

**Department of Environmental Management
Maui Wastewater Community Working Group Meeting IX
Thursday, August 5, 2010
Lahaina Civic Center**

**Meeting Notes
Final - September 15, 2010**

I. Welcome & Introductions

- Leland Chang: Opens the meeting with introductions. Robin indicates that she represents DIRE and the University of Hawaii Botany Department.

II. Agenda Review

- Leland Chang: Reviews the agenda. Ground Rules reminders: let Leland recognize speakers; speak one at a time; for initial question, he ask all members their impressions. Please speak loudly, clearly, and concisely.

- Cheryl Okuma: On September 1, there will be a presentation by a State Department of Health (DOH) representative regarding staphylococcus. The presentation will be at the Maui Planning Commission Room; estimated time is 9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. DOH will send invitations to CWG members.

III. CWG VIII Meeting Summary

- Leland Chang: Draft meeting summary inadvertently omitted Mayor Tavares' comments. Final draft will add back her comments.

IV. Pair Wise Strategies Rating Exercise Results Discussion

- Leland Chang: Asks for comments regarding strategy ranking results.

- Howard Hanzawa: Did not have multiple benefits at the top because we might lose focus on main objectives. Did have cost at the top and public acceptance because if we don't control the cost, we won't have buy in. If costs go up 3-5 times, people will be screaming. Public buy-in is needed. Need to get handle on how to attain this. Puzzled as to how we can do without injection wells; what is the alternative during winter when there are heavy storms? Where will the water go during those events?

- Pam Daoust: Evaluations were easier and faster this time. If we only take the top 10 rankings; we may leave out a lot of things because it's not broad enough. This is a concern and she wants to be able to discuss this more.

- Leland Chang: Howard and Pam mentioned that what is needed is to articulate cost in the equation.

- Warren Watanabe: How to expand the infrastructure and how to pay for it? Buy-in is critical. Agriculture is not a cure all for the situation.
- Sharon Suzuki: A lot of items in the top rankings require costly infrastructure.
- Frank de Rego: Concerned with how the cost of infrastructure will impact lower end of our society. Sewer increases gets passed on in rent. Public education and political support is needed. Important part of public acceptance is political support; it's two sides of the same coin. Had a lot of content variables in development of infrastructure but not process development (i.e. public and political support). Concerned that these process variables get pushed down the line.
- Robin Knox: Agrees with the top rankings; thought multiple benefits should be lower and compliance and reliability higher. Cost cannot be looked at in a vacuum. What is the cost to not doing something? Cost of losing ecosystem is another cost. If we can't fish, that's a cost. Concern about wet weather -- this is not how the system is supposed to work. Under consent decree to get this straightened out. Need to get storm water out of the system. How to accelerate run off and build with offsite storage; getting large volume of water is a problem to handle. Need to look at multiple benefits and integrated solutions.
- Leland Chang: Storage relates to processed wastewater for recycling. When it rains, you have an excess supply.
- Robin Knox: Other places capture storm water and this is another infrastructure cost.
- Joie Taylor: Likes the way the rankings fell. Did have concern about certain things suggested. Didn't suggest about process involved; wants to look at that.
- Leland Chang: The question is how do these recommendations become actual solutions; and are they to be implemented?
- Frank de Rego: And how public will buy in.
- Russell Sparks: Similar views; first few are obvious (expanding pipeline, increase customers). #4 is important to develop areas for irrigation or disposal. Big open pastures and forests. #7 is at the top and gets to problem -- how to pay for this? Lots of things at the bottom are also important. For example, combining water and wastewater departments is an important way of dealing with this. There are examples on mainland -- yet it ranked low.
- Jeff Pearson: Our mission statement refers to 100% recycling. #10 on ranking is to phase out injection wells. We can try to achieve this goal but we may not be able to completely phase out injection wells. As Cheryl mentioned in the news article, there is more to damaging reefs than injection wells -- storm water, surface runoff etc. So we are looking at ways to solve things but there may be other issues. Most of these things are difficult in real world to achieve because of cost and need for public support. Process takes time, which equates to more cost. Squeaky wheel gets the grease. Small percentage of people creates a lot of squeak. Good that small group gets heard but bad that projects they want amounts to a lot of costs to get done.
- Scott Meidel: Pleased with rankings shaking out; and glad that the group pared down the strategies and criteria. Happy to see the emphasis placed on opportunity for expanded agricultural use. This sets up for a discussion of the tangible cost of developing private-public efforts to expand use. Recognize cost of inaction; still there are enormous costs to doing what we are talking about. Need to come to grips with developing way to do it -- getting it to elevations, capacity commitments. Sounds great but have lots of work on the nuts and bolts to make it work. Launching pad for further discussion.
- Sean O'Keefe: Echo comments on what's come out at the top and opportunities for ag. Need to be alternatives -- don't want to count on ag as the main solution and have it not materialize. Should look at range of solutions and opportunities. Suggests not just taking top rankings.

Eliminate the lower recommendations by categories. Then have balanced set of recommendations.

- Dan Clegg: Likes Howard's comments about focus -- mission is to come up with alternatives for this water to go somewhere else. Little disappointed about #11 because while all this is in process, we need to insure that we can still do what we are doing today. From an organization that uses a lot of reclaimed water, Kihei is a poster child of how reuse can benefit when water quality and the system are top notch. This takes money, time, and effort. Because of the quality, it's allowed building of businesses around it. Need that kind of confidence in the water supply to build those business models. There's a lot of money spent to do what we are doing now. Everything else is in addition. Regarding cost -- how can you take pulse of the community and find out what the community is willing to pay as customer? What is it worth to customers to resolve this issue? Ask this on the water bill? How many people would say this is worth more money out of my pocket?

- Frank de Rego: Have high number of renters and this is our socio economic. Need to think about stressing and stretching this segment of society when raising fees because it gets passed on to the users. Many have two or more jobs and don't own their own homes. This is unintended consequences.

- Dan Clegg: That reinforces the point that nothing is free.

- Howard Hanzawa: Interesting that increasing the sewer fee is near the bottom. We need to be realistic that money needs to come from somewhere. If not from fees, how do we pay for this cost? Regarding combining the departments, DEM is trying to reuse water and water department is trying to conserve water. They should be combined somehow.

- Leland Chang: The team looked at the results and had a preliminary discussion -- #s 1-5 and #9 relate to building out infrastructure. #6 places responsibility on developers. #7 looks to public-private partnerships as way to lessen impacts on rate and tax payers. #8 and #10 address phasing out injection wells (line with mission), but this is tied to how rapidly infrastructure is developed. #11 deals with taking care of existing infrastructure while expanding reuse. #12 calls for fairness in the rate structure based on usage (related to financing). #13 and #14 deal with incentives and dedication of facilities to the County. #15 community education to build acceptance for paying for all of the above. Team members observed that rankings were clear in terms of expanding infrastructure but were less clear on how to pay for it. This next discussion will be devoted to how to pay for it. To stimulate this discussion, we wanted to present some information.

- Robin Knox: There is tendency to focus on injection wells. When speaking about nutrients, she's not just talking about injection wells.

- Scott Rollins: Goes over the Fact Sheet for CWG.

- WWRD is currently doing a verification study for Central Maui; South Maui verification study was completed last year for Kihei. A simple study was done in Lahaina where we looked at all users around the plant; and looked at users where we have infrastructure.

- Kihei: Verification study was done in conjunction with DWS. Steve put this data together. Kihei has the most use currently. Plant flows are lower now vs. non drought years. Overview of verification study. There are projects in various stages of planning or construction that will use up to 600,000 gpd. Timelines are up to the developers.
- Can get to 40% total reuse mostly in Lahaina/Kihei. The bulk of the remainder, 60%, is in Kahului where we don't have any significant reuse. In order to increase here we know that the water needs to move a long way at a great cost.
- Sewer rates: We currently project a 5% increase each year for next 10 years. Graph of history of sewer rates -- This trend will continue; reuse funded by sewer fees will increase the rates and adds to the trend.
- Reclaimed water history: some users rates are determined by their avoided costs. Whatever it costs to produce the brackish water they were previously using, is what the County will charge them for the reuse water. Couldn't charge them exorbitant amounts for recycled water. Included DWS potable water rates. Looked at how could offset the water.
- Salinity is always a concern. Kihei water is good because the pipelines are a newer system. The chlorides numbers are in a usable range for Monsanto. Lahaina system is older and down on Front Street with more ground water infiltration with higher chlorides. Issues with Honua Kai because salinity has damaged and killed some of their plants. Resorts have lush landscaping so this is an important aspect of the water. Our tracking has shown that the salinity increases with less rain and groundwater recharge.
- WWRD is in the process of upgrading its UV systems in Kihei. The new system has reduced the energy consumption by half in Kihei thus far.
- Rainy day issue -- there is infiltration; spent about \$7M to rehabilitate pipes in low lying areas and chloride levels dropped as a result. Goal is to try to keep storm water out of system.

-Robin Knox: Salinity is discussed as total dissolved solids. Is issue chlorides or something else?

- Steve Parabolicoli: Issue is TDS. Honua Kai didn't realize TDS was high; chlorides are about half of TDS. Good strategy for TDS is to install systems to inject gypsum to allow sodium salts to drain quickly, water softening, etc. This is a challenge in Lahaina.

- Pam Daoust: What are cost figures in terms reducing salinity or thinking of only uses where salinity is not a concern?

- Steve Parabolicoli: Preventing salt water intrusion is more cost effective. To take salt out of the water is reverse osmosis and cost prohibitive.

- Dave Taylor: New pipes are PVC; old used clay pipes and gaskets that didn't last long; this exists in Lahaina with gaskets every 4 feet that leak water. Did smoke testing into the system to show leaks. Smoke ended up everywhere in Wailuku. There are lots of these connections to houses, under slabs etc. No practical way to seal these items. Kihei is a newer community with

PVC pipes. Lahaina is the old system and we cannot seal from the houses to the connections. Cannot get onto peoples' properties.

- Steve Parabolicoli: Most potable water has higher salinity in Kahului. So we have higher salt in the water than from what's being treated at the plant?

- Tui Anderson (DWS): "yes".

- Leland Chang: Opens discussion of financing. Refers to the Fact Sheet. To pay for infrastructure and increase reuse to 40%, looking at the current \$58/month doubling over 10 years. Does the CWG support this first level of financing?

If we assume that the County pursues outside funding and in the event this funding is elusive or insufficient, is CWG willing to support a new rate structure? If so, what will it look like and how will it fairly allocate the cost of any incremental increases in recycling among all users and taxpayers -- ag, residential, commercial users, property taxpayers (who are not currently tapped for wastewater infrastructure), visitors, non-sewer users? How do you allocate costs for higher levels of recycling? What time frame for expansion would this group recommend to the County? Phasing out injection wells is tied to decreasing wastewater and increasing recycled water use. Will the CWG support recommendations for mandates and other requirements (e.g., if we prohibit use of brackish wells, people must use recycled water)?

- Robin Knox: Wants to understand assumptions behind estimates of increasing to 40% -- how does this relate to sewer fees?

- Tui Anderson: Water Department's Water Use Development Plan lays out growth and needs for next 30 years; and recycled water does play into that. Displacement of potable use has some viable options. Use of reclaimed is somewhat cheaper than developing fresh water in certain areas. Development Plan is on the website.

- Steve Parabolicoli: Increasing reuse component in water fees because some people are not hooked up to the County system. Now WWRD subsidizes about 75% of recycled fees.

- Tui Anderson: We have water customers being subsidized by other water users.

- Russell Sparks: 1) tacking a substantial increase to potable rates means people will use less water and result will be less sewage. Money can go to building and sustaining reuse. For example, people are putting in photovoltaic because MECO's increasing rates are hitting them in pocketbook. If reuse is going to be successful, it has to be tied to the price of potable water.

- Tui Anderson: The water development plan does look at recycled water.

- Russell Sparks: It has to happen quickly.

- Scott Meidel: How many are not connected to wastewater grid?

- Tui Anderson: There are about 39,000 water accounts.

- Dave Taylor: Looking at upcountry that gets county water but no sewer (20%). Guessing that 80% is on the county sewer grid.

- Jeff Pearson: 9-10 mgd usage upcountry.

- Jeff Pearson: Agrees with Russell's statement. This will affect public/political opinion. Statement in Fact Sheet is to get to 40% reuse; if going to 80% reuse, the curve is huge

- Scott Rollins: 40% is low hanging fruit.

- Jeff Pearson: At 95% , you will triple your costs.

- Gregg Kresge: When trying to conserve water, your first cutback is agriculture like lawns, not flushing. Reducing irrigation doesn't change flow, so you're not reducing what goes into the system. Once infrastructure goes in, you need to get the payback for that infrastructure regardless of irrigation or conservation.

- Dave Taylor: For the Water Department, cost is moving the water. Wastewater's big cost is treating solids; so even with less flushing, your solids are the same. When people stop flushing, our revenues go down. This can actually drive rates up. Billing is on water rather than on solids. We would like to charge for solids, but don't have a way to do this.

- Robin Knox: Are we assuming the same rate structure based on volume and charging less for potable water? People don't value wastewater but they do value potable water. Part of the strategy might be to not do things the same way we have been.

-Pam Daoust: 1) Example of an "affordable" house served by a privately built system where sewer bill was \$79/month. House is affordable by County standards but sewer rate is higher. This is actual cost for a constructed project; 2) wants to remind group that the Clean Water Fee in her proposed addendum might be an approach.

- Jeff Pearson: What were they paying for? R-1 reuse?

- Pam Daoust: Don't know.

- Steve Parabolicoli: Where was it?

- Pam Daoust: Wailuku

- Russell Sparks: Living in Pukalani and paying \$35/month.

- Steve Parabolicoli: Now building new plant with higher quality.

- Russell Sparks: This is a set rate and yet County is basing it on water use. Maybe just set a rate and add anything additional to that rate.

- Dave Taylor: There is a cap on the rate because anything beyond the cap is assumed to be for irrigation. So people are paying the same max rate, which is basically what Russell is talking about, i.e., a fixed rate. Most people are paying the residential max rate. It's about \$60/month for single family residential.

- Joie Taylor: It might make more sense to combine water and wastewater or link those two together.

- Dave Taylor: There is interaction between the two departments; and the people in the departments do work together, such as on the verification study. Putting together 300 people has been talked about a lot; and there is no joining the labs. Regarding rates, this is defined every year by County Council and water and wastewater go right after each other. Don't see that anything would be different from a strategic planning standpoint because the interaction is already happening.

- Joie Taylor: If potable water rates increased and people need an alternative, would the recycled water rate structure be communicated with Dept. of Water?

- Dave Taylor: The recycled rates are in WRD; and Council considers both water, wastewater and recycled rates. This is discussed at the same time in the Council. Don't know if things will be any different or change Council discussions by combining the departments. Rates and structures are discussed at Council every year and it's their decision.

- Jeff Pearson: Water Department looks at rates, brings it to the Board, and the group works on these rates with consultant. Bottom line is when looking at rates, they don't look at raising to reduce use; or to offset or pay for reclaimed water. The Council and departments may talk about it; but that discussion doesn't come up enough when you get into the details.

- Frank de Rego: Concerned that reducing wastewater volume results in increasing rates.

- Dave Taylor: Even if we use less water next year, we still need to charge \$60 a month to obtain the revenues. Solids require the same handling whether or not water volume changes; fixed costs need to be paid. Water pumping cost isn't as much as solids treatment cost.

Sean O'Keefe: Why are the fees the way they are? If cost of running is not related to volume, make it a fixed cost instead.

- Cheryl Okuma; Honolulu and Maui have set up sewer charges in a similar fashion. Both have sewer rates set on a base charge and a water usage charge. This is a very common method and formula for setting sewer rates. Maui has a cap beyond a certain amount (9,000 gallons) because of a recognition that any use beyond that amount is probably irrigation use. Honolulu has a lifeline charge and a cap that recognizes a certain volume represents irrigation use and does not go into the sewer. Both counties have a base charge and charge on volume. The base charge cost is to pay for fixed costs for operating and maintaining a system; and the use charge is a function of volume used. Federal law requires counties to be responsible for payment of operations, maintenance, and repairs.

- Howard Hanzawa: If private system is hooked up to the County system?

- Dave Taylor: Council sets those rates and they are fixed.

- Howard Hanzawa: What are those fixed rates?

- Dave Taylor: A little less than the County max.

- Jeff Pearson: Does the County read own meters and give readings to wastewater which charges different industrial rates?

- Dave Taylor: Amount of solids are assessed rates in terms of what comes into the system. There is a formula and calculation based on density of the sewage. There is a mathematical reason for these sewer calculations that are based on fairness.

- Scott Meidel: Decoupling of water and sewer fees?

- Dave Taylor: Lanai decouples cost of water and sewer.

- Pam Daoust: May be legal problems if enacting fees on those with potable water system but no public wastewater treatment system. Private system users are faced with upgrading their own systems and should not be forced to upgrade the public system as well.

Sharon Suzuki: Hear Dave say there is collaboration on rates because they are presented at the same time. Would there be more collaboration if they were under one person.

- Jeff Pearson: Was not always involved in the issues that Dave is talking about. When involved in rate discussions, reclaimed water was not much of an issue in establishing the rates.

- Dave Taylor: Looking at the current draft, this is the first time there is a linkage in the Development Plan and South Maui Reuse. This is a recent evolution.

- Warren Watanabe: Lots of discussion on what the rates should be and how much would community be willing to pay. Will the Council accept what is proposed?
- Jeff Pearson: What is the CIP for water? It was \$22M plus and a lot of it was not done. So why raise rates to increase CIP and then do nothing? CIP the next year was reduced.
- Robin Knox: Discussion points to Pam's idea that there needs to be overall Water Resource body to look at this. This doesn't even take into account storm water. Some places charge a storm water fee. Maybe don't combine the departments but have an overall Water Resource group to manage this.
- Dave Taylor: MECO struggles with this issue; how is this dealt with?
- Sharon Suzuki: Rates are developed with a similar quantitative model -- who uses what and a fair allocation with class subsidies. Rate design and cost to serve are considered, so some are not paying exactly what it costs. Allocation based on peak demand and energy usage. No demand charge for residential. Molokai cost is subsidized and they still pay a higher rate.
- Leland: People seem open to revisiting how rates are set to pay for reclaimed wastewater infrastructure: increases to potable and wastewater rates; better coordination between the two for a more cohesive approach; relooking at cap on rates above 9,000 gallon; using a set rate for sewer separate from volume except for tying the pumping part of it; affordability issue and impact on people, especially those with low incomes.
- Jeff Pearson: Russell talked about reducing potable water use with higher cost.
- Leland: This underlies philosophy to raise fresh water rates.
- Russell: Conservation of potable, increasing recycling, and generating funds.
- Leland Chang: Current timing of build out -- 10 years to get to 40% reclaimed usage with a doubling of fees.
- Russell Sparks: This sets up for a long time line. If setting timeline based on effects on reefs, then we find an urgency to make things happen. Public-private partnerships may be able to do things quicker. We're setting selves up for long time to get this done.
- Leland Chang: Intent is not to set that up but to ask what the CWG thinks in terms of timeline.
- Tui Anderson: Water Development Plan should be looked at, because it talks about growth. What are we going to be dealing with in 20 years. Remember that in 20 years, we are going to be dealing with a lot more and we need to be prepared. Maybe cannot get away from injection wells but maybe we can reduce reliance on them. We need fresh water, because the next chunk to develop potable water is really expensive.
- Robin: Need short and long term strategies. There is an urgent need, but these realities mean there needs to be a long term strategy so we don't find ourselves in this position later. Need to plan for replacement of what we have. Lot of people view exemption from secondary and injection wells as ways to get around the Clean Water Act.

- Leland Chang: Does CWG want these recommendations to be aggressive in terms of solutions and ways to pay for them? Does the CWG want the team to bring back something that is ambitious and aggressive?

- Frank de Rego: Maybe we need to garner those solutions that would have significant short term impact but not negate that there will be some long term needs. Are there some things we can address right away such as public-private partnership? Has to be parallel sets of recommendations to see how we would divide it up.

- Robin Knox: Don't have to accomplish everything in the short term; if we can gain 20% in the short term that's still a gain. Don't discount the continuing cost of injection because it may cost anyway. Do we want to spend money short term or shift to reuse? Should do any short term gains.

- Scott Meidel: There needs to be a lot of dialog to understand higher return, short term strategies.

- Steve Parabolicoli: A lot of the options will be identified in the verification studies.

Scott Meidel: The Fact Sheet is the "bang for the buck". Some is affordable; others, pie in the sky.

- Pam Daoust: Stumbling block is that we narrowed the mission focus, which precludes our looking at cheaper alternatives, e.g., constructed wetlands. If not suitable county-wide, this might be suitable for smaller areas. Not saying that we must redo mission statement, but wants to bring this up because of so narrow a focus.

- Craig Lekven: Constructed wetlands are designed for flow thru and disposal. To not dispose into ocean, you need to construct a very large wetland as the end disposal solution. In flow thru, water flows thru and is being disposed; can remove 90% nitrogen.

- Pam: Florida relies on constructed wetlands and one involves 50 acres that handles 4 mgd. Shouldn't discount this. We need a vehicle to discuss this to make recommendations. These are associated costs. Maybe there are cheaper alternatives.

- Joie Taylor: How long to construct a wetland?

Craig Lekven: It's a public works project.

- Joie Taylor: How long after construction to function?

- Craig Lekven: Within a year, will get good treatment. In California, within 4 months, 2 ml per liter nitrogen in a 10,000 gpd facility.

- Joie Taylor: Any sites that are good locations for constructed wetlands?

- Craig Lekven: The problem is that the soils are so porous -- it will be more expensive here because it would need to be lined. You would need level ground for the least expense.

- Sean O'Keefe: This would be an added cost.

- Craig Lekven: Wetlands have operations and maintenance costs; and mosquitoes love wetlands. We can integrate pest management but mosquitoes will always grow.

- Scott Meidel: Emphasis on irrigated pastures as a viable means of use.

- Leland Chang: Wanted to point out that for better or worse CWG is looking at infrastructure development and rates and costs.

- Pam Daoust: Not proposing to switch to wetlands; just pointing out that our focus is narrow.
- Robin Knox: 50 acres? What volume?
- Craig Lekven: 26 acres treated 1 mgd, but it was oversized. Maybe it could have treated 2-3 mgd.
- Robin Knox: There are water quality standards for the specific wetlands. This can be seen in running water NPDES as opposed to wetlands that have a greater capacity for treating the water.

- Leland Chang: Are there other types of mandates that would affect the choices made?
- Dave Taylor: Currently, the deferred cost clause will cause debate with businesses about costs.
- Jeff Pearson: Can't use potable water for golf courses.

- Russell Sparks: Could private people put in the infrastructure and then not have to pay fees for the water for a certain amount of time?
- Jeff Pearson: That is currently done with (DWS) for fresh water supply.

- Dave Taylor: The Council could pass a law that says that you have to take back as much as you put into the system.

- Steve Parabolicoli: We do have a clause that looks at retrofit costs as part of using reclaimed water.

- Leland Chang: This is a request for you to take the next couple of weeks to take this homework assignment back to your respective groups for input. We would like to see what your organizations or groups have to say about the issues you are discussing.
- Gregg Kresge: The assignment document will be put on the website in both Word and pdf.

V. & VI. N&P; Pam Daoust Request for Addendum to Recommendations

- Pam Daoust: Proposes a Coastal Clean Water Commission to provide recommendations regarding "clean water fees" dedicated toward the reduction of nutrients and other pollutants in Maui's coastal waters. Commission duties would include reviewing and recommending possible projects, legislative remedies and additional funding sources. We need to have a vehicle for further discussion of ocean nutrient loading. Are we only looking at reuse or are we also looking at the effects on the ocean? I found the Chesapeake Bay situation as an example and I am not looking to exactly duplicate their organization, but I would like to look at the organizational structure and how they handled reducing nutrient loading. I also wanted to present how they looked at their fees. I would like to look at a far-reaching fee that would be paid by everyone -- tourists, residents, businesses, everyone. I would like to see the CWG recommend this vehicle to be able to go forward with legislation and fees. I see this as a mechanism that would go on after CWG ends, and address issues that the CWG wasn't able to address.
- Joie Taylor: Does the watershed group handle this already?
- Robin Knox: The watershed group came about to address issues of water quality and nutrient loading within the watershed. The County of Maui will see more NPDES permits. I am not only talking about the County government, I am talking businesses, everyone. EPA is mandating TMDL and is requiring this under the Clean Water Act. We have the best opportunity in the country to make this happen.

- Joie Taylor: Do we need to have a separate group?
- Robin Knox: Yes, I see this as being a separate part of the watershed group. These issues are all related -- water quality, TMDL, and how communities address them.
- Dave Taylor: Chesapeake Bay was handling several townships and governments, whereas in Maui we don't have this structure.
- Pam Daoust: Florida is doing the same thing and involves a lot of community groups. It is not only government that is making the decisions. Here we have so many stakeholders and we don't have a vehicle for them to deal with these issues. There is no group that is making recommendations to handle these issues. The County people are really busy and are not able to take the community input.
- Sean O'Keefe: We have a mandate to make recommendations on how to reduce injection of the wastewater and to increase reuse. Let's not dilute our efforts. It is already in our list to look at fees. We don't need a separate group to talk about fees. There doesn't need to be a separate group to look at a \$50 million cost to increase reuse. I don't think that we should be asking for a group that needs to be funded. Let's spend the money on solutions.
- Joie Taylor: One issue is increasing use of recycled water. The other issue is the science and if there is an identification of the non-point sources that affect nutrient loading. Maybe we could recommend a position in the County to be hired to handle these issues. We would be solving the underlying issue of water quality.
- Dave Taylor: What if the recommendation to the Council is that they have a committee specifically addressing water quality. The Council is the entity that makes the decisions. A Council committee could be provided with necessary technical support.
- Pam Daoust: I tried to model this on the commission structure within the County.
- Robin Knox: I agree with Sean that we shouldn't get too scattered. I think we need both in that I think we need a commission that has greater authority. I also see a need for County positions so we're not just relying on the commission. There needs to be the technical expertise. I would like to see both.

- Dan Clegg: I agree with Sean that we need to stay focused. One thing we can agree on is that we are short on money. Looking at the timeline, let's look at what we've been given and look at how we can get to 40% with \$25 million. We need to resolve this first.
- Joie Taylor: What if we did come up with a solution to come up with the money but we don't solve the water quality issue?
- Dan Clegg: That is not what we were asked to do.

- Pam Daoust: I would like to see a recommendation from CWG for s Coastal Clean Water Commission loosely patterned after the Chesapeake Bay program, or if there are not enough votes for this, a minority report.
- Frank de Rego: This is a consensus process and there isn't a minority report mechanism.

- Sean O'Keefe: The rankings of criteria and strategies went through a process. Additional recommendations should not just be added.

VII. Next Steps and Next Meeting

Leland Chang: Two week turnaround for CWG members to consult with their organizations; team will meet following this to draft recommendations.

Next meeting is set for September 2nd but may be moved if the team needs more time.

VIII. Comments from the Public

John Seebart: Cannot forget that there are opportunity costs. We have to look at the cost of doing nothing. I really appreciate what Pam brought up. You have to look at the pollution and not necessarily the injection well. If you were putting in seawater, we wouldn't have this issue. Someone asked is nitrogen really the problem or some other source. If you are going to dispute the Dailer study, then you need to come up with the studies and data to refute that. The rainy day scenario and diversion issue, we still use some water and could redirect the water into streams etc. In regards to rates, when the rates go up due to scarcity, then the reclaimed water becomes more valuable too. Since the next water source is going to be really expensive, we should get ahead of the game and use the 17 million gpd going down the wells.

Tom Roper: Injection wells were devised decades ago and techniques have changed and improved. We should look at these improvements. In regards to Pam's request, I haven't seen something like what Pam suggested here on Maui. I would like to see us take a step beyond water and look at the whole ecosystem.

Megan Powers: I would like to address the need to stay focused; Pam's suggestion could collect fees to pay for the first step of the \$25 million.

Ellie Cochran: I am part of the DIRE group and we've woken up the community about the injection wells. My question has always been why have the plans that have come up before never been done. I think the focus should stay on the injection wells and reuse first and then tackle other issues later. There is a positive way to look at this and we need to put a ray of hope in something being done. Thank you all for being here and taking part.

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.