

From: [Barbara Buikema](#)
To: [Domine Barringer](#)
Subject: FW: Proposed Grinder Pump Policy Comment
Date: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 5:54:13 PM

Domine - here is another one for Public Comment

-----Original Message-----

From: Laura Armev <laura.armey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 5:17 PM
To: Barbara Buikema <Buikema@cawd.org>
Subject: Proposed Grinder Pump Policy Comment

This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Bukeima and CAWD board,

We think it is laudable that you want to implement a more fair and consistent policy for the community you serve. However you should consider a few factors and amendments before you approve an ejector pump policy.

1. 10 years maintenance is a very short maintenance period. Maintaining and replacing these systems in the long run could pose significant costs to homeowners (not to mention its detrimental impact of home values). In many systems these are wholly owned by the public utility (particularly where they replace existing sewage access). This would mean lifetime maintenance. Is it even legal to cut off a public service that we pay for down the road?
2. Section 2b. is ambiguous, it is not clear what parts of installation CAWD is paying for - electrical hookup? damage to landscaping/hardscaping? alterations to landscaping/hardscaping/structures to make the system accessible for maintenance?
3. We think there should be a provision that pumps will only be used according to manufacturers specifications. These won't be installed where manufacturers don't think they will work.
4. There are some other ambiguities to be ironed out: what constitutes a long term power outage for example - we have a busy household with a lot of kids that flush toilets, require a lot of dishes, and showers etc. What is reasonable to expect in terms of where these get placed - how disruptive are these allowed to be to the use of my backyard?

Finally, We appreciate that CAWD is taking on additional costs, however I believe it is the board's fiduciary and legal responsibility to consider these costs in the proposals for these systems moving forward, and it strikes me that once a pump policy is enacted proposals such as Carmel Meadows and Pescadero (if not others) should be reconsidered with these additional costs in mind.

We appreciate that all of you are trying to do your best for our community and environment, we are hopeful there is another way to do it generally than installing pumps, and have other objections to implementing ejector pumps in our neighborhood, but as for a general policy, we hope you will consider these suggestions and issues before approving/implementing it.

Sincerely,

Laura Armev and Nicholas De Luca