



Christina Stacey &lt;cstacey@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

## Cliff Island Septic Questions

13 messages

---

**Christina Stacey** <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Nov 10, 2022 at 10:56 AM

To: "hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com" &lt;hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com&gt;, Walter Swift &lt;wlsswift@me.com&gt;

Hi Walt and Mark,

I am reaching out with a couple of questions on the Cliff Island community disposal field.

The state has advised us that the primary thing we need to check is whether the disposal field has adequate capacity for the six houses to be connected.

It appears that five of the six houses were part of the "original participants list," so I'm assuming that the septic field design included enough capacity for them. The only one that I don't see as part of the original list is 25 Wharf St, Judith McKone.

With that said, do either of you have a list of who is already connected? I'm attaching a spreadsheet of the original participants, plus Judith McKone. I was not able to find anything in our records confirming who connected, or any HHE-200's for tanks on those properties. Any information you have to clarify this would be extremely helpful!

One last question for Mark -- our records on the disposal field are not great. I have the letter from you dated 10/5/14 confirming that it was installed to the design, but nothing from Tom Greer's end. Do you happen to have any certification or inspection documentation of Tom's in your files?

Thanks,  
Chris

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager  
Permitting & Inspections Department  
City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)**Cliff Island Association Septic Participants.xlsx**  
9K

---

**Walter Swift** <wlsswift@me.com>

Thu, Nov 10, 2022 at 4:20 PM

To: Christina Stacey &lt;cstacey@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Cc: Mark Hampton &lt;hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com&gt;

Hi Chris: I can comment on most of these issues, but Mark should comment or supplement what he can. My answers are in line below.

Walt Swift  
[wlsswift@me.com](mailto:wlsswift@me.com)

On Nov 10, 2022, at 10:56 AM, Christina Stacey &lt;cstacey@portlandmaine.gov&gt; wrote:

Hi Walt and Mark,

I am reaching out with a couple of questions on the Cliff Island community disposal field.

The state has advised us that the primary thing we need to check is whether the disposal field has adequate capacity for the six houses to be connected.

I've attached a graph showing our records of flow rate - it shows that for the operations to date, the average flow to the leach field during summer months when occupancy is its highest is 10% to 20% of the original design flow of 5,120 gpd. During fall/winter/spring the flows are much higher, sometimes indicating as high as 50% of design flow rate. These high flows seem to indicate serious leakage from groundwater into the system. We've done periodic inspections of the tanks and piping and believe we have located and repaired the sources of the in-leaks. With 20 homes actually connected, the summer flow figures indicate very low flow compared to design - we believe that the number of connections could be doubled without approaching the design flow.

It appears that five of the six houses were part of the "original participants list," so I'm assuming that the septic field design included enough capacity for them. The only one that I don't see as part of the original list is 25 Wharf St, Judith McKone.

With that said, do either of you have a list of who is already connected? I'm attaching a spreadsheet of the original participants, plus Judith McKone. I was not able to find anything in our records confirming who connected, or any HHE-200's for tanks on those properties. Any information you have to clarify this would be extremely helpful!

I'm attaching a modified version of the spreadsheet that you sent. I've added a second sheet that lists the members, originally proposed, those actually connected, and the new additions. They are color coded with the following explanations:

Yellow - connections that exist as of June 2022. One is a temporary connection (Beebe) that is being replaced with a more permanent link to the main system, being provided by the installation of the Sunset Rd. pipe. Total connections presently feeding into the leach field = 19.

Light Green - new connections planned for this set of applications. These primarily reflect delays by some owners who originally intended to connect, but for one reason or another, deferred timing until this past summer. Total new connections scheduled = 5.

Blue - Future possible connections - these are property owners who have shown interest in connecting but not yet committed to timing. Total future = 3.

The number of possible connections has changed over time. I believe that the total number contemplated was about 35 properties. But if I recall correctly the design flow was established by also considering the limitations of the leach field imposed by the depth of soil to ledge and geographic features. These issues were addressed by independent entities who produced reports that provided guidance in the design of the system. The reports were part of the original packages submitted to the State and probably the city as well. Pinkham & Greer used these findings and recommendations in designing the system and in establishing the design flow rate.

I do not have HHE's on the tanks except for a subgroup in the region of Griffins' Cove. The tanks and subsurface connections tying in to the Wharf Road pipe were part of an earlier existing collection system for overboard discharge. One of the requirements for joining the CISSA system was that the property owner's tank had to be in good shape - i.e. recently inspected and/or replaced by a plastic tank meeting minimum size requirements. But to my knowledge, the only HHE-200 for the main system was prepared by Mark.

One last question for Mark -- our records on the disposal field are not great. I have the letter from you dated 10/5/14 confirming that it was installed to the design, but nothing from Tom Greer's end. Do you happen to have any certification or inspection documentation of Tom's in your files?

Thanks,  
Chris

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager  
Permitting & Inspections Department  
City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)

Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession of public officials or city employees about government business may be classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result, please be advised that what is written in an e-mail could be released to the public and/or the media if requested.<Cliff Island Association Septic Participants.xlsx>

---

## 2 attachments



**Cliff Island Septic System Association.pdf**  
139K



**Cliff Island Association Septic Participants Updated.xlsx**  
12K

---

**Mark Hampton** <mhampto1@maine.rr.com>  
To: Cstacey@portlandmaine.gov, WALTER AND KATHY SWIFT <wlswift@me.com>

Mon, Nov 14, 2022 at 2:02 PM

Sorry Christina, but I checked with Tom and you have the only information there is on the construction of the disposal beds . Tom did not do any certification or inspections.

Mark

Mark Hampton Associates, Inc.

---

**From:** Hope Hampton <[hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com](mailto:hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 13, 2022 3:28 AM  
**To:** Mark <[mhampto1@maine.rr.com](mailto:mhampto1@maine.rr.com)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Cliff Island Septic Questions

[Quoted text hidden]

It appears that five of the six houses were part of the "original participants list," so I'm assuming that the septic field design included enough capacity for them. The only one that I don't see as part of the original list is 25 Wharf St, Judith McKone.

With that said, do either of you have a list of who is already connected? I'm attaching a spreadsheet of the original participants, plus Judith McKone. I was not able to find anything in our records confirming who connected, or any HHE-200's for tanks on those properties. Any information you have to clarify this would be extremely helpful!

I'm attaching a modified version of the spreadsheet that you sent. I've added a second sheet that lists the members, originally proposed, those actually connected, and the new additions. They are color coded with the following explanations:

Yellow - connections that exist as of June 2022. One is a temporary connection (Beebe) that is being replaced with a more permanent link to the main system, being provided by the installation of the Sunset Rd. pipe. Total connections presently feeding into the leach field = 19.

Light Green - new connections planned for this set of applications. These primarily reflect delays by some owners who originally intended to connect, but for one reason or another, deferred timing until this past summer. Total new connections scheduled = 5.

Blue - Future possible connections - these are property owners who have shown interest in connecting but not yet committed to timing. Total future = 3.

The number of possible connections has changed over time. I believe that the total number contemplated was about 35 properties. But if I recall correctly the design flow was established by also considering the limitations of the leach field imposed by the depth of soil to ledge and geographic features. These issues were addressed by independent entities who produced reports that provided guidance in the design of the system. The reports were part of the original packages submitted to the State and probably the city as well. Pinkham & Greer used these findings and recommendations in designing the system and in establishing the design flow rate.

I do not have HHE's on the tanks except for a subgroup in the region of Griffins' Cove. The tanks and subsurface connections tying in to the Wharf Road pipe were part of an earlier existing collection system for overboard discharge. One of the requirements for joining the CISSA system was that the property owner's tank had to be in good shape - i.e. recently inspected and/or replaced by a plastic tank meeting minimum size requirements. But to my knowledge, the only HHE-200 for the main system was prepared by Mark.

One last question for Mark -- our records on the disposal field are not great. I have the letter from you dated 10/5/14 confirming that it was installed to the design, but nothing from Tom Greer's end. Do you happen to have any certification or inspection documentation of Tom's in your files?

Thanks,  
Chris

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager

Permitting & Inspections Department

City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)

Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession of public officials or city employees about government business may be classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result, please be advised that what is written in an e-mail could be released to the public and/or the media if requested.<Cliff Island Association Septic Participants.xlsx>

---

**Christina Stacey** <[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Charles Jarrett <[cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov)>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 9:57 AM

This email and the attachments include the information I received from my inquiry. Even though I definitely have some questions about the history of the individual tanks, I'm pretty much focused on determining whether the disposal field has adequate capacity for the number of houses that are already connected and will be connected. I want to ask Walt Swift who prepared the analysis of flow rates and how the data is collected. I also think we should forward this on the Alex Pugh at the state for feedback.

Please take a look and let me know your analysis and what questions you think we should ask Walt and Alex.

Thanks!  
Chris  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

## 2 attachments



**Cliff Island Association Septic Participants Updated.xlsx**  
12K



**Cliff Island Septic System Association.pdf**  
139K

---

**Charles Jarrett** <[cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Christina Stacey <[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 10:11 AM

I guess my thoughts are this;

- The system was designed for 25 properties and 5 of the 6 recent applications are for properties listed on the original approval, so we should approve those.
- 25 Wharf Rd is not on the list and so should not be approved until both of the following is received and approved by the city and/ or the state;

[Quoted text hidden]

--

**Charles Jarrett**

NFPA CFPE/ CFI-II  
CEO/ LPI/ Plans Reviewer  
Permitting & Inspections Department  
City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8715

---

**Charles Jarrett** <cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Christina Stacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 10:12 AM

I guess my thoughts are this;

- The system was designed for 25 properties and 5 of the 6 recent applications are for properties listed on the original approval, so we should approve those.
- 25 Wharf Rd is not on the list and so should not be approved until both of the following is received and approved by the city and/ or the state;

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Charles Jarrett** <cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Christina Stacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 10:17 AM

I guess my thoughts are this;

- The system was designed for 25 properties and 5 of the 6 recent applications are for properties listed on the original approval, so we should approve those.
- 25 Wharf Rd is not on the list and so should not be approved until both of the following is received and approved by the city and/ or the state;
  - A complete list of all properties currently using the system (19 or 20 units)
  - documentation supporting that the system will handle 40 properties as this is an expansion of the original approval

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Christina Stacey** <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Walter Swift <wlsswift@me.com>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 10:27 AM

Hi Walt,

Thank you (and Mark) for your responses. I am going to reach out to the state with this information to get their advice on how the city should interpret and proceed.

I did have a question -- did you create the analysis of the monthly flow rate measurements, or if not, who did? Where/how is that data collected?

Also, if you have a chance, would you be able to scan and email me the HHE-200's for the Griffin's Cove tanks? Did the city ever approve them? I'm concerned that we don't have any record of them in our files.

Thanks again,  
Chris

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

It appears that five of the six houses were part of the "original participants list," so I'm assuming that the septic field design included enough capacity for them. The only one that I don't see as part of the original

list is 25 Wharf St, Judith McKone.

With that said, do either of you have a list of who is already connected? I'm attaching a spreadsheet of the original participants, plus Judith McKone. I was not able to find anything in our records confirming who connected, or any HHE-200's for tanks on those properties. Any information you have to clarify this would be extremely helpful!

I'm attaching a modified version of the spreadsheet that you sent. I've added a second sheet that lists the members, originally proposed, those actually connected, and the new additions. They are color coded with the following explanations:

Yellow - connections that exist as of June 2022. One is a temporary connection (Beebe) that is being replaced with a more permanent link to the main system, being provided by the installation of the Sunset Rd. pipe. Total connections presently feeding into the leach field = 19.

Light Green - new connections planned for this set of applications. These primarily reflect delays by some owners who originally intended to connect, but for one reason or another, deferred timing until this past summer. Total new connections scheduled = 5.

Blue - Future possible connections - these are property owners who have shown interest in connecting but not yet committed to timing. Total future = 3.

The number of possible connections has changed over time. I believe that the total number contemplated was about 35 properties. But if I recall correctly the design flow was established by also considering the limitations of the leach field imposed by the depth of soil to ledge and geographic features. These issues were addressed by independent entities who produced reports that provided guidance in the design of the system. The reports were part of the original packages submitted to the State and probably the city as well. Pinkham & Greer used these findings and recommendations in designing the system and in establishing the design flow rate.

I do not have HHE's on the tanks except for a subgroup in the region of Griffins' Cove. The tanks and subsurface connections tying in to the Wharf Road pipe were part of an earlier existing collection system for overboard discharge. One of the requirements for joining the CISSA system was that the property owner's tank had to be in good shape - i.e. recently inspected and/or replaced by a plastic tank meeting minimum size requirements. But to my knowledge, the only HHE-200 for the main system was prepared by Mark.

One last question for Mark -- our records on the disposal field are not great. I have the letter from you dated 10/5/14 confirming that it was installed to the design, but nothing from Tom Greer's end. Do you happen to have any certification or inspection documentation of Tom's in your files?

Thanks,  
Chris

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager  
Permitting & Inspections Department  
City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)

Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession of public officials or city employees about government business may be classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result, please be advised that what is written in an e-mail could be released to the public and/or the media if requested.<Cliff Island Association Septic Participants.xlsx>

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Walter Swift** <wlsswift@me.com>  
To: Christina Stacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 10:38 AM

Walt Swift  
[wlsswift@me.com](mailto:wlsswift@me.com)

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Walter Swift** <wlsswift@me.com>  
To: Christina Stacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>  
Cc: Mark Hampton <mhampto1@maine.rr.com>

Tue, Nov 15, 2022 at 12:57 PM

Sorry for sending the blank email. Here are some answers - below, in line.

I am not sure what record the City has. But I have compiled everything that I could find a record of from our files, from requests to Pinkham & Greer, and from Mark. I believe that the information I am sending is a complete record of correspondence between P&G, Mark, and CISSA. I am sending the package to you for your reference and to support your dialog with the State.

I believe that the necessary steps were complied with and met all requirements.

Here's a list of the copies I am sending (by separate email - the size of the files makes it difficult for me to send them in a single email.)

Supplement email 1

1. HHE App City Response20130812101629990.pdf - A memo from J. Rioux to T. Greer describing the city's requirements for review and local approval of the system. (I cannot find a letter requesting this guidance, perhaps there was a meeting or phone call.)
2. 11161,tsg,xmnl,city 20130923.pdf - an application to the city for construction of the CISSA system dated 9/23/13 including attachments.

Supplement email 2

3. Xmnl tg to city 20140115.pdf - Tom Greer's transmittal of supplemental information supporting compliance with the requirements identified in Rioux's memo of 8/12/2013.
4. 2014\_10\_05 Mark Hampton Associates Letter.pdf - A letter to T Greer regarding Hampton's inspection results.

See below for other answers.

On Nov 15, 2022, at 10:27 AM, Christina Stacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov> wrote:

Hi Walt,

Thank you (and Mark) for your responses. I am going to reach out to the state with this information to get their advice on how the city should interpret and proceed.

I did have a question -- did you create the analysis of the monthly flow rate measurements, or if not, who did? Where/how is that data collected?

I prepared the analysis of data. At some point in the project, we determined that flow meter measurements from the main pumping tank would be cumbersome, and instead decided to measure flow rate by collecting data each month on the hours of operation of each pump. We used the hours of operation, together with the flow characteristics of the pumps (which give flow rate in gallons per minute) to determine the approximate number of gallons pumped during the month.

The electric control box has a meter for each pump that indicates the number of hours of operation for each pump. We manually record the hours on or about the 10th of each month which gives us the hours of operation for the number of days elapsed from the prior reading - this gives us the gal/day figure for that interval. The information is useful, but not precise. At some times, both pumps operate simultaneously - when this happens, the total flow is less than the predicted flow rate that is calculated by adding the number of hours of operation. As a result, our recorded and plotted data are much larger than the actual flows.

We chose this method with the expectation that if we saw flows that were anywhere near the design flow rate for the system, we would spend the time and effort to install flow meters, to improve the accuracy. But - the flows never came close to the design rate, and in fact they are only high during winter months when only one or two of the properties are occupied. We attributed this to heavy leakage into the system during excessive rain periods.

We have since checked earlier results by examining the hourly power meter readings that are recorded by Central Maine Power. These readings confirm that the pumps are operating well below 20 % of design flow rate.

Also, if you have a chance, would you be able to scan and email me the HHE-200's for the Griffin's Cove tanks? Did the city ever approve them? I'm concerned that we don't have any record of them in our files.

The Cove subsystem was approved as part of the entire engineered system, but the only tank that required replacement was the one for Kathleen Swift 18 Griffin Lane. Attached is a copy of the HHE-200 and supplemental letter.

Thanks again,  
Chris

On Thu, Nov 10, 2022 at 4:20 PM Walter Swift <[wlsswift@me.com](mailto:wlsswift@me.com)> wrote:

Hi Chris: I can comment on most of these issues, but Mark should comment or supplement what he can. My answers are in line below.

Walt Swift  
[wlsswift@me.com](mailto:wlsswift@me.com)

On Nov 10, 2022, at 10:56 AM, Christina Stacey <[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)> wrote:

Hi Walt and Mark,

I am reaching out with a couple of questions on the Cliff Island community disposal field.

The state has advised us that the primary thing we need to check is whether the disposal field has adequate capacity for the six houses to be connected.

I've attached a graph showing our records of flow rate - it shows that for the operations to date, the average flow to the leach field during summer months when occupancy is its highest is 10% to 20% of the original design flow of 5,120 gpd. During fall/winter/spring the flows are much higher, sometimes indicating as high as 50% of design flow rate. These high flows seem to indicate serious leakage from groundwater into the system. We've done periodic inspections of the tanks and piping and believe we have located and repaired the sources of the in-leaks. With 20 homes actually connected, the summer flow figures indicate very low flow compared to design - we believe that the number of connections could be doubled without approaching the design flow.

It appears that five of the six houses were part of the "original participants list," so I'm assuming that the septic field design included enough capacity for them. The only one that

I don't see as part of the original list is 25 Wharf St, Judith McKone.

With that said, do either of you have a list of who is already connected? I'm attaching a spreadsheet of the original participants, plus Judith McKone. I was not able to find anything in our records confirming who connected, or any HHE-200's for tanks on those properties. Any information you have to clarify this would be extremely helpful!

I'm attaching a modified version of the spreadsheet that you sent. I've added a second sheet that lists the members, originally proposed, those actually connected, and the new additions. They are color coded with the following explanations:

Yellow - connections that exist as of June 2022. One is a temporary connection (Beebe) that is being replaced with a more permanent link to the main system, being provided by the installation of the Sunset Rd. pipe. Total connections presently feeding into the leach field = 19.

Light Green - new connections planned for this set of applications. These primarily reflect delays by some owners who originally intended to connect, but for one reason or another, deferred timing until this past summer. Total new connections scheduled = 5.

Blue - Future possible connections - these are property owners who have shown interest in connecting but not yet committed to timing. Total future = 3.

The number of possible connections has changed over time. I believe that the total number contemplated was about 35 properties. But if I recall correctly the design flow was established by also considering the limitations of the leach field imposed by the depth of soil to ledge and geographic features. These issues were addressed by independent entities who produced reports that provided guidance in the design of the system. The reports were part of the original packages submitted to the State and probably the city as well. Pinkham & Greer used these findings and recommendations in designing the system and in establishing the design flow rate.

I do not have HHE's on the tanks except for a subgroup in the region of Griffins' Cove. The tanks and subsurface connections tying in to the Wharf Road pipe were part of an earlier existing collection system for overboard discharge. One of the requirements for joining the CISSA system was that the property owner's tank had to be in good shape - i.e. recently inspected and/or replaced by a plastic tank meeting minimum size requirements. But to my knowledge, the only HHE-200 for the main system was prepared by Mark.

One last question for Mark -- our records on the disposal field are not great. I have the letter from you dated 10/5/14 confirming that it was installed to the design, but nothing from Tom Greer's end. Do you happen to have any certification or inspection documentation of Tom's in your files?

Thanks,  
Chris

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager  
Permitting & Inspections Department  
City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)

Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession of public officials or city employees about government business may be classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result, please be advised that what is written in an e-

mail could be released to the public and/or the media if requested.<Cliff Island Association Septic Participants.xlsx>

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager  
Permitting & Inspections Department  
City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)

Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession of public officials or city employees about government business may be classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result, please be advised that what is written in an e-mail could be released to the public and/or the media if requested.

---

 **18 Griffin Lane HHE-200 Appl.pdf**  
3043K

---

**Mark Hampton** <mhampto1@maine.rr.com>  
To: Cstacey@portlandmaine.gov, WALTER AND KATHY SWIFT <wlsswift@me.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2022 at 2:14 PM

Here is a response from Tom Greer regarding his involvement on the construction of the project.

Mark

Mark Hampton Associates, Inc.

---

**From:** Thomas Greer <[greerthomas03@gmail.com](mailto:greerthomas03@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2022 7:15 AM  
**To:** Mark Hampton <[mhampto1@maine.rr.com](mailto:mhampto1@maine.rr.com)>  
**Cc:** Johanna Cady <[jodyfalmouth@yahoo.com](mailto:jodyfalmouth@yahoo.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: FW: Cliff Island Septic Questions

Hi Mark,

I made very few visits to the island during construction. I don't believe I prepared a summary of the work. Roger did the management of the work. As for the capacity, Steve is correct, the homes on that section of the system were included in the design. Let me know if I can help with more.

Tom

On Mon, Nov 14, 2022, 6:25 AM Mark Hampton <[mhampto1@maine.rr.com](mailto:mhampto1@maine.rr.com)> wrote:

Also, they are using Hope's email address, would you please respond to my email address [mhampto1@maine.rr.com](mailto:mhampto1@maine.rr.com)

Thanks

Mark Hampton Associates, Inc.

---

**From:** Hope Hampton <[hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com](mailto:hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 13, 2022 3:28 AM  
**To:** Mark <[mhampto1@maine.rr.com](mailto:mhampto1@maine.rr.com)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Cliff Island Septic Questions

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Walter Swift <[wswift@me.com](mailto:wswift@me.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, Nov 10, 2022 at 10:20 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Cliff Island Septic Questions  
**To:** Christina Stacey <[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)>  
**CC:** Mark Hampton <[hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com](mailto:hamptonsiteeval@gmail.com)>

Hi Chris: I can comment on most of these issues, but Mark should comment or supplement what he can. My answers are in line below.

[Quoted text hidden]

It appears that five of the six houses were part of the "original participants list," so I'm assuming that the septic field design included enough capacity for them. The only one that I don't see as part of the original list is 25 Wharf St, Judith McKone.

With that said, do either of you have a list of who is already connected? I'm attaching a spreadsheet of the original participants, plus Judith McKone. I was not able to find anything in our records confirming who connected, or any HHE-200's for tanks on those properties. Any information you have to clarify this would be extremely helpful!

I'm attaching a modified version of the spreadsheet that you sent. I've added a second sheet that lists the members, originally proposed, those actually connected, and the new additions. They are color coded with the following explanations:

Yellow - connections that exist as of June 2022. One is a temporary connection (Beebe) that is being replaced with a more permanent link to the main system, being provided by the installation of the Sunset Rd. pipe. Total connections presently feeding into the leach field = 19.

Light Green - new connections planned for this set of applications. These primarily reflect delays by some owners who originally intended to connect, but for one reason or another, deferred timing until this past summer. Total new connections scheduled = 5.

Blue - Future possible connections - these are property owners who have shown interest in connecting but not yet committed to timing. Total future = 3.

The number of possible connections has changed over time. I believe that the total number contemplated was about 35 properties. But if I recall correctly the design flow was established by also considering the limitations of the leach field imposed by the depth of soil to ledge and geographic features. These issues were addressed by independent entities who produced reports that provided guidance in the design of the system. The reports were part of the original packages submitted to the State and probably the city as well. Pinkham & Greer used these findings and recommendations in designing the system and in establishing the design flow rate.

I do not have HHE's on the tanks except for a subgroup in the region of Griffins' Cove. The tanks and subsurface connections tying in to the Wharf Road pipe were part of an earlier existing collection system for overboard discharge. One of the requirements for joining the CISSA system was that the property owner's tank had to be in good shape - i.e. recently inspected and/or replaced by a plastic tank meeting minimum size requirements. But to my knowledge, the only HHE-200 for the main system was prepared by Mark.

One last question for Mark -- our records on the disposal field are not great. I have the letter from you dated 10/5/14 confirming that it was installed to the design, but nothing from Tom Greer's end. Do you happen to have any certification or inspection documentation of Tom's in your files?

Thanks,  
Chris

--

Chris Stacey - Permitting Manager  
Permitting & Inspections Department

City of Portland  
389 Congress St.  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 874-8695  
[cstacey@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:cstacey@portlandmaine.gov)

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Christina Stacey** <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Mark Hampton <mhampto1@maine.rr.com>  
Cc: WALTER AND KATHY SWIFT <wlsswift@me.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2022 at 3:28 PM

Thank you both. I am working with Alex Pugh at the state just to make sure we are reviewing everything correctly, but I agree that it looks like all of these homes (except 25 Wharf) were part of the original design, and there appears to be adequate capacity.

Walt -- two of the septic permits (38 Sunset and 40 Sunset) have already been issued, as a different reviewer picked them up and didn't realize I was doing this research and review. Those two are officially approved and installation may proceed.

We'll hopefully be able to issue the other 4 shortly.

Also -- you will be getting a \$20 refund on your credit card, as you were erroneously charged a variance fee on one of the applications.

Thanks,  
Chris  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Christina Stacey** <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Charles Jarrett <cjarrett@portlandmaine.gov>  
Cc: WALTER AND KATHY SWIFT <wlsswift@me.com>

Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 12:16 PM

Hi Walt,

We heard back from Alex Pugh at the state, and his opinion is that the data and history that you provided appears to have adequate design flow capacity of the community field to support the connection of six additional homes to the community system. We will finish processing and approving the remaining subsurface permits this week.

Alex did recommend that you continue to investigate and make a determination on what is causing the winter peak usage and/or leakage, and whether it can be mitigated. There is concern about the effects of leakage of the water out of the system without treatment, as well as possible premature failure of the field.

For any applications for future connections, be aware that the city will again ask for supporting documentation that the receiving field has adequate capacity, based on design flows for the properties to be added and data of existing usage. The following are the standards that Alex advised may be used to determine existing usage and design flow per Ch 241, Sec 4:

#### G. WATER USE DATA

1. Use records: The design flow may be calculated from appropriate water use data, provided the following procedures are used:

(a) Acceptable records: Data is collected from billing records of the service provider or from water meters certified to be accurate within 2 percent;

(b) 1 year minimum: Continuous records over a period of at least one year, or operating season (or other period acceptable to the Department) are utilized;

(c) Like establishments: Records from the applicant's facilities or from a like establishment are utilized.

2. Adjustments for peak days: The average daily flow utilized for design purposes must be adjusted for peak flow days as follows:

(a) Daily monitoring: If water use records are recorded on a daily basis, the 80th percentile value calculated using standard statistical methods must be used for the design flow;

(b) Weekly monitoring: If water use records are recorded on a weekly basis, the 85th percentile value calculated using

standard statistical methods must be used for the design flow;

(c) Monthly monitoring: If water use records are recorded on a monthly basis, the 90th percentile value calculated using standard statistical methods must be used for the design flow; and

(d) Quarterly monitoring: If water use records are recorded on a quarterly basis, the 95th percentile value calculated using standard statistical methods must be used for the design flow.

(e) Other Methods: In the event a system designer demonstrates that an alternative method for calculating a design flow based upon water use data is at least as effective as the methodology described in Sections 4(G)(2)(a) – (d), the Department may approve such alternate method.

Please let me know if there are any other questions at this time.

Sincerely,  
Chris

[Quoted text hidden]