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The purpose of these bills is to provide funds to the water pollution control revolving fund and to allow the Director of Health to make grants, loans or a combination of grants and loans from these funds to government agencies for the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, and if applicable, the expansion of existing sewage treatment plant facilities, or other projects intended for wastewater reclamation or wastewater management.

Our statement on these bills does not represent an institutional position of the University of Hawaii.

For the past 19 years, the Environmental Center has been involved with almost all aspects of wastewater treatment systems in the State of Hawaii. We have assisted in the review of construction projects, wastewater monitoring programs, water quality studies, reclamation and reuse of wastewaters, and marine environmental studies. We have served in both an advisory capacity, through our facilitation of input from various members of the University community who specialize in wastewater management, as well as having direct hands on personal experience with various technical studies pertinent to the environmental affects of wastewater discharges. I mention our involvement only to stress our experience in this particular field.
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HB 1850 HD 2 and SB 1882 SD 1 are nearly identical bills and both seek, quite appropriately, to acquire the much needed funds to improve wastewater treatment facilities on a statewide basis.

The only significant difference, and this is an extremely important difference in our opinion, is that Section 1 of SB 1882 SD 1 (page 3, lines 3-6) states as partial justification for the funds that an immediate appropriation of over $300 million is required to upgrade existing wastewater treatment facilities to secondary treatment as mandated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. In contrast, Section 2 of HB 1850 HD 2 (lines 8-10) specifically states that, "It is not the intent of the legislature to use these funds to upgrade sewage plant facilities to secondary treatment if such treatment is not warranted."

The need for funds to improve wastewater treatment facilities is essential. Development and population increases are creating potentially serious statewide water quality problems particularly in areas such as West Hawaii. Therefore we strongly support the intent of both bills to provide funds to address these wastewater management requirements.

However, we are strongly opposed to the language in SB 1882 SD 1 (lines 3-6) that states that the funds are "required to upgrade existing treatment facilities to secondary treatment" or that such secondary treatment is "mandated by the federal Water Pollution Control Act."

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act provides for waivers from secondary treatment under Section 301h for those cases where it can be shown that the discharge of primary treated wastewater will not jeopardize water quality for public, ecological or recreational uses, that adequate standards exist and monitoring program are established. Furthermore, we have conducted an extensive review of the technical, scientific, and observational studies pertinent to the environmental impacts associated with the deep water discharge of primary treated wastewater in Hawaii and have concluded that secondary treatment would produce no measurable improvement to the quality of the receiving waters off these deep ocean outfalls.

HB 1850 HD 2 recognizes the legislative intent to provide funds to be used for primary treatment but would not permit the use of these funds for secondary treatment if such treatment is not warranted.

We strongly support HB 1850 HD 2 and recommend that SB 1882 SD 1 be amended to delete the sentence in lines 3-6 on page 3 that refers to the requirement for secondary treatment and replace this sentence with the more flexible language in HB 1850 HD 2 page 3 lines 8-10.