

Chepachet Village - Local options for village wastewater management

Town Action	Pros	Cons
<p>No action - System owners continue to make decisions about system maintenance and repair and individually.</p>	<p>Least cost to town</p> <p>Homeowners free to maintain and upgrade system based on personal preference.</p> <p>Choice of system upgrade left up to system designer.</p>	<p>High risk of wellwater contamination from failed and substandard systems.</p> <p>Homeowners unprotected from impacts of nearby substandard systems.</p> <p>Repairs unlikely to meet minimum siting or design standards, and without addressing multiple impacts of systems within wellhead areas.</p> <p>Repairs likely to be made using conventional mound system, often at high cost but without improved treatment, visual impacts and nuisance flooding.</p> <p>Lack of guidance to landowners in selecting appropriate technologies for difficult sites.</p>
<p>Voluntary system maintenance and repair - Through town education program.</p>	<p>Low cost to town.</p> <p>Homeowners free to maintain and upgrade system based on personal preference and information provided.</p> <p>Choice of system upgrade left up to system designer.</p>	<p>Experience in other RI communities shows that voluntary programs are not effective in upgrading substandard or failing systems.</p> <p>Similar to no action except guidance provided to promote system maintenance and select appropriate technologies.</p>
<p>Mandatory system inspection and pumpout</p>	<p>Provides baseline information on location, type and condition of onsite systems for town planning and management.</p> <p>Regular maintenance is most cost effective way to keep good systems functioning.</p> <p>Can ensure that maintenance contracts on advanced treatment systems are renewed annually.</p> <p>No cost to town or general public if mandatory program focuses on advanced treatment and systems in critical areas, with annual fees to fund town contractor.</p>	<p>Town staff or contractor needed to implement and enforce program; set up and manage database to track results.</p> <p>Inspection and tank pumpouts ineffective in removing cesspools and failed systems - these present highest risk of groundwater contamination.</p>
<p>Town standards for system repair, cesspool phase out and level of wastewater treatment.</p>	<p>High level of groundwater protection for all landowners; can protect future quality from combined impacts of systems.</p> <p>Establishes consistent standards for all homeowners.</p> <p>Required improvements can be phased in over time and with sale</p>	<p>Public support needed to adopt repair and upgrade standards in wastewater management ordinance; incorporate treatment standards (often through groundwater overlay zone).</p> <p>Town staff or contractor needed to administer and enforce program.</p>

	<p>of property.</p> <p>Provides guidance to homeowner and designers on system types capable of controlling impacts.</p> <p>Standards can be designed to avoid new construction on marginal sites, prevent nuisance flooding from mounds, avoid extensive site alteration in historic / environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>Cost of system repairs and upgrades to homeowners.</p>
<p>Investigate feasibility of cluster treatment unit.</p>	<p>Highest groundwater protection if wastewater discharges removed from wellhead protection area.</p> <p>May support additional growth in village center in keeping with historic character and town goals.</p> <p>Size of treatment unit can be kept small by only tie-ing in sites that are poorly suited or unsuitable for onsite treatment.</p>	<p>Potentially more cost effective than individual system repairs and replacement over time.</p> <p>Requires town effort and landowner cooperation to evaluate options and reach consensus.</p> <p>Local inspection, repair and upgrade requirements for remaining individual systems will still be needed.</p>