

LOS OSOS WASTEWATER PROJECT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works



Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 4, 2008

- 1) Call to Order/ Roll Call: approximately 7:05 pm, Chairman Garfinkel calls meeting to order. Absent: John Fouche, Marshall Ochylski, and Karen Venditti. Opening comments by Chairman Garfinkel (**attached**). Discusses the meeting format as well as encouraging public members to submit their comments in writing.
- 2) Agenda Item 1, Accept minutes from previous meeting - January 7, 2008: **Chairman Garfinkel motions to accept minutes, Bob Semonsen moves, and David Dubbink seconds. Chairman Garfinkel request public comment. No corrections from public requested regarding minutes. Passes unanimously.** John Waddell, County of San Luis Obispo – Department of Public Works, comments on the need of a more defined purpose and objective on all future tech memos. Discussion of the process of obtaining comments on tech memos which must be received by the County in writing within two weeks of meeting date. County will be compiling and responding to all comments/questions in a similar manner as comments/questions from Proposition 218 protest. The goal for the upcoming TAC meeting will be to have two to four tech memos to review. Mark Hutchinson, County of San Luis Obispo – Department of Public Works, introduces Michael Brandman and Gene Talmadge from Michael Brandman Associates (MBA) who are the perspective EIR consultant
- 3) Agenda Item 2, Discussion of the Project Team's Tech Memo titled "Low Pressure Collection Systems"; Chairman Garfinkel provides an introduction directly from the tech memo of these types of systems. Chairman Garfinkel then opens up discussion for TAC members regarding this tech memo. Rob Miller discusses conversation with vendor regarding grinder pump maintenance and installation. Daniel Berman discusses portion of summary of this tech memo (page 21) which compares step, gravity, and low pressure systems with regards to neighborhood impact. This tech memo's summary mentions that the step systems has less neighborhood impact than gravity and that is not consistent with TAC member's previous findings which found that the step systems could have more neighborhood impacts due to the on-lot disturbance. Daniel Berman comments to John Waddell on this tech memo figure 2 – page 10, with regards to the project cost vs. on-lot owner cost, the installation of grinder pump should be part of the project's cost and not the on-lot owners regardless of where it is located. John Waddell responds to this comment by stating that he agrees that this matter is something that will have to be looked at in more detail. Figure 2 – page 10 is consistent with the analysis of step and gravity systems since in those cases a small number of homes may possibly require a grinder pump

Project website: www.slocounty.ca.gov/PW/LOWWP

Project email address: LOWWP@co.slo.ca.us

and this is consistent with previous project development which would be responsibility of on-lot owners. If the systems ends up to be an intensive low pressure collection systems, with many homes needing a grinder pump, the County will defiantly have to look into the possibility of project taking this cost. Bob Semonsen discusses cost for the control panels and questions who will have the final say for the control panel's requirements. Rob Miller agrees that the cost of control panels can be of great significance and comments that as a projects team writes up performance specifications, these should be clear. Bob Semonsen discusses the electrical code and distance from disconnect to pump location. Rob Miller agrees and states that it is an issue that will need to be looked at as well. David Dubbink discusses area of disturbance calculated by him and areas of disturbance discussed on this report are contradictory. His calculations showed that gravity and step have approximately the same area of disturbance, but the low pressure collection systems would have less area of disturbance. Russell Westmann discusses a discrepancy in pricing this report reflect horizontal boring, but all systems contacted put the low pressure pipe thru open trench process. John Brady discusses that this report showed three hundred dollars for complete decommissioning the septic tank and he stated that the cost of simply pumping out septic tank is a lot more. Rob Miller comments that the grinder pumps systems that he has worked with are 240 volt. **(see attached TAC written comments)**

Public E-mails

Robert Stark – **(see attached)**

Don Bearden – **(see attached)**

Public Written Comments

None Provided

Public Comment

Alon Perlman: Questions if there is going to be a general comment at the end

George L. Taylor: Discusses examination for pump components in more detail

Anne Norment: Discusses the need of a more in deep information of what homeowners will experience with having this kind of a systems on lot versus a step steg long term. Some of her concerns include overflow capacity, power outages, spills for grinder pump failure and who would pay for it, and whether there is less of an I&I issues with this smaller pipes.

Rob Miller (responds): On the I&I questions, because this systems is pressurized, there is a less likely hood of infiltration

Al Barrow: Discusses issue with energy use being significantly more.

Gail McPherson: Discusses disadvantages of this system being high energy cost and would like to see systems energy footprint comparison.

Keith Wimcer: Discusses the sealing of certain lengths of pipes when near high ground water, grease clogging of the grinder pumps, and the waste of energy by using grinder pumps when not required.

Richard Margetson: Discusses the cost of abandoning the existing septic tank compared to what is mentioned on this tech memo.

Rob Miller (responds): Agrees with cost issue

David Duggan: Discusses the Conditional Permit to Proceed by the Coastal Commission and the use of existing septic tank for recharge.

Tom Murphy: Discusses required pretreatment prior to discharge.

- 4) Agenda Item 3, Discussion of the Project Team's Tech Memo titled "Decentralized Treatment"; Chairman Garfinkel provides an introduction directly from the tech memo of these types of systems. Chairman Garfinkel then opens up discussion for TAC members regarding this tech memo. No TAC comments provided.
(see attached TAC written comments)

Public E-mails

David Venhuizen – **(see attached)**

Public Written Comments

Tom Murphy – **(see attached)**

Public Comment

Lawson Schaller: Discusses report as it compares to Lambardo letters and discussions

Keith Wimer: Discusses fewer treatment sites would make cheaper and more acceptable

Maria Kelly (responds\questions): Whether Keith Wimer said that it would be one tank for every four houses and whether Pio's proposal required each house to have grinder pump with shared tank

Keith Wimer (responds): One of Pio Lambardo's proposals on the internet was about one tank for every four houses and grinder pump only required at the centralized tank which then uses the pump to then send to the collection

John Brady (responds\comments): With regards to ground water balance and the difference between current populations and build out. Also, recharging the upper aquifer with decentralized system and multiple contaminants that need to be dealt with other than nitrate.

Chuck Cesena: Discusses the overstated monitoring issues given that there will probably be less than 30 sites and amount of sea water intrusion being 460ac-ft & water purveyors dealing with some of those problems

Rob Miller (responds): The 460ac-ft is Cleath estimate before the implementation of any de-nitrification of upper aquifer water by Golden State, but hopefully rate coming down this year

Daniel Berman (responds\comments): The environmental TAC subgroup also commented on the groundwater balance\sea water intrusion but should notice the difference between decentralized systems and purveyors separate issue of sea water intrusion.

Anne Norment: Discusses the need for more specifics of what these types of systems are going to be like (odors, noise, other) and a more accurate costs since it is unlikely that there would be 30 sites

Al Barrow: Discusses reduction of sea water intrusion would simply by reducing the pumping and consideration of more impacts with decentralized systems

John Brady (responds\comments): On current sea water mitigation factor and why it is not simply a one for one when reducing pumping as it relates to sea water mitigation

Tom Murphy: Discusses pretreatment prior to discharge (**see attached**)

Richard Margetson: Discusses 930ac-ft per year sea water intrusion in the prohibition zone being inconsistent with numbers for indoor\outdoor consumption in the fine screening report

Rob Miller (responds): There needs to be further clarification on this number

David Duggan: Discusses locations in Los Osos will have no problem to be for sale and discharge sites permitted by the Regional Water Board

Maria Kelly (responds\comments): The need of there being more specifics on the identification of sites which would be potentially viable with decentralized systems.

Gail McPherson: Discusses septic issue of amount of carbon which can be collected and used for energy and decentralized systems should be seriously considered

Rob Miller (responds): Separation from effluent to wastewater lines and required 4' minimum (edge to edge) separation between tertiary lines to any raw wastewater and from tertiary to any potable water (in separate trenches)

Maria Kelly (question to John W): Will there be a tech memos with cost comparisons associated with methane capturing?

John Waddell (responds): Tech memo will be provided on the general greenhouse gas (AB 32/Greenhouse Gas) issues to look at carbon footprint and greenhouse gas emissions

John Brady (comments): Small landfills typically do not produce waste energy since it is not cost effective. When have tax credits it makes it more reasonable

Gail McPherson (questions): Whether or not this will take another step and have a detailed evaluation and comparison because it was indicated in the report that it was

John Waddell (responds): There are others steps (especially with decentralized systems) that need to be taking before finalizing this tech memo. The first being that need regulatory input on assumptions and questions regarding monitoring and permit ability in general (Coastal Commission and Regional Water Board, other) and also working with Pio Lambardo to get some of the specific questions related to his proposal answered

Daniel Berman (comments): Discusses what he believe to be the most useful way of reviewing the tech memos and then reads to the public one of the comments written by the environmental subgroup members to make aware to the public that TAC members review comments matches very well with public comments and concerns

Russell Westmann (comments): Discusses the need to be careful with the use of figure one so that people are not mislead with regards to the total number of plants and its relation to the total cost

John Brady (comments): Discusses the comparison of centralized to decentralized systems. Distribution systems as it relates to separation requirement and agricultural exchange being a crucial part of balancing the basin at build out

- 5) Agenda Item 4, Discussion of the Project Team's Tech Memo titled "On Site Treatment"; Chairman Garfinkel provides an introduction directly from the tech memo of these types of systems. Chairman Garfinkel then opens up discussion for TAC members regarding this tech memo. No TAC comments provided.
(see attached TAC written comments)

Public E-mails
None Provided

Public Written Comments
None provided

Public Comment

Keith Wimer: Discusses management system, the need of more information from the Regional Water Board on what the on site groundwater recharge requirement is going to be, ex-filtration and infiltrations never being one hundred percent contained, and conservation of water by minimize current pumping amounts

Maria Kelly (comments\clarifies): Did you mean that by good conservation would required fewer treatment plants? How does it relate to on site systems?

Keith Wimer (responds): He was referring to the decentralized system which was talking about a few minutes ago

Chris Allebe: Discusses items that have been mentioned as they relate to the cost expensive and possible ways of reducing this amount

Al Barrow: Discusses the need for consultants to provide an energy study and the need of a price per gallon on all systems. He also refers to State Water Board Resources Control website having many systems of this kind and this website providing a very good source of useful information

Steve Paige: Discusses retrofit to meet APCD CO₂ footprint of 1990 septic facilities
(see attached)

David Dubbink (comments): Suggest that it would be useful to explore ways that people individually may which to limit their water intake such as composting toilets

David Duggan: Discusses there being minimal possibilities of the regulatory systems allowing on site systems. It's his understanding that there was a resolution passed by the Regional Water Board requiring a wastewater facility in Los Osos

Chairman Garfinkel (comments): All of the system, before we spend a lot of money, we should first know from the Regional Water Board whether they would be allowed. He previously spoke to a recent member of the Board and found that in order for them of allow on site systems, every site where it's discharged they would need to obtain a discharge permit

David Duggan (responds): It is possible to obtain a discharge permit on homes that were built after 1998, but it is just in additional cost factor of \$875 to maintain

6) Agenda Item 4, General Public Comment;

Keith Wimer: Discusses possibility of the 2-5 sites keeping the water over the basin and completely balance both aquifers. We need to look into long term and not over draft the lower aquifer

Al Barrow: Discusses the need of using the industry' cost as a guideline

Don Bearden: Discusses that grinder pumps, electrical connections, and other system components required on some property should not be paid by the property owner but rather be part of project cost

Alon Perlman: Discusses general process and the need of both expert and non-expert input to make this process fair and effective

David Duggan: Discusses the need of verbal summaries from the TAC comities from each items

Chairman Garfinkel refers people listening at home to website at the bottom of the screen, signing up to be on the project's e-mail list, and/or to regularly visit our website for more information

7) Date of next advisory committee meeting: Monday, March 3, 2008 at 7:00 pm in Los Osos at the South Bay Community Center.

8) Meeting adjourns at approximately 9:34 pm.