

Sewage Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
Flatwoods, WV
September 12, 2007

Members In Attendance:

John Perkins, Melisa Powers, Bill Rice, Ed Winant, Stan Walls, Steve Bayer, Todd Powroznik, Kirk Powroznik, Mark Whittaker, Larry Main, Bill Clark, Marvin Kerr, Evelyn Hopkins, Paul Ashburn, Rick Hertges.

Guests In Attendance: Julie Wandling and Bill Timmermeyer.

Rick passes out the information on ICC Flow Tech Request for approval. Rick explains that the ICC Tech representative said that they want the same approval that Easy Flow has.

Mark says that the system is being used in the eastern panhandle.

Welcome and Introductions

Rick introduces Bill Timmermeyer to group.

PVP Update

Rick says that the PVP is available for manufacturers to start participating in. However he adds that it hasn't been advertised.

Melisa suggests putting it on BPH's website.

John suggests putting out a press release. He adds that he doesn't feel that widespread advertising is needed but if someone approaches you about getting a new technology approved then you would explain the PVP.

Paul says that it's important that the application be available on the website.

John suggests perhaps having Small Flows Quarterly do an article about the PVP.

Marvin suggests doing the same with Onsite Installer magazine.

Rick says Nathan will put it on the website and generate a letter of explanation to go with it.

Septi Tech Update

Rick says that the approval letter has been drafted but hasn't been sent yet. The approval allows for use of the Septi Tech system anyplace where an HAU can be used.

Eljen Update

Rick says that he still has not received the report requested back from MASSTC. He adds that he spoke to Jim Donlin of Eljen last week and that Donlin said that he would bring the report to him at the Public Health Conference in Morgantown.

Mandatory Sewage Training

Rick explains that at the last meeting a motion carried to recommend that BPH require two-day mandatory sewage training for all sanitarians by July 2008. He says that BPH Administration is agreeable to the idea of doing two days of training broken into two sessions. However he adds that it doesn't look like it is going to be mandatory.

Mark asks why food training can be made mandatory but not sewage.

Rick says that the food training was required by the Food Code.

Stan says that you'll have a lot lower attendance rate if it is voluntary rather than mandatory.

Steve says that it will be easier for the local health departments to get money for the training if it is mandatory.

Bill C. says that installers should have mandatory training as well. He adds that even if new technologies come into the state it will not be helpful unless the installers are trained to install it properly.

Rick says that a stipulation was put into some of the previous product approvals that required the manufacturers to provide training for both the sanitarians and installers.

Bill C. says that Bord na Mona wants to qualify installers so that the installation doesn't hurt their reputation.

Rick says that the mandatory training is a one-time offering whereas you would need ongoing training for new technologies as they come into the state.

Marvin suggests that a letter be sent to the Commissioner from the Board.

John says that he will send an email on behalf of the permitting section stating how the mandatory training would be beneficial to both agencies.

Mark says that there should be a written request and that stationary should be obtained specifically for the SAB.

Stan says that if the SAB makes a formal written request then there should be a written response.

Stan says that he thinks the letter should go to the Commissioner.

John says that he agrees if that is the action level. He goes on to say that if it's just going to be sent back down the chain of command then maybe it should be sent directly to the person that will make the decision.

Rick says that it will definitely be sent down the chain. However he agrees with Stan that the letter should be addressed to the Commissioner.

Paul suggests sending it to the Commissioner and carbon copying everyone below the Commissioner.

Minutes

Rick asks if there are any comments on the minutes

Marvin notes that he was in attendance at the June meeting.

Stan makes a motion to accept the minutes.

Marvin seconds the motion.

Motion carries.

Public Works Commission

Rick introduces Public Health Sanitation Director, Brad Cochran.

Brad says that he has been asked by the State and Local Sanitarian Liason group to speak to the SAB. He explains that he wants to talk about the Public Works Project. The Governor's Office hired a consulting group to come up with ideas to streamline government services. One of the things presented to the Bureau has to do with construction permits for public sewer systems. He says that he realizes that the SAB doesn't do much with public sewer systems but they still wanted to put it out there before the Board. Both the BPH and DEP issue construction permits for public sewer systems right now. The recommendation from the Public Works group is to give all of those efforts to the DEP. Basically the BPH would not be issuing construction permits for public sewer systems. There is one part of this that the Bureau does have issue with. He explains that the definition of public sewer system is anything that surface discharges more than 600 gallons per day and any system that subsurface discharges greater than 1000 gallons per day. The Bureau really has no problem with surface discharging systems and will be willing to stop issuing permits on those systems as soon as they are ordered to do so. However they do have concerns about the subsurface discharge permits. He says that currently any subsurface discharge permits that come into the Bureau between a 1000 and 3000 gpd is looked at by Rick and anything over 3000 gpd is looked at by their engineering section with some assistance from Rick and their group. The reason that the

Bureau is concerned about this is that local health does all of the onsite systems and they get involved with subsurface systems throughout. There are a lot of large expensive subdivisions going in particularly in the southern part of the State that have steep slopes and other concerns. These subdivisions may require cluster type systems. They have district sanitarians and district engineers try to go out and look at these sites to determine that the plans being submitted to their engineering folks is actually going to work. They are looking at soil conditions, percolation tests and observation holes. He says that the engineering folks don't know a whole lot about that so the Bureau would like to keep that in the hands of the sanitarians to make sure that these systems are going to function properly. The Bureau and OEHS is intending to have an internal group look at where the line needs to be drawn for considering public sewer systems. They want to look at who is going to inspect them, who will investigate complaints and problems as well as how the laws and rules will need to be extracted and rewritten. He was asked to come and tell the group about the Bureau's plans and to ask if there is anyone on the Board who would like to volunteer to serve on the committee to look at the public sewer system definition and how they might keep that in their realm.

Ed says that he was at a workshop last week in Virginia that was sponsored by their Department of Health and DEP. They split their permitting with the DEP issuing any surface discharging systems and the Health Department issues the construction permits for any subsurface discharging systems. If you want to streamline government so you don't have to go through two permitting processes then it seems logical to make that same split.

Brad says that the Bureau for Public Health is leaning the same way. He says that the Bureau has no problem with DEP issuing the surface discharge permits but is concerned with the subsurface issues.

Paul asks what the maximum volume is for a public sewage system.

Brad answers that there isn't a maximum volume stated in the definition of the public sewer system. It just gives a minimum and that is over 1,000 gpd subsurface. He adds that he over 3,000 gpd BPH has their Engineering Section look at the designs as well.

Rick adds that his office still looks at the larger designs to offer expertise on soils evaluation and information on the alternative systems that the Engineering Section may not be familiar with.

Brad closes by asking the members to get back with either him or Barb Taylor.

Paul offers to be on the Committee.

Bill asks if the District Sanitarians will be made to go through the mandatory training being recommended for sanitarians.

Brad says that the district sanitarians have been receiving additional training already and will continue to be trained so that they can effectively do site evaluations for alternative systems.

Evelyn, Bill C. and Ed offer to be on the committee.

Mark offers as well.

Brad thanks the group.

Bill R. asks if there is an issue about who does the inspection of the system after it is built.

Brad says the only issue being discussed is which agency issues the construction permit.

Bill R. asks if the permits are for a sewer line extension or new construction.

Brad answers that either scenario will require a modification of a permit.

Rick explains that the permitting of a sewer line extension may still remain with the Health Department. The changes would concern the permitting of newly constructed plants.

Brad explains that there are still gray areas.

John says that Kathy Emery of DEP may have someone that would want to serve on the Committee.

Rick asks if there are any more comments that need to be addressed to Brad before he leaves. Rick adds that the SAB will go ahead and send a letter to Chris Curtis recommending the mandatory training for sanitarians.

Brad says that he talked to Ron Forren about the SABs recommendation for mandatory training. Ron felt that the training could not be made mandatory and thought that it is different from requiring food code training. He explains that the food training was replacing a state rule with a federal code and there was a difference in how the inspections were done so they felt they had no choice but to require training. Brad adds that there is a concern that if the agency makes the training mandatory that the local health departments may want the state to pay for everything and they don't know how they would be able to do that. Brad asks Stan what his feelings are as a health department administrator concerning whether all of the health departments will be willing to pay for travel expenses and time and everything involved if the training is a two-day course.

Stan answers that since most of the health departments get the majority of their money from the state that he feels that they will feel obligated to fulfill the training requirement if it is mandated by the state.

Brad asks if there is an agenda already set for the training.

Rick answers that there would be a refresher on basics and then the rest of the training would be on alternatives systems.

Todd suggests that the training be divided into two sessions and be provided by district in lieu of the normal in-service meeting.

Rick likes the idea but would like to see the training be provided for a full 8-hour day.

Bill R. says that other regulatory employees such as mining inspectors are required to have mandated training so he doesn't see why this training cannot be made mandatory.

Brad says that sanitarians are required to have 15 hours of continuing education in order to maintain their registration. However he explains that training can be in any of the programs that the sanitarians deal with.

Stan suggests that the training sessions be videotaped so that new employees can view them.

Brad says that he thinks that could be possible.

Brad says that he doesn't think that if the training sessions are broken into two one-day sessions that it will be possible to complete the training by July 1, 2008 as was requested by the SAB.

Rick says that he doesn't feel that anyone will be upset if the training wasn't completed until September. He adds that the idea of giving a deadline for completion was just to get it going.

Flow Tech Request

Rick says that his office has received a request for the same approval that the Easy Flow has.

Stan says that they should apply under the PVP.

Ed and Paul express agreement.

Bill R. says that Rick's office will have to let the SAB know how the PVP needs revised as it is used.

Rick says that there will be benefits to having a drainfield component going through the process first as opposed to a treatment technology. He adds that while it will be a less complex design to evaluate, the process of evaluating how the soil is responding to the technology will require careful attention to the limiting factors and characterization of the

soil during the site evaluation. He adds that systems that are asking for a drainfield reduction need to be evaluated over a long period time. The test period would have to be longer than the 1 year and 3 month minimum period required by the PVP. He adds that almost any type of drainfield would remain functional for that amount of time if the site is not too bad. The biomat buildup and failure over time is what really determines whether the sizing and system are suitable. He adds that he does not feel that the PVP is set up for that.

Evelyn asks if a book is going to be kept for the systems that are approved through the PVP.

Rick says that he and Penney are working on compiling all of the approvals that have previously been granted and that the new approvals will be added to those.

Rick says that he will get back with the Flow Tech folks and tell them that they need to go through the PVP.

Ed says that septic tank effluent clogs the soil causing the field to fail. He adds that the idea of giving a reduction to a dispersal component without providing additional treatment concerns him.

Home Loan Evaluation

Rick says that DEP has asked that the Home Loan Evaluation Procedure be changed to require that if an HAU with surface discharge system is being evaluated that current registration with DEP be verified before approval. He says that the registration can be checked on DEP's website. He asks John to explain.

John says that a link on the DEP's website shows whether the registration is valid and current. He says that we are 3 years into the permit period and that they still have over a 1,000 expired registrations and they felt that this would be a way to let the new owners know that they need to have the system registered and serviced. He says it is simple to check on the website.

Rick says that it is already a requirement that documentation that service has been provided for the unit within the last 6 months be shown. He says it's one extra step that will help to take care of some problems over the long term.

Larry asks whether the private contractors performing the evaluations will have to follow the guideline.

Brad says that the guidelines will be out there for both sanitarians and private contractors to use and hopefully the private contractors will use the procedure as well.

Larry says the issue that he has with the private contractors doing the evaluations is that when they find a problem they can walk away from it. He adds that if the sanitarian finds

a problem then the owner is required to correct it. He asks if the private contractor will be required to report a problem if they find it.

Rick says that to do that would require a change in state code.

Marvin says that if the evaluation is being done for the bank or a realtor that the only thing that they want to know is what they saw that day.

Rick asks if there is a list out there of the private folks that are doing home loan evaluations.

Todd asks if they need certification to do home loan evaluation.

Mark says that there is no certification requirement for them.

Rick says that BPH is rewriting the H-12 Procedure as requested.

State Revolving Loan

Rick asks if anyone knows the status of the low interest loan program being created for failing systems.

Brad says details on the State Revolving Loan application is being worked out with the WV Housing Development Authority and a satellite non-profit agency.

Paul asks if it will be administered by BPH.

Brad says the revolving loan fund comes from DEP and will be administered through the WV Housing Development Fund and the local health department will have a form to fill out as part of the process. Brad adds that there are not income restrictions to qualify.

Rick says that the change in Legislative Rule last year that allowed non-profits to be involved in lending is what allowed for the State Revolving Loan program to be created for the individual systems.

HAU Maintenance

Rick says that although they have a requirement that perpetual maintenance be provided on the HAUs being used in conjunction with a drainfield to allow for vertical separation, BPH does not have a mechanism for tracking them.

Melisa says that DEP is using a spreadsheet system and that it is very labor intensive. She adds that she has information from a Small Flows article on an electronic system being utilized on a county level in Wisconsin to monitor 12,000 onsite systems in the county. It allows regulators to know when a system is overdue for maintenance or pumping.

John says that the maintenance providers log into the system and enter their maintenance information into the system.

Rick says that he assumes that most of the service providers would have access to a computer to enter the information.

Evelyn asks what kind of maintenance should be being required for an HAU going subsurface.

Melisa says that NSF requires the HAUs to have at least 2 service visits per year.

Rick clarifies for the first two years.

Melisa says that the two visits per year requirement is based on the system maintenance requirements.

Evelyn says then that they should be including the perpetual maintenance requirement in the UIC permits.

Paul says that different systems require different levels of maintenance.

John agrees.

Paul says that the industry standard is every 6 months for small systems.

Bill R. says that he sees that he sees the HAU service going the same way as health care. He explains that his concern is that those who can pay will and those that can't won't. He asks how the reports of unpaid fees are dealt with.

Paul says that the contractor sends a letter to the DEP asking to be released because they aren't getting paid.

Bill asks Paul if he gets anything other than relief of liability for the permit. Bill asks if he can expect to ever get his money back.

Paul says the homeowner isn't going to pay after they've been released.

Bill states that the business then just has to eat the cost. Bill asks John if they send a letter back to the contractor relieving the contractor.

John says that the DEP first checks the inspection database to see if inspections for that system have been submitted for the system that the contractor is requesting to be released from. If not the DEP requests those from the contractor. He adds that once the DEP receives the reports they contact the homeowner about the request and to inform them of their permit responsibilities that includes a perpetual maintenance contract. He goes on to say that while they do have to have a maintenance contract they do not have to continue

with the service provider that they registered with. However that is what occurs most of the time-the homeowner usually gets their account current and service continues.

Bill R. asks what percentage gets back into compliance.

John says that he cannot give a percentage but says that there are very few requests for release.

Ed asks what happens after 3 years of not paying and the permit expires.

Bill R. says that the DEP will catch a number of the HAUs operating without maintenance in 2009 because they will need a permit.

John agrees but says that are 1100 that have renewed from the last permit.

Ed asks what do you do with the people that haven't renewed their permit.

Melisa says that the DEP is trying to deal with the contractors first. She says that it makes no sense to try to force homeowners to pay for service they aren't getting. She explains that the DEP has created a database for the inspection reports. The inspection reports are being entered into the database and reports of those that are behind on service is being generated. Those contractors are being contacted. Once that issue is resolved the DEP can focus on the homeowners who have not renewed their registrations.

Bill R. asks whether the fact that the homeowner does not have a service provide cause the system to be classified as a failing system.

John answers that it does not. He explains that DEP's definition of a failing system would mean that effluent samples were collected and analyzed and the samples did not meet the standards set by the permit. He adds that it does however put them out of compliance with the permit requirements.

Bill R. asks when does the local sanitarian get involved.

John answers almost never.

Todd says that if he gets a letter from a contractor saying that they are canceling service his office sends out a letter informing the homeowner that they have 14 days to get a service provider.

John asks Todd if they are doing that for surface discharge.

Todd answers yes. He says that they send a letter that says that the contractor has contacted his office about their contract being cancelled or expired and that they have so many days to get a valid contract.

John says that is basically the same letter that the DEP sends.

Ed asks what the DEP does about it when they do not comply.

John says that the DEP has not reached that point but that it does subject them to enforcement action.

Evelyn asks if the contractor fails to perform the service if the DEP sends a letter to the Dept of Labor concerning the contractor.

John says no but that the homeowner could or if they have paid for service that they have not received then they can contact the Attorney General's Office.

Melisa says that there are contractors that collect a fee for a year of service and then do not provide the service.

Bill R. says that he has brought these issues up because he wants to reiterate that those that can pay do and those that can't will still expect service and that it will cost the ones who pay more because of the ones that don't pay. Bill says that he knows how hard it is for a small businessperson in the state and would like to see them be able to collect on 90% rather than 50% and adds that those are the figures that he has heard.

Paul says his delinquent customers are 5-6 % at the most.

Bill says that his are less than that.

Paul says that he had a good way of handling this until the DEP stopped it. He says that they did not provide the NSF visits until the last two years of the contract. He adds that this allowed them to be able to continue service if the homeowner was not able to pay. Paul adds that it he places importance on the plant being serviced on time. He says that they always request that the homeowner be there.

Bill R. says that until DEP puts some teeth into the ones that don't comply that there is a slope that people will just tend to slide down.

Bill R. asks if he chooses to get a new service provider for his HAU is he responsible to notify DEP.

John explains that he would have to notify DEP and submit a copy of a maintenance contract that provides coverage through the permit period along with a transfer form. The DEP then notifies the former maintenance provider that they are no longer responsible for the registration and then notifies both the homeowner and the new service provider that the registration has been transferred.

Bill R. asks who determines if the system is failing.

John says that DEP has accepted the maintenance contract as assurance that the system is in compliance in lieu of having monitoring. Therefore if they do not have a maintenance contract in place then they are considered to be failing to meet permit requirements.

Bill R. says that he would prefer to have a sample taken once a year or every two years to determine if the maintenance provider is doing what he is supposed to.

John says that if he has his way in 2009 Bill will get his wish.

Paul says that he felt that there should have been a monitoring requirement as well to make sure everyone stayed on the same page.

Bill R. says that he doesn't feel that it should be as often as a commercial facility but that there should be some required.

Paul says that it is his understanding that DEP does some monitoring.

John says that they have done quite a bit.

Ed suggests that perhaps that the DEP could require a sample once a year in lieu of the service visit.

John says that he is in favor of the annual sample but not in lieu of the service visit.

Mark says that the 1999 sewage rule says that Health can waive monitoring requirements.

John says his that DEP's monitoring requirements come from the N.P.D.E.S. permit.

Melisa says that the premise behind waiving the monitoring in lieu of a maintenance contract was that the effluent coming from a system that was under a maintenance contract would meet water quality standards and that has been proven not to be the case.

John says that he has an article that discusses the results of 15 different studies addressing HAU compliance and that they all pretty much say the same thing-that is that providing maintenance on HAUs does not guarantee compliance.

Paul says there were numerous meetings concerning monitoring when the DEP program was being developed and at that time it was felt that requiring monitoring would be too big of a burden on both the homeowner and the DEP.

Bill R. says that he feels that the local sanitarian should be involved somehow.

Stan asks how many registrations have not renewed their registration.

John answers 1100.

Stan asks if given the fees that would be collected, if it wouldn't make sense to send someone house to house to get folks reregistered.

Bill R. asks if the DEP will have a better idea who is in compliance and who isn't by 2009.

John answers yes and says that the DEP is still working to bring the people operating without a registration into compliance. He adds that they are going to try to institute a penalty for those that failed to renew their registration during the previous permit period.

Bill R. says that there has to be a penalty for those that don't pay.

Paul says that he sees a bigger problem being an unscrupulous businessperson taking advantage of homeowners.

Bill C. says he was competing with a person charging \$12.50 a service call.

Bill R. says that he has a problem paying more because someone else isn't paying.

John says that a contractor is not required to be in the business of providing HAU service. Therefore if he cannot make a living charging a reasonable rate he wouldn't be in business.

Melisa asks if the Health Department would consider suspending the maintenance providers' Class II installer license for failure to either to do maintenance or to do it properly.

Ed asks if they are licensed through the Health Department.

Melisa answers that most are Class II installers.

Ed says that theoretically that he could get the training to service Norweco systems and do that without the Class II certification.

Melisa agrees but says that most are Class II installers.

Todd asks if an installer is 175 inspections behind why would DEP be still issuing permits. If they cannot get any more permits then they will be out doing their maintenance.

John says hopefully that is the next step that DEP is able to take to correct the problem.

Rick says that because they don't have to have a Class II certification to do the maintenance therefore their certification could not be suspended due to not performing maintenance.

Paul asks Bill R. if his maintenance provider has ever cleaned the Bio Kinetic filter.

Bill R. says he has no evidence that they've ever removed the HAU lid.

Paul says that the filter is supposed to be cleaned every 6 months and he does not think that this is being done.

Bill R. says that given the discussion there are obviously problems with the maintenance issue.

Rick says that both the agencies are aware that there are problems with maintenance being done and if there is maintenance done that it may not be being done properly.

HAU Inspections

Rick says that the installer must notify BPH when an installation is going to take place. He explains that while the BPH staff will not be able to inspect every system that the idea that they may be inspected will hopefully ensure better installation practices. The installer will not be required to wait for inspection prior to covering the system. However they will be required to provide notification.

Paul says that he gets many calls asking him to service Multi-flo systems but that he isn't able to service them. He says that one service provider is charging \$300 per visit.

Melisa says that because the Mid-Atlantic Aeration system was de-listed by NSF any approved service provider can now service those units.

Bill R. says that other counties need to be notifying homeowners about expired maintenance contracts like Monongalia County does.

Rick says that only ten counties even have an HAU program.

Bill R. says that it could start with ten.

John says that even with those that do have a program they are only doing the permitting and finals. He says that at that point the county turns it over to the DEP and in most instances do not deal with it unless it is on a complaint basis.

Bill C. says that there should be a penalty for homeowners not having maintenance done that exceeds the cost of the service call.

Bill T. says that there is a section in the penalty order that allows the Environmental Enforcement Inspector to include an economic benefit amount as part of the penalty. In this case he explains the cost of the maintenance that has been foregone can be included in the penalty amount along with the charge for other violations. He agrees that in it has to be an economic disadvantage for the permittee to be out of compliance.

Todd suggests that there should be a way to disconnect the homeowner's water if they do not keep their sewage system in compliance.

Paul says that many years ago that MUB talked about a water-reducing device for those cases.

EPA Voluntary Management Guidelines

Rick distributes copies of the Pipeline articles that discuss the models and says that he would like to discuss adoption at the December meeting. He says that they can be adopted in part or in whole.

Ed asks what adopting the Guidelines would do for the State.

Rick says because it is voluntary it would not have any force of law. He goes on to say that it may help counties such as Fayette that are looking at the idea of adopting onsite management for the entire county.

Paul suggests changing wording from adopt to accept.

Evelyn says that they already use the Guidelines in the Groundwater Section.

Rick reads aloud the description of some of the levels of adopting the guideline. He says that many of the elements required are already being addressed.

Existing Failing

Melisa says that she wants some feedback on whether the sanitarians and contractors understand that they should be using whatever they can subsurface to correct an existing failure, even if it doesn't necessarily meet Design Standards.

Ed says that Maryland has a written policy that states that they must meet Design Standards if at all possible. If that is not possible then they are to use whatever the best technology is to meet the Design Standards. He adds that WV does not have a written policy concerning this.

Melisa clarifies that she is asking if everything is being done to keep the systems subsurface or if when it is determined that there is not enough room or separation then they are going directly to surface discharge.

Rick asks if the sanitarians are looking at sites that may not be suitable for new construction but that could be used to fix a failure.

Ed says that he had a situation where the original system was installed improperly. The homeowner wanted the \$20,000 fix because it wouldn't mess up his back yard. He goes

on to say that the contractor could say he can put in a \$5,000 HAU with surface discharge to fix the problem so why would he put in a \$20,000 system when he could put in an HAU for much less. He asks whether the Health Department or DEP have the necessary tools to require that a subsurface system be put instead of a surface discharging system when it costs 4 times as much to go subsurface.

Melisa says that she is asking whether the contractors are being advised to keep it subsurface in situations where there is a cost premium for subsurface but not necessarily four times the cost. She says that the contractors and homeowners are proposing to go surface even in situations that would only require pumping to an area that could be used for a leach field.

Paul says that it has to be reasonable. He says that it can be pumped for 3,000 feet but is that reasonable. He says that there have to be guidelines set. He adds that his understanding is that if the site can't support a standard system then it is eligible for an HAU with surface discharge. He adds alternative has never been defined.

Rick says that what has been said in recent times is that any alternative should be considered before surface discharge is used.

Paul says that he has had the same experience with owners not wanting to put in a \$20,000 system.

Ed says that he has had people not even want to put in a second drainfield.

Todd says that you can make them have a reserve area but they don't want to use it.

Paul says that the HAUs are now the same price as a drainfield.

Rick says that one idea that hasn't been promoted enough is using an HAU with a smaller drainfield. He adds that this would give the original drainfield a chance to remediate.

Ed suggests that the classes be offered again to educate sanitarians and contractors about the alternatives.

Rick agrees that there should be ongoing training about alternatives to surface discharge. He suggests that perhaps the next time the training should be in the field looking at drainfield technologies.

Larry Main says that he tries to keep it onsite. He says that while it can be a few more thousand dollars to go subsurface over surface discharge, in the long run surface discharge can be more expensive.

Melisa asks how he is able to convince people to go along with the more expensive option.

Larry says that he tells them that he is saving them money in the long run. He explains to them that while it is a few thousand more dollars now that with surface discharge they are going to have to pay a few more thousand every 5 years given maintenance and permitting fees. Larry says that he works with Eljen a lot and he hasn't had any problems with the systems. He says that the systems are designed with additional sand and oversized.

John says that an aerator is one of the most expensive options if you look at the life cycle cost.

Bill asks John if there will be a time when the DEP will not be able to issue any more HAU permits because the streams will be overloaded.

John says that there are streams now that are basically closed for any additional discharge.

Melisa asks that the subject of looking at all subsurface options be discussed at the mandatory sewage training.

Thursday December 13 at 9:00 am is set for the next meeting date.

SAB Funding

Evelyn tells Rick that her group needs a letter from BPH requesting the money allocated for the SAB.

HAU Memo

Bill C. asks if the memo means that only a motor sold by Jet can be used on the system.

Rick says that the memo was meant to address homemade parts being used. He says that he has seen upside down distribution boxes being used for aerator covers for instance. He adds though that if a different motor were used there is no guarantee that it will function the same as the motor tested with the unit.

Drip Irrigation

Rick says that he would like to have support from the group to restrict the use of drip irrigation on steep slopes.

Ed says that he has been using 50% as a maximum slope.

Rick says that 50% is the steepest that he has ever heard of being installed.

Paul says that you couldn't get a machine in on over 30% slope.

Rick agrees. He says that he would like to get some agreement to something reasonable that will ensure that the system will last over the long haul. He says that he would also like to see permeability testing done at the most limiting zone within 3 feet of the surface rather than just testing at the installation depth.

Ed asks Rick if he wants to see permeability testing at both the installation depth and the limiting layer.

Paul says that he thinks that both are needed for the design. He says that he likes to test at 18 inches with the permeameter.

Rick says that testing at the typical installation depth, 6 inches, is not acceptable. He adds that it is going to be a much faster perc rate than anything below it. He said that ideally there would be a 6-foot observation hole dug to look at the top 30 inches. Then a percolation test would be done in the most restrictive layer.

Bill R. asks if the group is talking about a septic tank going to a drip tube.

Paul says that it is going to a treatment system rather than a septic tank.

Bill R. asks what the problem is with just accepting it.

Rick says that we needed to decide whether to just take the manufacturers recommendation in relation to use on slopes or whether we needed to look at what other states in the region are doing with it. He says that he looked at what bordering states were doing and most had their own criteria, including slope limitations.

Rick asks if the group can agree to limit drip use on slopes of 30% or less as Kentucky does.

Ed says that he would like to see the possibility of using drip on 50% slopes.

Rick says that if installers cannot hand-dig suitable observation holes to look at the soil on a 35% slope then how will they install a system on that slope.

Paul says that he has looked at sites with a 50% slope and he could not walk on them without hanging onto the trees. He says he doesn't see how a system could be installed on the site.

Ed asks about the possibility of using spray irrigation.

Rick says that the Design Standards now limit spray and other land applications to a moderate slope.

Ed says that no one will use spray right now because you have the extra expense to disinfect whereas if the slope limit for spray were raised to a level that there are no other options at then it would be considered.

Paul suggests that it could be used as a unique design.

Rick agrees that it may be able to be used on a case-by-case basis.

Paul asks Rick whether he is saying to do the soil test at 2 feet.

Rick says that you are going to dig an observation hole and look for anything restrictive down to five feet from the surface. However he adds that the concentration should be on the first couple feet so that you have some vertical depth to soil for water to move horizontally. He adds that there should be enough soil to allow for water mounding over the limiting layer without coming to the surface. Therefore he adds that you look at the most restrictive layer in the top couple feet or 30 inches to do the permeability testing and then do the sizing from those results.

Rick says that Paul and some others had talked about the fact that they had seen some really small drip designs early on and that they felt that using the LPP design criteria then that would help weed out some of those really small designs. The use of pretreatment and LPP footprint criteria would provide a reasonable area in the design.

Ed makes a motion to adopt guidelines for drip irrigation that limit installation of drip on slopes of 30% maximum, soil testing at the most restrictive layer below the installation depth of up to 30 inches, pretreatment and LPP sizing.

Mark seconds.

Motion carries.

John makes a motion to add Bill Timmermeyer to the Board.

Kirk seconds the motion.

Motion carries.

Adjourn at 2:59.