

Draft

Minutes from the Individual Sewage Disposal System (ISDS) Task Force – Regulatory Working Group Meeting of February 28, 2001

The meeting was held in Conference Room 200, DEM Office of Water Resources, 235 Promenade Street and began at approximately 8:20 AM.

In attendance:

Russ Chateaufneuf, Joe Frisella, Tom D'Angelo, Scott Moorehead, Eugenia Marks, Tom Getz, Kendra Beaver, Rob Adler, Sue Licardi, Tim Stasiunas, Ernie Panciera, Deb Knauss

Review of minutes from February 13, 2001

It was noted that Sue Licardi's name was omitted from the minutes. The minutes were accepted with the addition of her name.

Applicability of Old Field Data

Russ summarized the proposal, which was presented by the Department at the January 31st meeting of the Regulatory Work Group. Russ reminded the group that a key issue with this proposal was that the building community cited the law and asserted that the Department must accept data approved in 1992 or later, without a requirement for additional soil data. DEM legal counsel feels that the law allows the Department to require additional soil tests. It was noted that future ISDS rules may require system designs to be based on characteristics that can only be determined by gathering additional soil data or other field data. Thus, while previously gathered field data might be considered valid, additional soil testing or data gathering may still be needed to design systems under future rules.

Russ asked if there was agreement on the DEM proposal he summarized. He noted that this proposal will be in the "mini-amendment" which will have a workshop and hearing. Although agreement among committee members has not been reached, a participant stated that there has been enough discussion of the issues involved for draft language to be prepared for review at the workshop.

Sizing by Soil Class

Russ reminded the group that George Loomis, Mark Stolt, Everett Stuart, Scott Moorehead, and DEM staff, including ISDS field staff, agreed that systems would be sized on the least permeable horizon, as determined on the basis of texture, structure and consistence, within four-feet of the bottom of the system. Following that meeting George, Mark and Everett looked at the table and made minor modifications (the modified table was distributed). One of the modifications was the addition of a column which stated relative state-wide abundance, which Russ stated may be helpful information to include in the rule, as it may help guide the soil evaluator.

It was asked, if use of the least permeable horizon is protective for pathogens and nutrients. Russ responded that the purpose of the table is to establish a conversion chart for sizing systems using data collected by a soil evaluation in conjunction with percolation rates and sewage flows in the current regulations. The potential to remove pathogens and attenuate nutrients was not evaluated as part of this process for purposes of the mini-amendment

There was discussion concerning changing the fastest percolation rate allowed to ten minutes-per inch. Russ asked if everyone present was in agreement on this issue. No one indicated disagreement.

There was discussion of the ten-minute per inch percolation rate in regards to the suitability of an existing system designed on a five-minute per inch perc rate when reviewed under the SSD process. It was determined that the “mini-amendment” limiting the fastest percolation rate would apply only to new systems’ installations submitted after the effective date of the amendments. It was agreed that the SSD issue would be revisited in the future.

Scott recommended that rather than sizing leachfields on the least permeable horizon within four feet below the bottom of the stone, that they be sized on the least permeable horizon within the three-feet of naturally occurring soil below the system. This would address raised systems where the bottom of the stone may already be three feet above grade, which was the basis for the four-foot requirement, and would suffice in areas where the water table is well below grade. The current percolation test is performed only 18” below the system.

It was noted that the RIBA representatives would need to bring the proposed soil sizing chart to their group for comment. They were asked to try to get a response back to the group at the next meeting March 8th.

Encasing waterlines

Russ stated that if a water line is within 25’ of a leachfield, the waterline is sleeved. He stated that the sleeve must be schedule 40, which withstands vehicle loads and as such is durable enough that damage to the sleeve is not realistically anticipated. It was stated that most towns accept this alternative to safeguarding the waterline when it is too close to a leaching field provided the sleeve is extended at least 25’ from the leaching field and ends of the sleeve are plugged.

It was suggested that we look at the issue of separation of waterlines from tanks and building sewers too. It was stated that if sewer and waterlines cross in those cases, the “TR-16” manual, which is applied to public infrastructure projects, will be referenced in the ISDS rules.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00.

Next Meetings

Meetings will be held in Conference Room 280, DEM Office of Water Resources, 235 Promenade Street.

- Thursday, March 8, 2001 8 AM to 10:00 AM
- Wednesday, March 28, 2001 8 AM to 10:00 AM