

CESSPOOL CONVERSION WORKING GROUP (CCWG)

Main Group - Meeting Agenda

Date: June 19, 2020

Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Location: Webinar

Call in Details: Please join meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/521327949>

You can also dial in using your phone.

United States: [+1 \(872\) 240-3212](tel:+18722403212)

Access Code: 521-327-949

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/521327949>

Members Present:

Sina Pruder (SP)
Ted Bohlen (TB)
Stuart Coleman (SC)
Bill Kucharski (BK)
Ken Hiraki (KH)
David Smith (DS)
Kawika Winter (KW)
Eric Nakagawa (EN)
Erica Perez (EP)
Darren Lerner (DL)
Representative Nicole Lowen (NL)

Lani Fernandez (LF)
Jason Kagimoto (JK)
David Albright (DA)
Senator Kalani English (KE)
Bruce Anderson (BA)

Guests:

Dr. Stuart Waugh (SW)
Cari Ishida (CI)
Roger Babcock (RB)
John Katahira (JK)
Elizabeth Benyshek (EB)

Members Not Present:

Michael Mezzacapo (MM)
Lori Kahikina (LK)

Facilitation Support:

Christin Reynolds (CR)
Kayla Saunders (KS)

AGENDA

- A. Call to Order at 1:05pm by TB
- B. Approval of April 3rd meeting minutes led by TB
 - a. No comments from group or public for adjustments
 - b. TB moves to approve meeting minutes
 - i. SC seconds motion
 - c. TB moves for vote to approve
 - i. BK abstains from vote

- ii. 10 members say “aye”
- iii. No oppositions

C. Scope updates on Finance, Technology and Data & Prioritization

a. Project status update from Cari Ishida

i. Tasks for Technologies Group:

- 1. Monthly progress reports
- 2. Evaluation matrix of OSWT technologies
- 3. Homeowners guide
- 4. Review/update 2008 DOH OSWT Survey & Assessment
- 5. Assessment of other states
- 6. Final Report

ii. Tasks for Finance Group:

- 1. Monthly progress reports
- 2. Funding options
- 3. Affordability and equitable distribution of funds
- 4. Research other factors
- 5. Final Report

iii. Questions/Comments:

- 1. Discussion on evaluation of incineration toilets
 - a. Further evaluation deemed unnecessary because they are NSF and State approved.
- 2. Question: [*regarding the finance group update*] Was research conducted looking at different types of community improvement structures?
 - a. They reviewed mechanisms for distributing funds.
 - b. Important to capture community element in final report.
- 3. Question: Are there any options for EPA funding that should be considered within this context?
 - a. EPA member agreed to assist with incorporating potential funding sources into Carollo’s finance contract work.
- 4. Question: How will the funds be managed?
 - a. Looking into different options, including the timing of funds disbursement.
- 5. Question: How much time will be given to review and comment on the final report?
 - a. At least a week.
- 6. Question: Are there any Data and Prioritization group updates?
 - a. An MOU was established with UH.

D. Cesspool Conversion Lessons Learned from Stony Brook and Suffolk County

- a. Presentation by Dr. Stuart Waugh on solving Long Island’s on-site septic system crisis

- i. Nitrogen pollution problems and associated human health risks
 - ii. Suffolk County's "Reclaim Our Water" Program – regulatory Article 19 and Septic Improvement Program
 - iii. Permitting phases
 - iv. On-site wastewater treatment installations
 - v. Progress towards Nitrogen Removing Biofilters (NRB)
- b. Questions/Comments
- i. Question: What are the sources of funding being used to support this program? What about the low interest lending program and grants for disadvantaged households?
 - 1. SIP grants (Septic Improvement Program)
 - 2. Reclaim Our Water Program website has a huge amount of information, including performance information. There is also a description of their financing on there.
 - 3. Some funds are from NY-State.
 - 4. Priority areas ranked from 1-4.
 - ii. Question: Why is the unlined system lower and what were the two lined systems that was included in the data?
 - 1. Performance data is from prototypes at an Air Force base.
 - 2. Must look at the long-term history.
 - 3. The unlined has always been a little bit less.
 - 4. Relationship between size of system and loading.
 - iii. Question: The negative health effects of nitrogen were shown at a 2 mg/L amount, so how come your system design is shooting for 10 mg/L?
 - 1. 2 mg/L is a drinking water goal and 10 mg/L is what is allowed to be released from the system before dilution. 10 mg/L is what the technology could do.
 - 2. This is initial improvement on performance, but the next goal will be lower than 10.
 - 3. Every mg counts! On Long Island, each mg of N removed represents 116 tons of N prevented from entering marine systems and 14,000 tons from entering groundwater every year.
 - iv. Question: What kind of wood was used in the wood chip system?
 - 1. They used wood that is readily available on Long Island, which is Oak and Pine.
 - 2. They screen woodchips to prevent clogging.
 - 3. Currently experimenting with different sieve sizes.
 - v. Question: Did you ever use a passive, gravity flow system?
 - 1. No; gravity-fed systems work on pipes that are much bigger and wider in diameter.
 - vi. Question: What are your solutions for areas with a high-water table?

1. Suggest going to NY State Center for Clean Water Technology website and checking out June 2020 presentation on design issues.
 2. Compensation options for making system wider and flatter.
 3. Suggests aboveground commercial treatment units for areas with less than 5-feet available.
- vii. Question: Where do you find that most of the costs come from?
1. Varies from area-to-area.
 2. Huge part of cost is renting the earth-moving equipment, like excavators. Installers usually either rent or own their own.

E. Adjournment by TB at 2:49pm