

October 9, 2018

Kristy Senatori
Cape Cod Commission
PO Box 226
Barnstable, MA 02630-0226

Dear Kristy,

I have thoroughly read the draft RPP as posted. In a separate submission, I provided (via email) over 20 comments to the document. However, the proposed change regarding removal of Minimum Performance Standards (detailed on page 68) warrant these additional comments:

I am vehemently opposed to the elimination of all Minimum Performance Standards from the core plan. Minimum Performance Standards represent the guts of your regulatory powers and responsibilities for DRI's. To eliminate them from this document is negligence of purpose. Members of the review committee as well as voting members of the Cape Cod Commission need specifically defined minimum performance standards in order to reach an objective conclusion as to whether or not an applicant's proposed project's benefits outweigh its detriments. Otherwise, decisions will be reduced to a person's subjective opinion on how well a proposed project aligns with the RPP.

The DRAFT indicates that Technical Bulletins support the RPP, and within them, an applicant will find the performance measures required (pg 6). Why isn't this information expounded upon in the actual section that discusses benefits and detriments and how a project needs to perform, on page 68? The plan indicates there is a technical bulletin for each goal. This is not true (at least not at this time). **This DRAFT RPP is not complete without them.** What good is a plan, without the regulations to implement it? If you intentionally removed the performance standards from the plan and placed them into Technical Bulletins, then every single bulletin must appear in a "regulatory" section of the RPP, and become part of the whole. The information contained within the Technical Bulletins is critical to the Commission fulfilling its mission, which is to plan and regulate. Without the bulletins, you are guilty of only planning, and pushing the regulatory responsibility you have into oblivion. Every land use attorney will have a field day with this!

Your planning staff appears to eschew their responsibility to regulate. It happened with the Barnstable GIZ renewal and it's happening here with the RPP. Please do not sanction perpetuation of this policy. Many of us count on the Cape Cod Commission to fulfill its regulatory role, and the CCC Act supports this view.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Felicia R Penn". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.