anyone recording this mess? Anybody else recording this meeting?

REPORTER: Barnstable Patriot.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Oh, you are. Okay. So we have a separate recording besides our original recording. In that case, I will then call the meeting to order.

We will start with a moment of silence to honor our troops who have died in service to our country and all those serving our country in the Armed Forces.

(Moment of silence.)

Thank you.

We will now stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: The Clerk will call the roll.

**Roll Call (67.21%): Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Ned Hitchcock (1.27%- Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% -Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Julia Taylor (14.61%- Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).**

**Absent (32.79%): James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich – arrived @ 4:20 p.m.), Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Brian O'Malley (1.36% – Provincetown - arrived @ 4:05 p.m.), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable).**

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker, we have 67.21 percent of the Delegates present; 32.79 percent absent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Thank you.

I'll now need approval of today's Calendar of Business.

Mr. LEWIS: So moved.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. All those in favor?

(Motion carried.)

Speaker BERGSTROM: You should have received a copy of the Journal of August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015. Are there any additions or corrections to the Journal?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move approval.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Second.  
Speaker BERGSTROM: All those in favor? Opposed? Okay.  
Ms. MARTIN: One abstention.  
Ms. KING: Abstention.  
Speaker BERGSTROM: Two abstentions. All right.  
(Motion carried.)

Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners

Speaker BERGSTROM: We now have Communications from the Board of Regional Commissioners. Nothing to say? Come on.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: No meeting today.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Leo. Leo always has something to say.

Commissioner CAKOUNES: Yes. We had a lengthy report last week so I'm not going to give you a lengthy report this week. I will bring you up to date though.

At our last meeting on August 12, we did a couple of things. As I told you before, we received a report for the Complex Building Needs Assessment for the complex. In that report were a number of suggestions. We acted on two of them. We appointed Paul Niedzwiecki as our Project Manager. And we will be working on a charge for that position and that will be coming up soon.

And we also directed our staff to put out either an RFP relative to the services for a site evaluation. Those are two important recommendations that came out of that report.

The other two things that we did which you will be -- have been forwarded to you is we approved a proposed Ordinance for \$232,000 to be transferred into a fund to help us with the ongoing water monitoring at the Fire Academy, and that Ordinance was handed in today.

We also approved a Resolution which increases -- adds some money to the Home Consortium Project. As you all remember, that was a pretty interesting time during our budget. We all approved along with you the 172,000 to move the Home Consortium over to the -- out of the Cape Cod Commission.

Well, we neglected to put some funds in some specific accounts so we've allocated in that Resolution an amount of \$8,000 and it's to be divvied into the Legal Professional Technical Services and also the Advertising account. And, again, that's been handed in to you today, so you will be receiving more information on that.

Other than that, that's the only action we took last week. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. So we've officially received this during the meeting. Yes.

Commissioner FLYNN: I would like to add something to that. We have -- the Commissioners appointed a Fire Assessment Committee, a group of -- they're mostly fire chiefs to take a look at the Fire Training Academy and make an assessment regarding the structures that are there, the land, and the operation.

I know that the Fire Training Academy is really important mostly to the towns on the Lower Cape. Some of their fire departments are serviced with volunteers and, obviously, they all have full-time staff.

But even the fire departments in the Upper Cape have utilized the Fire Training Academy because the only other option is to go off Cape to Stowe, and that's a really long ride.

And the state Fire Marshal his name is Steve Coan, he happens to have a vacation home in Falmouth, so I've had occasion off and on to run into him here and there. And so I actually set up a meeting with him and George Russell and myself and the Fire Marshal.

The Commissioners did appoint me last week to be their liaison to the Fire Assessment Committee. So the state Fire Marshal is responsible for all fire training in the Commonwealth. I mean it's not just other -- it's not just sending people out and investigating fires that occur anywhere in the Commonwealth. He's also responsible for fire training.

So I happen to see him the other day after the road race, and we had a great conversation about what we can do next. So I think we're going to sit down and talk to the chiefs and talk to the Fire Marshal and see what we can't do, make an assessment of the Fire Training Academy, see what's there and what we would need to do to bring it up to the point where it would be serviceable as a training area to continue to operate as a training area for the other towns. So that's my report too.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes. Ed Lewis.

Mr. LEWIS: That Fire Assessment Committee also includes three of us, Teresa Martin, myself, and Ed McManus.

Commissioner FLYNN: Right.

Mr. LEWIS: So since -- I know Teresa and Ed have been to two meetings and I've been to one meeting. So I would appreciate it for you as the liaison take over the whole job and start --

Commissioner FLYNN: Of course.

Mr. LEWIS: -- and those of us who have had meetings and have begun -- and are having another meeting scheduled for --

Commissioner FLYNN: September 2.

Mr. LEWIS: -- September -- the 2<sup>nd</sup> of September that we be involved in this because I think all three of us have to process some ideas. And as I understand it, that committee was formed with the three of us in mind. And it's nice to have you aboard but let's make sure that you understand the Assembly is involved.

Commissioner FLYNN: Yes, no, I'm very much aware of that and I knew that. In fact, I have a list of the people who are on the committee.

And I think what we need to do is to really just kind of take another look at where we are and what we think our charge ought to be. We don't want -- this is a short-term committee. It's a committee that has a specific job to do, and after that, that will probably be the end of it. But that's what we need to do and we need to plan and get going. So I will be there on the 2<sup>nd</sup> when I find out where it is.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, John.

Mr. LEWIS: It's supposed to be Harwich at the Community Center.

Commissioner FLYNN: Community Center, okay.

Mr. OHMAN: Mary Pat, what have we done to deal with the town of Barnstable's issues with that site?

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, I've had conversations or that we have had conversations with Tom Lynch before, but I plan to meet with them before that September 2 meeting so I get a better feeling for where he is on that.

If they have not made a definite decision, I've heard a lot of rumors about the town of Barnstable would like to close it down. But the testing that we have been doing recently shows no excessive contamination or deceedance in the numbers.

So it really -- it's a joint -- I think it's a joint decision between the county and the town. I don't think it's just the town of Barnstable's decision, but I'm going to have that conversation with him and let him know what we plan to do.

And we haven't used foam there for over 10 years. And whatever that -- whatever foam that was used, it has been shown that that was one of the products that were contaminating the wells but that's long past in use.

And then we're not using anything at the Fire Training Academy now that from my understanding that is threatening at all the water wells.

Mr. OHMAN: I think Pat had discussions directly with the Cape Cod Commission and the people in their study. The problem with the rumors, I think they have an action plan.

Commissioner FLYNN: I'm not aware of that at the moment.

Mr. LEWIS: What are you talking about?

Mr. OHMAN: The Fire Training Academy on the town of Barnstable's concerns regarding the past practices.

Mr. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. LEWIS: Just so -- there is -- what they're doing right now is mitigating what was -- the contamination that was there. Regardless of whatever happens that contamination has to be handled. If they closed it down, you'd still have the contamination. So it doesn't make much sense to say we're going to close it down because of the contamination because you can't do anything else there while it's being cleaned up. So I don't think that should be a major issue.

As I understand it, that's a county facility.

Commissioner FLYNN: That's correct.

Mr. LEWIS: And it would be nice if some of those articles in the paper that we had these discussions before we find out a lot of things in print. But I think Tom Cambareri has been out there several times. He's got some -- what do you call it?

Mr. MCMANUS: Monitoring wells.

Mr. LEWIS: Monitoring wells. He's doing a lot of work out there, so there's a lot of money being spent in order to mitigate what happened. But it's going to have to be done regardless of what -- and I would agree with what Mary Pat said before, it's a very important academy. It's very important for fire training, but I think at some point the committee will make a report of some type.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Brian.

Mr. O'MALLEY: So a question to follow up then, clearly this mitigation needs to happen. This is going to cost money. Where are we in discussions about who's responsible?

Commissioner FLYNN: That's a good question. We have been doing

mitigation for many years. And I think we've spent, I know, in the neighborhood of over \$700,000 already in terms of testing in what's already been done.

I think, as I said, the most important thing to do now is to make sure that the town of Barnstable is in line with us. And if not, then we'll have to work something out. Because it's clear that the fire chiefs in this community need the training and want the training.

Mr. O'MALLEY: That \$700,000; is it County funds or the town of Barnstable?

Commissioner FLYNN: Yes, County funds.

Mr. O'MALLEY: County funds. Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Mary Pat, traditionally, the Fire Training Academy has served just the towns -- the 15 towns of Barnstable County or do we go further than that?

Commissioner FLYNN: Go further.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So if we would upgrade the facility, we could have other towns come in as well.

Commissioner FLYNN: Oh, you mean over the bridge?

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Commissioner FLYNN: It's possible because I know the town of Plymouth -- well, they have some fire training now of their own. I'm not sure exactly what it is. But when I was there, the fire fighters always had to go to Stowe and it was very expensive to do that.

But there needs to be -- I mean it's required. And I think the fact that the State Fire Marshal is very willing to work with us on this because he's the person who's responsible for all fire training. And I've had a couple of conversations with him and one just the other day, as I said.

So I think -- that's what this committee is. It's an assessment. It's really to assess not only the property itself but also the training and what are we doing, what do we need, what should we be doing? And I would hope that we would have that done by January. You know, this doesn't need to take a long time to come up with --

Speaker BERGSTROM: One more thing I think the people should know because, of course, they listen to this conversation either on the Internet or over the air that the -- what the so-called contaminants that are under discussion are still in common use. This isn't something that somebody decided was bad.

When they had a fuel truck tip over at the rotary, the Bourne rotary, they put this foam on it, and it's contained in common household products. It's contained, for instance, if you have a stay-press shirt that stuff is in there.

So the purpose of the studies that are going on now is to determine -- and there are no minimum limits, in other words, minimum limits set on this so they don't know how much is dangerous or if it's dangerous at all.

I don't want people to get alarmed and they hear that there's contaminated water.

Commissioner FLYNN: Well, it's not contaminated now. That's been contained. There is a new contaminant now but it's called an emergent.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Right. That's called --

Ms. KING: Point of order.

Commissioner FLYNN: It has not yet been --

Ms. KING: This is not an agenda item.

Commissioner FLYNN: Yes, it's not.

Ms. KING: I think we're going a little farther than what we just -- what was supposed to be discussed. I don't mean to cut you off. But I think this is a great discussion but can we put this and maybe have the fire chiefs -- have you guys all back to have a full discussion? This is not an agenda item and it's becoming an agenda item; it appears to have a major discussion on it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Ed.

Mr. MCMANUS: Well, actually, there's a committee appointed and we will work through --

Ms. KING: That's great --

Mr. MCMANUS: -- and provide -- and rather than, you know, if we want to just throw it to the Assembly as a whole --

Ms. KING: Well I agree. I will do that. We'll wait for you guys to come back and give us a talk.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Any more questions for the Commissioners?  
Yes, Ned.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Would it be useful to take the Commissioners or whoever originally made the suggestion up and invite Tom Cambareri to come -- Leo -- ask Tom to come and run through his studies, what they're about, what the problems are, what's been done so far and so forth and so on.

Commissioner LYONS: That was suggested.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: There's a lot going on there that has been thoroughly studied and evaluated and is being taken care of.

Commissioner LYONS: Yes, I think that first piece of your education would be best to have Tom here to explain the history, what has happened, and what the present situation is now.

Mr. LEWIS: We will.

Commissioner LYONS: And then we have to look at -- we have to look at budgetary items and we have to look at need and this study is to tell us what is the benefit against the loss.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Anything else that's not on this? Yes, Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: Just one thing. Could we -- could the Assembly schedule some type of a meeting with Paul Niedzwiecki on what he presented to the Commissioners because the Commissioners are well aware but I know it's within their purview as it relates to the facilities and the complex, the County complex --

Speaker BERGSTROM: You're talking about the meeting that they reported on?

Mr. LEWIS: Right.

Commissioner LYONS: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: Right, the meeting that they reported on, have them come to us so that we don't have to -- I get a little aggravated sometimes when we find out about something in the press and we don't -- there's nothing scheduled so that the Assembly is

at least brought up to speed. Whether it's our decision or not, but at least brought up to speed so when people ask us questions, we have answers.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We'll follow up the Commissioners' Report with a direct conversation with Paul. Okay.

Mr. LEWIS: Thank you.

Communications and Discussion with Deputy Director Kristy Senatori: 208 Update

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Well, thank you very much. We now have Communications and Discussion with Cape Cod Commission Deputy Director Kristy Senatori and staff. I don't see the staff here.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Just me.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Regarding the Clean Water Act, Section 208 Area Water Quality Management Plan Update. Okay. You're on.

Ms. KRISTY SENATORI: Well, thank you for having me here. I appreciate it. And I can't think of a better location to discuss an Area-Wide Water Quality Management Plan so.

Speaker BERGSTROM: That's why you're here.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Yes. Typically, I would have a PowerPoint, so I apologize if my back is to anybody over here. But I do have copies of a PowerPoint so if you want to follow along, you're welcome to do so. And also we have made copies for everybody of our Area-Wide 208 Water Quality Management Plan.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Do you have any extra?

Commissioner LYONS: They're coming along.

Clerk O'CONNELL: They're coming.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: -- the plan in its entirety and the 2,000-plus pages of appendices are available on our website. But we did want to make sure you all had a hard copy because it is sometimes easier to read that way.

So what I wanted to do today was just to give you a little bit of background on the Commissions' role, when we were designated to update the plan, what the plan actually contains, and what the next steps are going forward as towns look to implement solutions.

So back in January 2013, the Cape Cod Commission was designated by the state to update the Area-Wide Water Quality Management Plan. The last time this had been done was in 1978. And so we were directed to do this and pursuant to Section 208 of the Federal Clean Water Act. So when you hear Section 208 Plan, that's actually what it refers to is the Federal Clean Water Act.

And so we were directed to update this plan and really to focus on 21st-century problems and primarily that's measured in our marine waters.

And so we had a very short timeframe to actually implement the update and actually do the planning. It was about a 12-month window to do so. And we actually submitted the plan to MassDEP. It was certified by the governor back in June of this year, and now we are waiting approval by the Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1, and we anticipate that that approval will be in a September timeframe and that's pursuant to a settlement agreement between the Conservation Law Foundation and EPA.

So we have been working very diligently with the communities and with – mostly coordinated with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and also the EPA. They’ve been integral partners, planning partners, in this, and we certainly would not have been able to complete the plan within the specified timeframe without them.

What we also needed to focus on was high stakeholder engagement, and I know that several of you were actually stakeholders throughout the process so you know what a long time consuming process this was and how many meetings after meetings after meetings there were to do a lot of the planning.

What we also thought was one of the integral parts of the plan was to maximize previous town plannings. So the towns on the Cape have been engaged I wastewater planning in one form or another for years, decades even in some of the towns. So we needed to take a look at those existing plans and see how we could maximize the benefits of those plans.

And then we also knew we needed to take a look at different options. No technology was off the table. We needed to explore diverse array of options and multiple solutions, so we knew that off the bat we weren’t going to sewer the entire Cape. That wasn’t a strategy that was going to be effective for several reasons. So we needed to look at a multiple variety of solutions that we could potentially implement on the Cape.

So the next slide really just takes a look at the eight chapters of the plan, and then it goes through each chapter briefly. So I’m not going to go into a whole lot of detail in any chapter but feel free to stop me if you have questions or we can do questions at the end if that’s easier too.

So the first chapter really focuses on the “People.” So we really needed to define the people who make up these communities. And we know that a lot of the planning that’s been done has been great planning, but we haven’t always had a lot of success at town meeting. So we needed to reach potentially a broader audience.

So we had over 170 stakeholders that followed the process throughout the 12 months or 12-month-plus planning period and hours and hours of meetings.

But we also needed to engage the broader public and so we tried a variety of different online strategies to do this. We used online gaming which was actually effective. We ran two different online types of community charrettes at two different times so we were actually able to engage some of the summer population.

And we also did an online community engagement charrette in the fall, so we were able to get some students. So we had almost a thousand players in these two online engagement tools. So it was interesting to get a lot of the feedback from these ways.

But what we also did was we knew we needed to be objective so we hired the Consensus Building Institute out of Cambridge to facilitate all of our meetings. And that was an effective strategy just having that third-party objective person in the room. We needed to stay on schedule. We were given a very short timeframe to do this. So that was one of the primary goals of our stakeholder process.

So the second chapter really focuses on the “Problem.” So we needed to define the problem and really the case is defined by our water. We are surrounded by marine waters between the Cape Cod Bay, Buzzards Bay, the Atlantic Ocean, and

Nantucket Sound.

We have almost a thousand ponds on Cape Cod. And while ponds pose different issues with phosphorus issues, they're still something that we needed to take a look at as we completed the 208 plan.

And then the one thing that does draw us altogether is our one source aquifer. So Chapter 2 really focuses on the problem in the natural environment.

Chapter 3 is the "Policy" chapter, and people joke that this is kind of the boring chapter but I actually like this chapter being a lawyer but that's okay.

So really what this chapter does is it outlines the existing regulations that are in place and then it also poses some suggested solutions for streamlining regulation and regulatory reform.

What we have been doing historically as 15 communities on Cape Cod are planning comprehensive wastewater management plans that really plan to the towns' municipal boundaries. And we know that 53 of the abatement watersheds that we've been studying, 32 of those actually cross town boundaries. So it no longer makes sense to plan to municipal boundaries. We really need to plan to the jurisdiction of the problem, which are the watersheds.

So that's what we took a look at here and how can we create more targeted approaches to fixing the nitrogen issues in particular watersheds rather than in the whole town. A lot of this is tied to funding sources. In order to qualify for SRF funding, typically you need a completed Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan. So changing the regulations and suggesting new ways to have more targeted plans, it may only cost a portion of what a typical CWP would cost.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: SRF funding?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: State Revolving Loan Funding. So that's typically the mechanism for towns to finance wastewater solutions.

Ms. KING: Hold on. My question was going to be is this going to get us certified to get SRF funding because the position was always only towns qualified for that?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: So we're working very closely with regulators to make sure that more targeted solutions can be eligible for SRF funding. So, yes, we are certainly working to that.

And another piece of the regulatory streamlining was making sure that we can get credit for things that towns are already doing such as fertilizer management programs and plans within towns and storm water credits. We want to make sure that if you're already doing these things which are nitrogen reducing that you can get credit for these things.

And so another thing that we're working closely on with Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection is watershed permitting. So this has not been done in the Commonwealth before. But there are so many different layers of permitting that towns need to go through in order to permit different technologies and going through all the different agencies that need to do this. If we can combine all this into one watershed permit, it will make the process much faster and efficient for towns to implement solutions.

So Chapter 4 really deals with the "Solutions" and this is really about the

technologies. What we did from the very beginning was we knew we needed to put all the technologies on one page. And we knew we needed to make sure that all the technologies that would be potentially available to remediate nitrogen were available to the Cape.

So what you've got here and it didn't print very well, but if you look in Chapter 4 in the actual plan itself, you have all of the available technologies that are used to remediate nitrogen throughout that chapter. So there are 60-plus technologies in the technologies matrix, which is a massive spreadsheet that you probably wouldn't want to look at. So we tried to distill it into a one-page document that is more easily understood by people who are going to be actually be implementing the solutions.

So they're kind of categorized into three different ways: Reduction, Remediation, Restoration. And this really has to do with where the treatment is, whether it's before it get disposed to the grounds, in the groundwater, or in the water body.

So if you take a look at that spreadsheet, they're also categorized by Site Scale, Neighborhood, Watershed and Cape-Wide. And you won't see the actual conventional treatment or sewerage system Cape-wide because we're not suggesting that that would be an appropriate solution.

So, if you printed out that technologies matrix, it would probably span the length of this. So I suggest to you that one-pager is probably a little bit more exciting to look at.

So then Chapter 5 really looks at "Evaluation." We had a team at the Commission, including some of our consultants, look at traditional technologies and then also a team looking at nontraditional technologies to see how they could potentially apply both to different watersheds. And, ultimately, a hybrid solution was really where most of the watersheds pollutions will come into play.

So the traditional approaches are really those collection systems, the more traditional sewerage systems. And the non-traditional approaches are really those non-collection systems such as permeable reactive barriers and certainly aquaculture which is seemingly popular on the Cape and effective. So those really will form the outer bounds of these watershed management plans for individual watersheds.

Chapter 6 really deals with the "Money." So we didn't label this the financial chapter. We really labeled it "Money" because that's what people want to talk about when we're talking about the 208 Plan and wastewater. And so this deals with four different areas: Costs, Financing, Revenue, and then Impact. And I think the most important piece of this is really the impacts. And we know we have 215,000 year-round residents on Cape Cod.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: And how can we make sure that the cost of implementing solutions are affordable to those 215,000 year-round residents. Thirty-six percent of our housing stock is second homes, so we need to make sure that whatever solutions are implemented take into consideration that reasonable economy that we do have on the Cape.

So we are actually working with a partnership called the Southeast New England Partnership, and it's actually with EPA and the state of Rhode Island, Southeastern Massachusetts, and we've been successful. It's actually Senator Reed out of Rhode Island was successful in the last budget cycle in getting a \$2 million earmark to

secure pilot programs on the Cape and in southeastern Massachusetts and Rhode Island. And some of that money did come to the Cape, and we anticipate seeing more of that federal money coming to the Cape, which is a great sign for financing some of these projects on the Cape and seeing some of that, those federal resources actually make it here is exciting and promising for the future.

So then Chapter 7 really deals with the “Planning and Growth Management” section. We’re in the middle of updating our Regional Policy Plan, and so it’s fitting to take a look at this chapter in conjunction with that. And really this chapter kind of discusses some of the partners that we do have on Cape. We have two federal land holdings; there’s the National Seashore and Joint Base Cape Cod. So we do have planning partners.

But it also discusses the areas where it may be appropriate for more development and so there were other areas where it may not be appropriate for development. And, for example, we may look at increased densities and economic centers. Those increased densities may be opportunities for sewerage at lower costs. And so that chapter really discusses the balance between the environment and economic development.

Chapter 8 really deals with “Implementation.” So this contains all of the recommendations. I think there are about 36 recommendations in total in the plan, and they’re grouped into four major categories.

The first is information. This plan does contain a lot of information. We’ve gathered a lot of information throughout the process but there’s still a lot that we don’t know. And there’s still a lot that will be gathered for information and data with regard to monitoring, not only performance monitoring, technologies monitoring, but water quality monitoring.

And so the Commission has a data warehouse where we store all of this information, but we certainly know that we will need more information -- we will need support from our planning partners and regulatory partners to make sure that the information that we have that we’re gathering and collecting is easily accessible and available to the general public and to the people who need to be using it.

Support; we know that the communities will need support as we move forward implementing these solutions. So the Commission will be implementing watershed teams, and we’ve actually worked with a lot of the community so far on Cape Cod in the watershed capacity even over the last six months. And so we’ll be offering support to the communities.

Regulatory Reform; I touched on this a little bit but this even goes to the Commission's regulations. When we regulate Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plans, the Commission then is the regional agency looking at it as a Development of Regional Impact. We regulate it with the Regional Policy Plan in mind. And that’s exactly how we would regulate any commercial development, even a supermarket.

So we know we need to change our own regulations with regard to watershed and wastewater management planning.

And then cost obviously. If this were free, we wouldn’t be here and we wouldn’t be having this discussion. So cost is certainly the paramount piece of this and at the forefront of every discussion.

So, as I mentioned, we did submit the plan to the state in June, and the Governor did certify the plan. In that we also designated waste treatment management agencies which we are required to do pursuant to Section 208 of the Clean Water Act. And the 15 towns as they were in 1978 were designated these waste treatment management agencies. So you're responsible for the implementation of plans and for carrying out the Area-Wide Water Quality Management Plan. The towns really have the capacity to do this. You've got the ones doing this all along so it made sense for the towns to continue to play this role.

So, like I said, just walking through the next step of what we can expect and what communities can expect over the next 6 to 12 months and even further.

What we need communities to do now are develop watershed reports for each of those impaired watersheds and then create those scenarios that would not only include traditional and nontraditional but hopefully a hybrid scenario that would actually meet those TMDLs in those watersheds.

And so what we would do is issue a report to the Department of Environmental Protection and the EPA after 12 months indicating the progress that has been made in each of the watersheds. The Commission is also doing a lot of this work. And if towns are unable to or communities are unable to issue their own reports, then the Commission could step in and offer up suggested hybrid plans or at least those outer bounds of plans that could potentially meet those TMDLs in most watersheds.

And so we would be prepared to do that in a 12-month timeframe. Hopefully we'll get approval from EPA in September, and we can move forward from there.

So what we've tried to do is really simplify the process so we're providing technical assistance to the towns. We wanted to ensure regulatory flexibility and also providing access to resources of revenue. That's been an important piece of the conversation from day one.

And so on the last page, if you've all be following along at all, but we actually have a cost flag here. So when we did the initial cost several years ago, the cost to sewer the entire Cape was about \$6-8 billion dollars.

And so when we did the Regional Wastewater Management Plan a couple of years ago, those costs came down slightly and we got those costs to about 4.6 and 6.2 billion.

And now we're up to meeting with the 208 Plan that those costs will be somewhere between 2 and 3.8 billion. So significant savings. Still not affordable yet but we're confident that we can work with our federal and state partners to try and get some of those costs even lower and spread out over a longer timeframe.

So that's what I have. I'd be happy to answer questions if you have any.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Well, all right. Thank you. Who are we starting with? Anybody here? Yes, Jim.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is obviously going to take a long time to implement; you can guesstimate how many years. But in terms of measurement of verification of success and failure, how do you have that all mapped out?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Certainly this is a long-term plan for Cape Cod, anywhere from 20 to 40 years would be something that we'd be looking at certainly

for financing options.

What we do have set in place are Adaptive Management Plans. So there are a lot of technologies that aren't necessarily proven yet on Cape Cod and we're suggesting a five-year check in on a lot of these technologies to make sure that they are working, they are performing like we expected they are. And if they're not, there's a fallback and then another solution can be implemented that would be able to address the nitrogen issue.

So the Adaptive Management Plan will be a component of those watershed permits that will issue for each watershed.

Mr. KILLION: So would you be implementing these Adaptive Management Plans on a large scale study or a smaller scale studying them and then expanding?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: The Adaptive Management Plans will be specific to the watersheds but we'll be studying the technologies Cape-wide and even beyond Cape. We have a lot of people interested in monitoring and definitely a multistate effort.

Mr. KILLION: So you estimate it will be about five years to get initial results?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: There are definitely pilot programs going on now. We are getting results and will be getting results. We're just suggesting that regular check-in of every five years seems to be an appropriate amount of time for each of the watershed scenarios.

Mr. KILLION: Thank you.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Brian.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Is it a given that the EPA will accept the estimations of town by town of the efforts that have already been done? I mean we're looking for credit for work done; is that a given?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right.

Mr. O'MALLEY: Do you think that's going to happen?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Well we certainly think that you should be getting credit for work that's been done. So we're working closely with Mass. DEP and EPA to make sure that fertilizer regulations that you may already have in place and things like that can be incorporated into a watershed permit and you can get credit for that.

Mr. O'MALLEY: You sound confident then.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: We're hopeful.

Mr. O'MALLEY: It's likely. Okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Ed.

Mr. LEWIS: Yes, just, Kristy, from an education standpoint when you talked about educating the public, how do you convince the 225,000 people or the 224,950, taking out the 50 town planners and those people who've been involved in the whole process over the years; how do you convince those 225,000 people that there is a problem that they need to spend billions of dollars on?

Because I think that, from a -- it's going to be very difficult because we know about what's happened in town meetings all across the Cape. There are a lot of different things and somehow we're going to have to convince people that they're going

to have to spend money because they really see a problem.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right. Yeah, I mean that's a great question. And we've been working really closely with the business community, with the Cape Cod Chamber, with the realtors and the homebuilders, and I think everybody recognizes that there is a problem.

And so how we're going to pay for it is obviously a larger question, but everybody does recognize that there is a problem. It's an economic problem.

Mr. LEWIS: I beg to defer with you, Kristy.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Not people at town meeting.

Mr. LEWIS: I don't think that the public -- if you go to a town meeting or go to a, you know, you get 50-100-150 people together, I'm not sure that everybody realizes there's a real problem.

And I've worked on this for years in Brewster so I understand it.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right.

Mr. LEWIS: But I'm not sure the public understands it. Trying to get the public --

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right.

Mr. LEWIS: -- they're going to have to spend their own -- regardless of federal or state, whatever, they're going to have to spend a lot of their own money and that's not easy to get.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: So what we've been doing at the Commission is trying to create division support tools that communities can use. So instead of going to town meeting and you get people that say, "Well why didn't you try that solution there." We now have a JS program that will show you well this is what this there looks like, this is how much that would cost. So this is why the solution might be better. This is why our community is looking to implement this type of solution. So the more information we can put in people's hand the better.

We also discovered that nothing beats going out night after night, Saturday after Saturday and meeting with people in communities and educating people on the issues but really hearing back from them on what they think the issues are and how they think that they should be fixed.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. Ned.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: I think to support what Kristy's saying, it's fine to have those who know come and talk about it. But, basically, we have to get and it's people like us, you know, not experts but that's people who've been involved in this process. You know, take five guys and show them the algae. And it's easy in the ponds, not so much in Wellfleet but Eastham and some of the other places.

But even on the shorelines. Look at the mung and look at the algae there. You can see it on Mayo Beach now, all the sea lettuce and everything else that grows much, much faster than it ever used to do.

Talk to the shell-fishermen. They know what's happening. You know, it's got to be on the ground and it needs to be from people who live where you are.

I would say, does everybody know what a TMDL is?

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Total Maximum Daily Load.

Mr. HITCHCOCK: Okay. Everybody -- we tend to rattle it off like that.

And the other thing is those WMAs are going to answer Marcia's question, that is at some point all the deciding has to come back to the towns. And the Commission finally figured it out that there needed to be a way to get the decision-making back to the towns. So the Water Management Agency is officially a town agency and will have to respond to town meetings and so forth and so on. That's how that problem gets solved.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Linda.

Ms. ZUERN: Have you taken this to the Board of Selectmen in the individual towns or are you planning to soon?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: We have not taken this plan specifically to the Board of Selectmen in all 15 towns. We have been engaged in conversations with all, I think almost all 15 towns at this point since the plan has been issued in June.

So I think that we will be doing that in the fall. We've had a few requests to do that so we'll probably be asking to get on those agendas and hearing that type of suggestion is helpful.

Ms. ZUERN: And I just wanted to make a comment too. When I look at this, I just see money spent on ink, which isn't -- for me, personally, I don't need all this color. And when I see a lot of flashy color like that, I just think how much did that cost to print this out?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Well, ordinarily it would be on the screen but I didn't want you to be completely blind to it.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Let me ask you a couple questions. Chatham went through this, I mean from soup to nuts. The very beginning we were under a consent order if we wanted to bring our wastewater treatment plant up to capacity, we had to go through a whole rigmarole. It took us 12 years to go through a wastewater management plan; 12 years. We went through some of the same issues that you went through, and I'm curious to see how you resolve them.

One of the biggest issues is we took an assessment of what condition the ponds and estuaries were in currently. That was done with modeling but also with people going out there and taking tests of the water.

Then it got to be, well, what is the build-out? In other words, what is our future contributions going to be to the estuaries and that called no end to problems, and I know that the Commission has already dealt with built-out scenarios in many other cases. Is that in here? Are you dealing with, you know?

And there's also the issue with the fact that build-out doesn't necessarily mean there's going to be people in those houses. But the government assumes that if you have a house, there's going to be people living in it that are going to live year-round.

So that was the conflict between how many people are actually going to be on the Cape as opposed to potentially. So you've dealt with all of that within this little document?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: It is in there. Most of that, what you're talking about, is contained within Chapter 7, with is the Planning Group Management Agencies. So looking at build-out, build-out's a tough subject. Build-out is more of an art than a science. You've probably heard that before.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: And a lot of our decisions support tools

actually take build-out into consideration. So, you can plan for existing conditions or you can plan for what the potential build-out might be.

Chatham's a great model to follow if that works for your community. So we looked a lot at the Chatham plan in creating the 208 plan. So, a lot of the hurdles that you had to cross, we understood and benefited from, the experience that you went through in putting this plan together.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, the other issue is that, you know, you can look -- they talked about sewerage the whole Cape. But I mean some areas are very critical. For instance, if you lived close to the beach in Wellfleet, Newcomb Hollow, I mean that water is -- it's going out in the ocean. It's not going to make a difference. If you live on, you know, some little pond, it makes a difference.

So I'd hate to see the money distributed according to -- and the responsibility distributed evenly over everybody when some areas obviously are more critical. The Route 28 corridor from Chatham all the way down to Falmouth is critical and it's just north of all the estuaries.

I mean I'm just saying this is an enormous problem and it's a good thing we have a planning agency because all these elements are taken into place.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: So are we going to look at the areas that are most critical regardless of where they are and concentrate the funding of those?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Yeah, absolutely. And prioritizing watersheds are a difficult task in and of itself. So we do have a prioritization table in the plan itself, but we recognize that there are areas that are in need of addressing sooner than others. So that would be taken into account when not only looking at funding but looking at how different resources might get allocated.

Speaker BERGSTROM: At the end of this legal process that we went through over the last few years is somebody looking over our shoulder? Is there somebody going to be looking at us to see that we're actually doing what we say we're going to do?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: And who is that?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right now there is still a lawsuit in place with the Conservation Law Foundation and the Environmental Protection Agency. We're hopeful that the documents that have been submitted will suffice and will be certified.

But there may be other enforcement mechanisms in place between the other regulatory agencies.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Suzanne.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Yes, as everyone knows that Yarmouth has been to bat on this. And I agree with Ned in terms of the education. We brought scores of regular citizens in. We did 14 or 15 pre-town meeting meetings, opened up to the public, and educated the public. And even then, the issue doesn't fly.

The thing I like about the 208 Plan is that it takes it out of the town's hands in terms of it gives the problem some credibility. It's not just your Selectmen or your Planning Board or your Water Commissioners telling you there's a problem. There's a Cape-wide very credible document that now makes this a Cape-wide issue even though

it's going to be town by town or watershed by watershed solution.

I think that this is great. But I will tell you the number one stumbling block, as you said, is the money.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Yes.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: We wouldn't be having this conversation if we were back in the 70s and the federal government was paying to sewer everything. It would be happening right now.

So, aside from the funding, the SRF funding, if there's any federal funds, I think we need to be very, very creative about how the burden is placed on each individual.

And I know, for instance, our town manager, Bill Hinchey, was a genius at developing a betterment that wasn't a betterment that literally made a water bill the size of a cable bill. And when you do it in terms like that, then people are willing to look at it.

When you come to town and you say, "I need 15 billion -- 15 million to start our \$350 million plan, people just shut their minds because that's not something they can get their head around.

So I really like the fact that the Cape Cod Commission has taken this on. I think it has to. The technologies are there. The technologies are not going to work for everyone in everyplace, but they are -- they're at least addressed so the people can't say well you didn't consider, you know.

So I really applaud the Commission for stepping up and taking the bull by the horns because I think that's what the towns are going to need to get in line and finally deal with their issues.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Of course you were sued to do it so.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: That didn't work.

Speaker BERGSTROM: We give your credit anyway.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Well, we told them that and that still didn't work.

Commissioner LYONS: That's right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Another question I have for you I just have in my mind is that it goes to what Suzanne was saying is that another issue we face in Chatham is that, obviously, if you live in an area that's critical, you may be -- more responsibility to clean up the water may be placed on you.

In other words, if you had a neighborhood system, you may be required to tie up to it. If you live somewhere like right on the ocean that you're not involved, you won't.

So the question is do we put the burden on those who live in a critical area and just ignore, you know, say well you guys have to do this or you guys don't have to do it. Or do you just simply put it on the tax base because you're cleaning up the water for everybody.

So I mean is that issue -- did you --

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: I mean that issue comes up all the time and it's a very important distinction to make. And we're not telling anyone how they have to pay for it. But we are trying to find other resources so that it doesn't just get more on the backs of the 215,000 year-round residents that do live here.

We're trying to find other federal and state funding sources, you know,

any other opportunities to keep those costs down so that --

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's not just the 215 -- if you live on -- if you decide you have to clean up Bass River and you live on Bass River, you may be required to put on secondary treatment or, in other words, they tried that in Barnstable, a neighborhood system. Of course the neighborhood is against it. They said, "Why should we have to pay and that guy over there doesn't?" So I mean it's an issue of fairness.

In Chatham, I think we put most of it -- we put some on betterments but we put most of it on the tax base because that seemed to be the fairer system.

So I hope that the Commission realizes it's not a central planning issues; it's a financial issue.

Commissioner LYONS: Right.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Right.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's an obstacle.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: We do. We recognize that. We're also creating a financial model which is the division support tool that the communities can use so that when it does come time for Town Meeting or for towns to actually make those decisions, the towns can make those decisions appropriately.

Speaker BERGSTROM: I've got another question for you. I know Paul who's very politically savvy, is there any efforts underway to reach out to federal and state agencies. I know that the well is pretty much dry but I mean the legislation that's being proposed or anything that could help us in this regard?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Well, we've actually just been successful in securing \$250,000 for monitoring for the Cape and that's going with a match from the County and through the Water Protection Collaborative. So there definitely are resources coming in.

And as I mentioned, that federal partnership that we're a planning partner in, there's a \$5 million earmark this year. So we're hoping that the \$2 million earmark from last year is now 5 million this year. We saw 750,000 of that come to the Cape last year. We're hoping to see more of that come to the Cape this year.

So, there certainly are opportunities and we are opportunistic in trying to make sure we take advantage of opportunities as they may arise.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yeah, well that's up to us really more than you.

So, any other questions? Yes, Chris.

Mr. KANAGA: It's not really a question. I just want to say thank you for the presentation.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes.

Mr. KANAGA: Also, I actually like the ink. And if we have to spend \$100 in ink to convince people we have a \$3 billion problem, that's okay with me.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: We don't typically print them but I wanted you to have a copy of that.

Mr. KANAGA: No, it's great. You know, I come from a neighborhood that has a working package plant and I know what it costs and it's a lot per household. And people are just going to have to get used to the fact that to have clean water and to not have the fish and the shellfish and our kids sucking up toxins, it's going to cost some

money.

I just applaud you for your efforts to educate people.

Mr. OHMAN: A little off the beaten path of this, but it seems to me when this gets implemented as it goes forward, they'll be educational opportunities and career opportunities. Have you addressed Cape Cod Community College or anyone else about partnering up and getting some young people to maybe move back to Cape Cod and take on this big responsibility?

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: We have. We've been in conversation with the community college. We're also -- the Commission's a member of the Smarter Cape Partnership; so it's the Cape Cod Young Professionals, the Chamber, the Realtors, and the Homeowners that you can see. I'm probably missing one.

And so we've had a lot of those conversations about, you know, if we're bringing new technologies to the Cape maybe that's going to attract some jobs. And the marine tech industry is growing (Inaudible). But as it relates to the Regional Policy Plan, we've looked at thresholds in some of those areas through our Chapter H program. So inviting some more of those RMD businesses into those areas where they don't come through the regional review, making some of those areas more attractive. That's at the forefront of all of those discussions. So we're happy to take any suggestions.

Commissioner LYONS: If I could just add onto that. In the Smarter Cape Conference, we did discuss this in one of these breakout sessions. And Lisa Guy and myself were both saying that this is going to be a generational fix. This isn't just us here and it's going to have to be educated because we're going to move on. We're going to die. There's going to be others. This is a 40-year-plan.

Mr. LEWIS: Speak for yourself.

Commissioner LYONS: I would agree -- no one ever knows what's around the corner. But it is something that could really be worked into the curriculum of the schools as part of the education, so that kids can understand that there are these job opportunities and look at the science, and it really is applicable to their life and maintaining their home outside their home. And this is really how we have to start looking at this. That this is our home and we have to take care of it just as we would anything else.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Yes, Marcia.

Ms. KING: I agree. Of course, I think this is fabulous and this is the beginning of a long journey. And I know I have friends who, believe it or not, who don't believe there's a problem.

And what I always come back to is if you don't believe there's a problem, okay, fine, I'll accept that. But do you understand this will decrease your property values. Oh, then they sit up. This will hurt the schools. This will hurt your children. And I think that, to me, here's what I say, "Look, I don't want to pay more." Given an option of me paying more or not, I'm going with the not, but then ---- but then you tell me that in the end, you know, I'm not going to be able to sell my house or I don't want to live here anymore, you know, that's the little gut reaction.

But I think this is just the beginning. I won't say that because I know that scares them. Whatever.

Yes, and the issue at heart has always been -- it's never been the issue of

not understanding the problem; it's always been the issue of money.

And as we said in the 70s, the feds came up with that money fortunately. I know about SRF and that was always the issue was we couldn't get SRF as a county, you know, it had to be town by town, the revolving fund, and that was the big argument.

And I worked in Barnstable for a long time. They were trying to get the state to move forward and maybe this will help even make that -- move that threshold so that would allow us to get some funding.

But at the end, really it's going to be the homeowners. And we're all going to have to pitch in like community education. This is a Cape-wide issue that we all have to face.

And what I was saying when I first got here today, I've never seen more people from out of state this summer. People are coming back here and they won't if this problem gets completely out of hand.

So I think this is fabulous and my anti-friends will probably -- I'll leave it on my kitchen counter. They'll say yes to the -- it's a great plan. Really, you guys did a great job.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. Well thank you very much. Sorry we didn't have the PowerPoint presentation.

MS. KRISTY SENATORI: Different and fun.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It's not a big loss believe me.

Okay. Moving right along, any Communications from Public Officials? Hearing none. Any Communications from Members of the Public? Hearing none.

### Assembly Convenes

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. The Assembly will now convene. We will now have a vote on Proposed Resolution 15-04. You should have a copy of this resolution. You have a copy of the proposed resolution. Okay. You know its \$54,000.

Proposed Resolution 15-04: To approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2016 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 15-02.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates

Proclaims:

The following transfers between budget groups one, two, seven, and nine for fiscal year 2016 are approved:

For the Resource Development Office, AmeriCorps Cape Cod Program:

Decrease 0011117-5750 by \$ 54,920 Misc. Match Expend-AmeriCorps grant

Increase 0011111-5101 by \$ 32,900.00 Member salaries

0011112-5203 by \$ 2,000.00 Trash removal for the residential houses

0011112-5204 by \$ 3,100.00 Member Leader Stipends

0011112-5213 by \$ 2,500.00 Phone costs for residential houses/staff cell

0011112-5221 by \$ 3,200.00 Electric expenses for residential houses

0011112-5223 by \$ 3,110.00 Heating fuel costs for residential houses

0011112-5225 by \$ 3,471.50 Cable charges for residential houses

0011112-5291 by \$ 200.00 Advertising and recruitment costs  
0011112-5295 by \$ 500.00 Printing  
0011119-5982 by \$ 1,315.00 Workers Comp-match to member fringes  
0011119-5983 by \$ 2,145.50 Insurance-match to member insurance  
0011119-5984 by \$ 478.00 Medicare-match to member fringes

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Do you need someone to move the Resolution?

Speaker BERGSTROM: I need someone to move the Resolution.

Mr. OHMAN: I got it.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: You need an explanation. John has done this before in the past. So it's a housekeeping issue; right?

Mr. OHMAN: It really is a housekeeping issue. This is an interdepartmental transfer involving AmeriCorps, which I hope we're all onboard. It's one of the great things the County has done in the last 16 years.

It's removing -- it's decreasing a line item 001117-5750 by \$54,920. It's their grant program dispersing it into a plethora of other needed expenses.

Mr. LEWIS: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: It will be --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: I'll second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. LEWIS: I thought you moved it.

Ms. MCAULIFFE: You did.

Mr. LEWIS: Oh, okay.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Hearing none. We'll have to take a vote on this; it's a financial issue?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes.

**Roll Call Vote on Proposed Resolution 15-04:**

**Voting YES (78.15%):** Ronald Bergstrom (2.84% - Chatham), Ned Hitchcock (1.27% - Wellfleet), Christopher Kanaga (2.73% - Orleans), James Killion (9.58% - Sandwich), Marcia King (6.49% - Mashpee), Edward Lewis (4.55% - Brewster), Teresa Martin (2.30% - Eastham), Suzanne McAuliffe (11.02% - Yarmouth), Edward McManus (5.67% - Harwich), John Ohman (6.58% - Dennis), Brian O'Malley (1.36% - Provincetown), Julia Taylor (14.61% - Falmouth), Linda Zuern (9.15% - Bourne).

**Voting NO (0%)**

**Absent (21.85%):** Deborah McCutcheon (0.93% - Truro), Patrick Princi (20.92% - Barnstable).

Clerk O'CONNELL: Mr. Speaker Proposed Resolution 15-04 passes with 78.15 percent of the Delegates voting yes; 21.85 percent are absent, now known as Resolution 15-04.

Resolution 15-04: To approve certain budget transfers for fiscal year 2016 in accordance with Barnstable County Ordinance 15-02.

NOW, THEREFORE,

*BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED* that the Barnstable County Assembly of Delegates

Proclaims:

The following transfers between budget groups one, two, seven, and nine for fiscal year 2016 are approved:

For the Resource Development Office, AmeriCorps Cape Cod Program:

Decrease	0011117-5750	by \$ 54,920	Misc. Match Expend-AmeriCorps grant
Increase	0011111-5101	by \$ 32,900.00	Member salaries
	0011112-5203	by \$ 2,000.00	Trash removal for the residential houses
	0011112-5204	by \$ 3,100.00	Member Leader Stipends
	0011112-5213	by \$ 2,500.00	Phone costs for residential houses/staff cell
	0011112-5221	by \$ 3,200.00	Electric expenses for residential houses
	0011112-5223	by \$ 3,110.00	Heating fuel costs for residential houses
	0011112-5225	by \$ 3,471.50	Cable charges for residential houses
	0011112-5291	by \$ 200.00	Advertising and recruitment costs
	0011112-5295	by \$ 500.00	Printing
	0011119-5982	by \$ 1,315.00	Workers Comp-match to member fringes
	0011119-5983	by \$ 2,145.50	Insurance-match to member insurance
	0011119-5984	by \$ 478.00	Medicare-match to member fringes

Speaker BERGSTROM: Okay. I don't believe any committees met in the last two weeks.

#### Report from the Clerk

Speaker BERGSTROM: Do we have a report from the Clerk?

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes, just a couple of items quickly. I will be posting this week a notice for the public hearing that we will be having on September 2, the next meeting, with Finance on the Proposed Ordinance that was delivered today by the Commissioners.

You will also at the meeting on 9/2 be voting on a Proposed Resolution that was delivered today. That does not require a public hearing or a committee meeting.

And the agenda for the next Assembly meeting you will not receive until Monday, August 31, because my family decided we needed to go to someplace hotter than Cape Cod this year. So I guess it's going to be the Grand Canyon. I'll be out of the office for the week.

Mr. KANAGA: Depends whether you're at the top or the bottom.

Clerk O'CONNELL: Yes.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All right. So, is there --

Clerk O'CONNELL: That's it.

#### Other Business

Speaker BERGSTROM: Is there any other business to be brought -- yes,

John.

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Kanaga and I would like to invite everybody over to Liam's at Nauset Beach for food.

Mr. OHMAN: Mr. Kanaga's delivered some very important components of this meeting.

Speaker BERGSTROM: Before we adjourn, I have -- the Finance Department of Barnstable County has indicated to our Clerk that they may be prepared or should be prepared to give us the results of the fiscal year 2015 results next week. So we'll be looking for that to see how things wrap up.

With that --

Ms. MCAULIFFE: Move to adjourn.

Ms. KING: Second.

Speaker BERGSTROM: All in favor?

Whereupon, it was moved, seconded, and voted to adjourn the Assembly of Delegates at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Janice O'Connell, Clerk  
Assembly of Delegates