

CESSPOOL CONVERSION WORKING GROUP (CCWG)

Main Group - Meeting Agenda

Date: May 18, 2021

Time: 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Location: Webinar

Call in Details: Join Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86027898284>

Meeting ID: 860 2789 8284

Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Members Present:

Sina Pruder (SP)
Ted Bohlen (TB)
Rep. Nicole Lowen (NL)
Mike Mezzacapo (MM)
Darren Lerner (DL)
Erica Perez (EP)
Eric Nakagawa (EN)
Dave Smith (DS)
Stuart Coleman (SC)
Jason Kagimoto (JK)
Kawika Winter (KW)

Cari Ishida (CI)
Raquel Gilliland (RG)
Christina Comfort (CC)

Members Not Present:

Wesley Yokoyama (WY)
Sen. Kalani English (KE)
Elizabeth Char (EC)
Ken Hiraki (KH)
Lani Fernandez (LF)
Ramzi Mansour (RM)

Facilitation Support:

Christin Reynolds (CR)
Aida Arik (AA)

Guests:

Heidi Schemp (HS)
Joachim Scheider (JS)

AGENDA

- A. Call to order by TB at 1:05pm
- B. Approval of April 20th meeting minutes
 - a. No comments from group or public for adjustments
 - b. TB motion to approve meetings as drafted, SC seconds motion
 - i. All members raised hands for “aye”
 - ii. No oppositions
- C. Outline of Cesspool Conversion Plan
 - a. Discussion about plan to draft Hawai'i Cesspool Conversion Plan by end of the year
 - i. Question raised about the goal of submitting the Plan to the legislator.

1. Draft of the bulk of the report by the end of the year.
 2. Discussions can go past this year before submitting to the legislature.
 - ii. Question about what happens after submitting the report.
 1. Working group would dissolve after the Plan is submitted unless the legislature changes the law.
 2. Funding is encumbered by end of 2021, report due end of 2022.
 3. Would be good to discuss how the information is presented and schedule some events to discuss outcomes.
 - iii. Question about financing and technology after Plan. Will there be a recommendation (acknowledging that a recommendation might be vast or a set of recommendations).
 1. This group should aim to present the future that they want to see with acknowledgment of limitations, priorities, and other gray areas.
 2. Prioritization question is key. Some recommendations or a menu of recommendations would be helpful. Include existing funding needs and potential funding options.
 3. Identify specific processes recommendations for the organizational work and technical capacity would be a valid way to approach the report.
- b. Discussion about Plan outline draft.
 - i. Question about what is the responsibility of the working group.
 1. The responsibility of the work group is to develop a long-range, comprehensive plan for cesspool conversion statewide of all cesspools by 2050 as required by Act 132 of SLH 2018. In addition, Act 132 provided a list of 15 objectives that are required to be evaluated by the work group.
 2. DL to ask Dr. Celia Smith to provide a presentation of the UH sewage study to the working group.
 - ii. Question about whether to include a “do nothing” scenario.
 1. Do we have enough information on that or how would that be calculated out? For example, amount of effluent reaching coastal waters.
 2. Potentially under the “Current Status of Cesspools.” Include
 3. Would be good to separately discuss long-term impacts of no action. For example, effects to ecosystem and reef system.
 - iii. Suggestion to add chapter about organization approach with outline of mechanisms for moving forward with options about how to approach the problem.
 1. Include ownership/oversight and financing options (overlaps with both the organizational approach and financing sections).

- iv. Suggestion to include specific policy recommendations for incentives and consequences targeted at the legislature. Include fees to show that there is a price to keeping a cesspool, and have revenue to help conversion process.
 - 1. Words such as “fees” and “fines” didn’t go over well in Rhode Island. Better to frame as help or incentives.
 - 2. There are political considerations, but can still include these in the report.
- v. Acknowledge the research project led by the Water Resources Research Center. Expect near final report by end of June with the final product to be delivered to the legislature by the end of the year.
 - 1. DL to reach out to see if research group could give a brief update for the June meeting. Deliver report to working group by the end of June with a deadline to provide feedback.
- vi. Stoneybrook group presentation also a potential June meeting item.
- vii. Send outline around to get feedback.
- viii. Interim report is due this year and final report is due next year.

D. Questions and Comments

- a. No additional question or comments

E. Adjournment at 2:00pm