

CESSPOOL CONVERSION WORKING GROUP (CCWG)

Main Group - Meeting Minutes

Date: October 2, 2019

Time: 1:00pm - 4:00pm

Location: DOH Kinau Hale Rm 205 (2nd Floor)

Members Present:

Sina Pruder (SP)
Representative Nicole Lowen (NL)
Bill Kucharski (BK)
Jason Kagimoto (JK)
Eric Nakagawa (EN)
Ken Hiraki (KH)
Stuart Coleman (SC)
Darren Lerner (DL)
Michael Mezzacapo (MM)
Erica Perez (EP)
Ted Bohlen (TB)
David Albright (DA) (phone)
Bruce Anderson (BA)

Members Not Present:

Lori Kahikina
Senator Kalani English
Kawika Winter
Lani Fernandez

Presenters:

Facilitation Support:

Christin Reynolds
Laura Ediger

Members of the public (2)

Meeting Summary

A. Call to Order by TB at 1:03 pm

B. Approval of June 21st meeting minutes

- 1) TB suggested amendment of June 21 meeting minutes to clarify language regarding inclusion of names in notes
- 2) TB moves to approve June minutes
- 3) All say “aye”, no opposition or abstention

C. Contractor Selection & Scope

- 1) Review of contractor scope, Carollo awarded contract for technology and finance research.
 - a) Discussion of whether scope is restricted to on-site (single unit on property) or will also include community / decentralized options
 - i) DOH will complete the review of community / decentralized options in-house, they already have the expertise on decentralized treatment options. Importance of

coordinating with counties to understand land area availability which determines options.

- b) Scope to include review of current DOH approval processes for new treatment technologies as part of item on “Emerging and Innovative Onsite Technology”
- c) Wastewater branch is limited by lack of statewide groundwater standards, in terms of determining what treatment level might be required for different areas. This could be pursued under DOH rulemaking.
- d) Suggestion to create a matrix of technology for on-site systems which analyzes all options and includes pros/cons/costs. This would make the analysis process and criteria transparent to show that all options were looked at. Scope will not include sewer or decentralized options, just on-site, but technology for on-site and decentralized is similar.
- e) Suggestion to engage with homeowners to understand what information they need and want for item on “Homeowner guide to conversion technologies”.
- f) Suggestion that group members support contractors and engage them in related work and events (such as upcoming EPA federal funding forum in January) to ensure they have all relevant info.

D. Schedule Update

- 1) Contractor will be guided by 3 meetings with subgroups. They will meet with Finance and Tech subgroups in beginning, middle, and end of process for check-ins.
- 2) Scope of work will be completed mostly during 2020.

E. Data & Prioritization

- 1) Suggestion that Data & Prioritization look first at impacts to human health and environment, establishing what is known or unknown, and then sequence the analysis of finance and technology with prioritization later.
- 2) Discussion of Data & Prioritization
 - a) Suggestion that modeling evaluates effect of treatment to justify the adoption of technology
 - b) Current information and categorization is a starting point for addressing known public health problems
 - c) Near-shore water study funded by the state legislature will inform CCWG work, goal is to learn from them and not duplicate their efforts. Suggestion to invite Cilia Smith from UH, who is leading that work, to present in November. Her group is looking at nitrogen update by limu around the state.
 - d) MM is consolidating existing data from around the state, which will be ready to present later this year.
 - e) Site-specific conditions make it difficult to make recommendations on what systems to install. Prioritization can help to simplify. Now, hard to definitively recommend septic vs. cesspool due to conflicting/confusing information, also depends on installation, geology,

maintenance. Practical effect of a treatment system in the field will vary depending on many factors.

- f) Research and outreach to determine how many cesspools are still in place may determine that current figures are incorrect.
- 3) Presentation from MM on approaches by other states to cesspool conversion
 - a) Rhode Island, New York (Suffolk County), Massachusetts
 - b) Some states delegated responsibilities to county or town health departments, raises a question of capacity for implementation at the county level.
 - c) Workforce development with training on new technologies is helpful, will need people to install, service, and maintain new systems.
 - d) Other states provided funding, subsidies, and support for early adopters.
- 4) Challenge of uncertainty in sewer extension plans, which may change with different management. CR or SP to follow up with counties on what their sewer plans are.
- 5) CR and SP to meet with BWS about whether they can identify non-sewer customers.
- 6) CR to create a Data & Prioritization workplan with the Data & Prioritization sub-group and then share with the main group.
- 7) Discussion of the practical effects of current legislation on home sales with 30-year mortgage, beginning in January 2020.
- 8) Depth to groundwater requirements may need to be increased from 3ft to account for sea level rise.
- 9) Suggestion to designate water management areas that differentiate areas with more or less impacts.
- 10) Decision to meet at UH in conjunction with a presentation by Cilia Smith. Proposed date of December 3rd (to be confirmed).

F. Questions and Comments

- 1) DL and MM will create document about development of outreach subgroup, as discussed in the June 21 meeting.

G. Adjournment by TB at 3:47pm