

The regular meeting of the Board of Health was called to order at 7:31 p.m. Present for this meeting were Tracy Carluccio (Committee Chair), David Wang-Iverson , Tony Berberabe, Ted Peyrek, Pauline Serafin, Larry Tatsch (Vice Chair), Bogdan Slecza and Charles Van Horn. Les Hamilton was absent. Christine Rosikiewicz, Board Secretary, was present. Mr. Dan Wyckoff from the Hunterdon County Health Department was also in attendance.

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, this meeting was advertised as a regular meeting in the January 24, 2013 issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat. Notice of the meeting was forwarded to the Township Clerk’s office, posted on the Township bulletin board and sent to the Hunterdon County Democrat, the Trenton Times, and the Star Ledger on July 11, 2013.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/AGENDA REVIEW:

Under Unfinished and New Business

A. Hunterdon County Division of Public Health Inspector’s Report

7/9/13 Notice of Violation B 20 L 17.11

Under Items of Discussion – Education and Health Issues

7/14/13 e-mail from Joyce Corboy re: Course -Using Practical Road Salt Reduction Strategies to Protect Groundwater Resources

Under Bills of the Evening

Princeton Hydro, LLC	Ridge at Back Brook Report	\$380
Ferriero Engineering, Inc.	Soil Testing Witnessing B 24 L 6.04	\$580
Ferriero Engineering, Inc.	Soil Testing Witnessing B 20 L 4	\$580

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES – June 18, 2013:

Mr. Tatsch requested the following amendments to the minutes:

Page 3 – Add “Mr. Hamilton withdrew the motion.” at the end of the fifth paragraph.

Page 4 – paragraph 5, third line – change “10mil standard” to “10 mg/L”.

Mr. Tatsch commended Ms. Rosikiewicz for the excellent job she did transcribing the discussion on molecular sodium chloride.

Mr. Wang-Iverson made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Berberabe seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Frances Gavigan, 123 Wertsville Road, commented regarding the June meeting minutes. She believes Mr. Wyckoff was given incomplete and somewhat misleading information. She sent an e-mail to Ms. Carluccio and CC'd the Board Secretary earlier that day; the secretary provided copies to the Board. She would like to clarify as it "looks like she didn't pay a bill". She explained that a post-Sandy contractor did a bad job and it is costing thirty thousand dollars to replace things. Ms. Gavigan had to put down an animal "as caused by things that they did". As part of the remediation early on a dumpster was put on her property, she "got into litigation". The contractor told Carnevale that they never used the dumpster but that was not the case; the contractor had taken off two roofs and "put things in there". She said the work was shoddy and had to be replaced along with structural work by a contractor Ms. Gavigan hired. After speaking to Ms. Gavigan's attorney the contractor came out to her posted and gated property, hooked up a thirty yard dumpster and dumped it in her stone driveway which leads to her barn where her horses are. There was a four foot by twenty foot pile of roofing materials including nails left. Alan at the County followed up and found that it is illegal for the contractor to do that and when faced with a \$5000 fine a dumpster was sent at seven in the morning "saying take it or leave it, we are going to come clean this up". An individual spent the day cleaning up but left around ten pounds of nails.

Ms. Gavigan reiterated that Mr. Wyckoff was probably not given the whole story and she would like to clarify because when she filed the complaint she was told that "this would go to the local Board of Health and people will know". She expressed that she doesn't care if people know as long as they know the facts and have accurate information. She expressed that it has nothing to do with Mr. Wyckoff as he wasn't the individual. She is still finding nails and thirty feet of four inch thick driveway stone ended up in the waste stream which left a bald spot which is now a risk when people or horses walk over it. She cautioned to beware of contractors even if they are licensed and registered.

Ms. Carluccio thanked Ms. Gavigan for bringing this to the Board's attention.

Ms. Gavigan said Carnevale sent the bill to the contractor.

Ms. Carluccio said Ms. Gavigan's e-mail (as follows) could be made part of the meeting minutes.

The minutes do not accurately reflect the situation regarding the solid waste complaint I FILED against Carnevale and I would like the record to reflect the facts instead of the inaccurate reasons provided by Mr. Filipi to Mr. Wyckoff.

The rest of the story is that Carnevale trespassed on gated/posted property and illegally dumped a 30 yard container of roofing/nails/debris in my driveway despite speaking to my attorney who informed him that the dumpster had been:

** contracted by, placed and used by a abusive, threatening and incompetent contractor [Majestic Home Remodeling] and*

** there was litigation pending over their actions and shoddy work that resulted in the death of one of my sheep.*

The matter has been resolved and the dumpster is gone. Carnevale and I have signed mutual hold

harmless agreements. Recovering my thousands spent to fix the sandy and Majestic damaged buildings and the costs, damages and over \$800 I spent cleaning up the dumped materials will be resolved in the courts.

I take some intermediate comfort in that a bill for removal has been sent to Majestic Home Remodeling. It is unfortunate that a significant amount of nail/debris stone and soil ended up in the waste stream as a result of Carneval's poor judgement and that my animals, vehicles and myself are still at risk from the nails and roofing fragments still surfacing with every rainstorm. I will be at this evening's meeting with some of the nails I have picked up "after" the complaint was closed.

Respectfully,

Frances Gavigan

Mr. Wang-Iverson made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS

A. Hunterdon County Division of Health and Safety – Inspector's Report

1. Owens - AKA Woody's – B 16, L 11 – 202 Old York Road

Mr. Wyckoff reported that there are no further updates on this item at this time; remediation is ongoing.

2. 7/9/13 Notice of Violation B 20 L 17.11

Mr. Wyckoff reported that this NOV was recently received as the property owner was using a wall of manure as a property barrier fifteen feet away from a well. The owner was asked to remove the manure by July 29th. Mr. Wyckoff requested this item be on the agenda for August and he will report on it again then.

Mr. Wyckoff reminded the Board that complaints are anonymous unless the complaint goes to Court; then it would become public.

Ms. Carluccio inquired if the Department of Agricultural regulations about manure management apply here.

Mr. Wyckoff was unsure if the manure was from an individual animal or farming; it is not a recommended practice and is a public health nuisance.

Ms. Frances Gavigan commented that the State manure management regulations apply whether there is one horse or one hundred; the number of units you have determines whether you have to file manure management plans. She mentioned restrictions regarding distances to water and containment and offered to provide the regulations to Mr. Wyckoff.

B. Preview Committee**1. Septic Alteration Application B 20 L 4**

Mr. Doug Fine, PE introduced himself and Sylence Spence, the homeowner. Ms. Carluccio said the Preview Committee met and reviewed this septic alteration application for an existing residence. This system would use an aerobic system which is considered an advance treatment system under 7:9A regulations and is allowed to be used for this purpose. The Board can request justification for using this system as opposed to a conventional system.

Mr. Fine explained that this property was purchased in 2008; the existing system (a septic tank followed by a seepage pit) was inspected at this time. The inspector determined that the seepage pit was full of water and failed the system. The previous owner contacted the Board of Health to discuss the possibility of doing some type of non-conventional repair due to the special constraints. Mr. Fine said he saw in the [East Amwell Township construction] file that the engineer was told to perform soil logs; which were completed. Nothing further was done. Ms. Spence was advised via letter that the septic system was fixed as the grading issue coming off the County road was fixed and everything was fine.

Mr. Fine explained that Ms. Spence is the only resident in the house. He evaluated the system in accordance to New Jersey standards and found that the system is still full of water even with only one occupant in the house. When reviewing the information with the purchaser of the home Mr. Fine learned soil log testing had been done in 2008 and proved the water table. Seepage pits are allowed as a means of repairing a system in New Jersey if the bottom of the seepage pit is four feet above the ground water table. This system is installed in the ground water based on the soil log information from 2008.

Ms. Carluccio inquired if there was a County permit issued for repair. Mr. Fine believes the repair was completed in 2005 or 2006 prior to Ms. Spence purchasing the home. Soil logs were done on January 8, 2008 and an engineering firm composed a letter saying the water was caused by runoff from the County road.

Soil log testing performed by Mr. Fine agreed with what was done in 2008. The property is very spatially constrained. Ms. Carluccio noted that the acreage was not on the plans. Mr. Fine explained that there was a dispute about the back portion of the property; .128 was added to the property. The total acreage is .42.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked if the system was currently malfunctioning because of the high water table. Mr. Fine confirmed this and explained that the New Jersey regulation changed last year and the description of a malfunction includes a direct discharge to the groundwater. Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about the level of the water table; the highest water table is 53 inches below ground surface which is the design basis. The aerobic septic

tank will be used for treatment; twenty-four inches of suitable select fill will be installed treatment above the water table. Code is 18 inches of fill; more will be added for safety due to the close proximity to the property lines and stream. There is 27 feet to the side property line to excavation. The toe of the slope is 17 feet from the property line. The excavation from the field will be 35 feet from the back.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked Mr. Fine to summarize why he believes the aerobic system is needed rather than a conventional system.

Mr. Fine explained that the biggest issue is the space and the proximity to the stream. The reduction in height of the disposal field allows for the grading for the system to fit. The sizing of the disposal field is reduced resulting in a reduction in foot print. He noted that it is to keep the system as far from the well and stream as possible while meeting as many facets of the code that can be met.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if the field could be made wider and meet the square footage requirements for a conventional system either at 1.6 or 2.08. He figured at 1.6 24 X 33 could possibly fit. At 2.08 it would be approximately 24 X 40. He went over these dimensions and the pit bail results with Mr. Fine and possible ways to fit the system on the property. The grading was discussed. Mr. Fine said that there is natural drainage towards the creek from the front of the property to the back; this should not be blocked with a mound. Keeping the mound small will enable the natural flow to continue. State standards for setback to the stream are not being met; DEP approvals are not needed as it is a repair of an existing system. The proposed system will put cleaner effluent closer to the stream [than a conventional system].

Mr. Wang-Iverson voiced the Board's concern of the maintenance requirements for these systems. The amount of maintenance was discussed. Mr. Fine explained the filter on the pump; it blows air to bubble the water. Mr. Wang-Iverson referred to a comment on the manufacturer's website that the air pump should not be off for more than two or three days without pumping the tank. Mr. Fine expressed that the filter should run 24/7. Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about power failures and if the system could be ruined if the air pump is not running. Mr. Fine said the aerobic activity could be lost if the power is out too long in which case it would convert to an anaerobic system; worst case septic effluent would come out. The system has an alarm on the blower which will be activated if the blower shuts off and an auto dialer is attached to the system; both are required by code. Mr. Fine explained that the service provider performs maintenance twice a year for the first two years and annually after the second year. The service provider is "attached" to the auto dialer which is on both the pump and blower.

Mr. Wang-Iverson explained that there was a twelve day power failure in the Township last year. He asked that the system would be not "wrecked completely" by a power failure. Mr. Fine said it would collect water if the well was being used. He said someone with an aerobic system who has a generator may want to put it on the pump and blower as well.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if a generator should be a requirement for these systems; Mr. Fine didn't believe so. Mr. Tatsch commented on recent extended power failures in the Township and believes they will be a common occurrence in future years. When the power fails the auto dialer will not work. Raw effluent can go into a bed which is designed only as a bed of disposal and not of treatment.

Mr. Fine inquired about where the water would come from to use in the house. He said after a few days and the system switches to an anaerobic system there will be effluent but it won't ruin the system. The bacteria from the system will carry out into the field so if there is spillover during an outage the bacteria will work on whatever is in the disposal field.

Mr. Tatsch agreed there would not be large amounts of water used during an outage if the well wasn't powered but residents have used water from other sources to flush toilets during past outages. A peat system would have similar problems if there is a power outage because a pump is involved. The only thing that would work is a gravity feed conventional system. Mr. Fine agreed a gravity feed conventional system is the only system not impacted by a power outage.

Ms. Carluccio reported that she contacted Mark Miller with the DEP regarding the power issue. Mr. Miller explained to Ms. Carluccio that due to the reduced size of the field there is more of a risk of effluent breaking through to the surface if effluent was to continue going into the field [in the event of a loss of power] as there is not enough area to absorb it. She explained how residents use other sources of water to function in the house during an outage, particularly when an outage lasts a week or more. Mr. Miller said any system that requires electricity has a high risk of failing and ruining the system if use is continued without power.

Ms. Carluccio expressed that the proposed system is more dependent on electricity than the peat system. She explained that the aeration must keep going or the bacteria will be ruined and will need to start from scratch again. She suggested a portable generator run by an alternate source be a requirement with this type of system as an extended outage could cost property owners thirty-five thousand dollars to fix a system. A generator costs approximately five thousand dollars.

Mr. Fine inquired about requiring this type of system to be pumped during an extended power outage. Ms. Carluccio agreed this was a possibility. She spoke of the lack of control of things in a storm; i.e. trucks going through a snow storm. She explained that the more outside sources will be relied on in times of crises the harder it will be. If a generator is used gasoline could be stored in advance and the generator could be run an hour or two a day. She asked Mr. Fine about the amount of power used by the system; it is a small amount. Mr. Fine said it would need to be done [requirement of a generator] for every system that has a pump.

Mr. Tatsch said that on every system there is a zone of treatment and a zone of disposal. With this system there is only a zone of disposal as the treatment is the aerobic. Mr. Fine said there is also a twenty-four inch zone of treatment above ground. Mr. Tatsch asked if

there was raw treatment discharged over a period of days into the reduced zone of treatment would that zone of treatment be able to recover from this or would it clog? Mr. Fine said it would clog over a long period of time i.e. years; a few days will not clog the system. Ms. Carluccio said this is good to hear but it is not what Mr. Miller said.

The dimensions of the system were further discussed in regards to function. Ms. Carluccio mentioned how the homeowner is relying on the aerobic system.

Mr. Tatsch inquired why Mr. Fine prefers this system over a peat system. Mr. Fine said that peat systems are more expensive and take up more space for the tank as the majority of them require two pumps. He mentioned there was no room for the pods needed for the Puraflow system.

Ms. Serafin inquired about the life span of the aerobic system. Mr. Fine said that under normal routine maintenance you are looking at replacement of a blower and cleaning out the tank on a recommended basis. Mr. Carluccio inquired about the number of years; Mr. Fine replied that it depends on sludge buildup in the treatment portion of the tank. The pumping is to remove the buildup of solids from the first chamber. There is no portion of an aerobic system that will be used up such as with peat; nothing is being consumed and there is no finite life span. The system is plastic. There is sludge buildup but that is part of routine maintenance. The annual maintenance includes checking the sludge in the tanks and determining when it needs to be pumped.

Ms. Carluccio commented regarding her conversation with the State and review of section 8.3 of 7:9A of the State code. This system is an advanced wastewater treatment system. It treats the effluent to a secondary level [under DEP] because of the biological oxygen demand and the total suspended solids are brought down by the aerobic system. This system is not like the systems that were approved thirty years ago by the Board. The older systems used a Jet system and it is a different company that now manufactures them. The advantage is similar to the peat for the applicant as the system takes up a smaller area and the advance treatment allows for a lower mound. There is a higher quality effluent but that depends on the quality of the aerobic system. The State requires the system have the NSF 40 (National Science Foundation 40 code) stamp; the Board can recommend the engineer certify this when it goes in the ground.

Ms. Carluccio said that electricity is needed; at Preview Committee requiring a small generator was discussed. Property owners installing these systems should be warned to not use the system during a power failure as the system could be ruined. If the systems are using a pump you do not want to use the tank when there is no electricity as the first tank will be overwhelmed and could result in a blowout; this has happened in parts of the State where there is municipal water and individual septic systems. Mr. Fine said he would have "a different take" if there was public water.

Ms. Carluccio inquired about the well radiuses; they are fifty and one hundred feet. She asked for them to be marked on the drawings. Mr. Wang-Iverson said the distances from the components to the well should also be marked. Mr. Fine went over the distances; he will add them to the drawing.

There was an error in the County letter on item 12; this is a typo that will need to be corrected. The system will be 956 square feet which meets State requirements for a pressure dosed advanced treatment system.

There are three bedrooms in the house; the County letter states four.

The system has a monitoring port. Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about this. Mr. Fine explained that samples are not normally taken from it unless there is something going on; the port is to see the groundwater table.

Mr. Wang-Iverson referred to his review of the ECOPOD Delta website which had an alert about ants attacking the air pump. Mr. Fine had not heard of this. Mr. Tatsch spoke about an ant nest he had in a pool pump but noted that it did not damage the pump. Mr. Fine said that ants are looked for during the annual maintenance as the top of the peat filter is attractive to the ants since it is warm.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about who was providing the system. Mr. Fine replied it is Tri-State Pump and Septic Supply. They will do the maintenance and oversight. They are also a supplier of one of the peat systems.

Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Fine when he is on the site; he replied that he is on the site a lot. Mr. Fine is there for excavation and tank installation and pressure testing. He will verify that the unit has the appropriate stamp. Ms. Carluccio said the verifying the stamp should be a condition.

Ms. Carluccio confirmed that separation distance requirements between the septic and well would not be met; a waiver would be needed per East Amwell ordinance to reduce the separation distance from the septic tanks to the well and the septic field to the well.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if the zone of treatment for this system is twenty-four inches; Mr. Fine replied that it is. It was noted that #13 from the County letter is incorrect.

Mr. Wang-Iverson confirmed that the toe of the mound would be fourteen feet from the property line; it is seventeen feet. This item was also incorrect in the County letter.

Ms. Carluccio went over the County letter with the Board; #13 could be removed as it is incorrect.

There were only two soil logs completed as there was not enough room to do two more. Mr. Fine said that in 2008 soil logs were performed which he reviewed; they were similar to what he had found.

Mr. Wang-Iverson reported that pit bail one had a K value of three to four inches per hour and pit bail two was eighteen. The system was designed on six to twenty inches per hour based on the suitable fill that is in the disposal field but it is pressure dosed.

Mr. Tatsch said it would be beneficial to have the older test results as part of the application; they are already part of the East Amwell construction file.

Ms. Serafin inquired about the manufacturer of the aerobic system that would be used; it is Delta Environmental. Ms. Serafin inquired if they are local; they are a large environmental treatment company from the mid-west.

Mr. Wang-Iverson said that backup power should be discussed further, especially for the air pump.

Mr. Tim Martin, 1 High Mowing Road, was in attendance and also had an application for an aerobic system on the agenda at this meeting. His home, which was purchased 22 years ago, has an aerobic system as do other homes in the area. In 22 years there have been 21 days without power. The aerobic system has functioned fine. Mr. Martin reported that he maintained the system quite well including pumping every two to three years; which isn't required. If you are pressure dosing a system the effluent will go in [the system] but it is not being treated aerobically. Mr. Martin spoke about municipal systems that also lose power during an outage and sewage that would go right into rivers; a residential system is not like that. He is in favor of sophisticated systems that provide better treatment. Mr. Martin said maintenance is needed but compared it to painting and maintaining your house and putting oil in your car.

Mr. Tatsch inquired about the age of Mr. Martin's system; it is 35-40 years old. He reported that the air pump runs constantly. If it gets dusty the filter needs to be changed; the longevity of the air pump could be a downside. Mr. Martin said he cleans the air filter on his.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked if there are problems with the system when it comes back on if the air pump doesn't operate for a few days. Mr. Martin replied that he didn't. Mr. Wang-Iverson referred to what he read on the Delta website that said if the air pump did not operate for two or three days the tank would need to be pumped. Mr. Martin said the Delta system is different with the way membranes are used to distribute air; the newer systems are "much more robust" than what was available four years ago. He explained that the older systems were single tanks with baffles in them where air was blown into them and there would be spillage over the top. He said pumping wouldn't be a bad idea but noted that he pumps his system even when it isn't needed. He had submitted an application to be proactive and do the right thing.

Mr. Tatsch commented that there are many ramifications to having a generator including proper installation and an interlock system or splitting out the circuit for the septic system. He believes the best the Board can do is recommend the homeowner has a source of power or not use the system during a power failure. He suggests the Board leave it as a recommendation at this point. If the Board approves it this will be the first aerobic system

approved in the past twenty years; this is not necessarily a bad thing. In the advent of peat systems and aerobic systems the Board is going to need to look at these systems to solve problems that will be "cropping up" in Ringoes and other areas. He noted that this is possibly the smallest lot the Board has dealt with. This system may be a good solution to a

very marginal situation. Mr. Tatsch noted that he was originally skeptical but considering the situation, improvements in these systems and that the State has allowed their use he said there are a number of reasons why these systems may be appropriate in these cases.

Mr. Van Horn expressed that he does not have any problems with approving the system but has a problem with requiring the generator back-up and questioned how it would be enforced. He spoke of the expense of a generator; especially if it is a standing one. He believes an outage is a problem that could happen but that every potential problem that could come up can't be solved. He believes that due to the size of the lot this is the "most doable" system.

Ms. Carluccio said the Board could consider a recommendation of a backup power source and to inform the owner that they should not use the system in the event of an outage. She noted the reduced size of the septic field on this application; if effluent is going into a very small field it will more rapidly take over the field system than if it was a regular sized septic system field. The Board has an educational responsibility to warn an applicant of this; if there is a problem it would be very expensive to fix.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if there could be a deed restriction as with maintenance requirements. Ms. Carluccio said the deed restriction is based on verbiage from the State; she does not know if the Board can say that or enforce it. The deed restriction regarding maintenance is clear and there is a contract with specific remedies for noncompliance. Mr. Tatsch said there has been language put in other systems that are substandard such as "this is the best system that could be designed however the Board cautions that this is a substandard system". He suggested a few sentences could be added stating that the homeowner either has an approved backup power system installed or the system not be used during extended power failures. Mr. Fine said this could be incorporated into the deed notice; it would show up during a title search. He read to the Board from a deed notice he had with him and demonstrated how that information could be added to the deed.

Mr. Tatsch and Ms. Carluccio went over the wording for the deed statement and where it should go in the conditions. The wording will be added to #4 from the County letter as follows: "This system depends upon electrical power for proper functioning. If there is an extended power outage the Board of Health recommends the system not be used unless there is a backup power source."

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if a waiver is needed to the distance from the stream; Mr. Fine replied that it is as it is less than fifty feet.

Mr. Tatsch asked about the slope; it is 3 to 1. This will be an additional waiver. Mr. Tatsch asked if 5 to 1 could be done; this was briefly discussed with Mr. Fine. Number 14 on the County letter should be changed to 5 to 1. It was noted that there were no neighboring wells within 100 feet. The slope will be nine feet from the eastern property line and thirteen feet from the rear of the property.

Ms. Carluccio summarized that there will be all of the waivers in the County letter. Number 12 will be changed (remove second sentence). A condition of the following statement to be

included in the deed will be added: "This system depends upon electrical power for proper functioning. If there is an extended power outage the Board of Health recommends the system not be used unless there is a backup power source." Number 14 should be changed to read as follows: "The toe of the mound will be only nine feet from the eastern property line and thirteen feet from the rear property line which is less than the twenty-five foot setback required from East Amwell ordinance. The system will have a 5 to 1 slope which meets Township ordinance." A waiver is needed to reduce the separation distance between the septic system components and the water well. A waiver is needed to reduce the number of soil logs due to not enough space to perform all required soil logs. Previously performed soil logs are to be included in the file. A waiver of the required fifty foot distance of the stream from the back of the septic field is required.

The acreage size should be marked on the plan. Fifty and one hundred foot radiuses around the wells should be added.

There will be a condition that the engineer will certify that the specific unit being installed is an NSF 40 certified unit and is labeled as such.

Mr. Wang-Iverson moved that the Board approve the system with the waivers and conditions described. Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion was approved.

2. Septic Alteration Application B 26 L 7

Mr. Tim Martin, 1 High Mowing Road and Mr. Doug Fine, engineer, identified themselves for the record. Mr. Martin suggested the Board increase the fees and devote that extra money to educational programs for new homeowners. There was agreement from Board members that this was a good idea.

Ms. Carluccio said the Preview Committee reviewed this application. Mr. Fine said that some background was provided earlier in the meeting. The Martins currently have an approximately forty year old aerobic system. Mr. Fine was asked proactively to look at it to possibly upgrade the system.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if the system was malfunctioning. Mr. Fine said it is close to malfunctioning as there is a saturated disposal area; it is age appropriate, there is some sludge in the system which is percolating to the soil.

Mr. Martin explained that many trees on his property were lost during Hurricane Sandy. Mr. Martin mentioned that as a previous Board of Health member he knows there is finite age to

the systems. He explained that there are only two people living in his house and they have the latest water saving devices. There is no breakthrough in the system, they are not moving but want to be proactive and a good steward.

Mr. Fine was asked to look at the system because Mr. Martin wanted to see if there were any problems before he worked on landscaping in his yard. He explained that the way the

system is operating now is less than ideal and if it were inspected as a real estate transaction “this is where we would be” and reiterated that Mr. Martin is doing this proactively. Basically an existing forty year old aerobic system is being replaced with a current NSF 40 treatment system aerobic system.

Soil log testing was performed; they are short one soil log. The log was attempted in multiple places but they encountered sewage from the existing field. Two permeability tests in the form of pit bails were provided. The water table is identified at the highest point at ten inches. The system should be elevated above the water table. Mr. Martin explained that a neighbor’s well line had been leaking and has since been remedied; this could have contributed to the high water table.

Mr. Fine said that space is an issue as there is the water table. He noted that this neighborhood would probably not be built now without advanced treatment systems.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired if the water table is the only reason a conventional system cannot be installed. Mr. Fine said the reason was the water table; space isn’t as much of an issue. Mr. Fine expressed that he doesn’t want to replace an aerobic system with a conventional mound system as it doesn’t make sense to him to reduce the treatment capability and say that he is doing something better. He is taking an existing aerobic and replacing it with a forty year newer aerobic system and considering the water table.

Mr. Tatsch inquired about the system as the County letter was unclear; Mr. Fine clarified that the system is an E50 which corresponds with five hundred gallons per day.

The application is for three bedrooms; the system is oversized by twenty-five percent to meet the East Amwell requirements to be oversized.

Ms. Carluccio said the one of the reason advance treatment systems are considered by the Board is due to a high water table.

Mr. Tatsch commented on the logic of replacing a system that has worked for forty years with a system of the same type. He believes it makes sense to do that rather than run the risk of a conventional system failing under these conditions.

Ms. Carluccio inquired if minimum separation distances would be met; they will be. She asked if the well radiuses could be labeled on the drawing.

Mr. Tatsch asked if a waiver is needed for the eighteen inch zone of treatment; one is needed, it is number fourteen on the County letter.

Mr. Tatsch inquired about the bed of the septic system. Mr. Fine said there wasn’t much; there was orange pipe surrounded by six to eight inches of gravel. There was no soil replacement. Mr. Fine spoke about sand beds he has seen in the Sourland Mountains, including Somerset County, that are amazingly clean.

Mr. Tatsch asked Mr. Martin if he knows if the other systems [in his development] are the same as his; they are. Comments were made about the age of the systems in the Country and the possibility of systems needing to be replaced when homes go up for sale.

Ms. Carluccio inquired about the slope on the mound; it is 5 to 1.

Ms. Carluccio inquired if the Preview Committee had any questions; they did not.

Mr. Tatsch confirmed that the fourteen feet distance from the property line was on the eastern side; it was. "Eastern" should be inserted before "property line" on the County letter.

There will be a condition to include the information about power failure in the deed.

There will be a condition that the engineer will inspect and certify that the specific unit being installed is an NSF 40 certified unit and is labeled as such.

Mr. Tatsch commented that the Board will probably see more applications with similar situations over the next five years. Mr. Martin commented about the possibility of using solar to power the pump and blower to prevent loss of power.

Mr. Tatsch made a motion the Board approve the installation of the septic system as noted with the conditions as noted in the County letter and the two just read including the NSF 40 certification and the deed restriction recommending the system not be used or alternate power be available. Mr. Van Horn seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

C. New Business

There was no new business.

D. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

A. Education and Health Issues

There were no comments.

CORRESPONDENCE

A. East Amwell

1. 6/21/13 Report of Analysis form Garden State Laboratories, Inc. – Clawson Park drinking water

Mr. Tatsch reviewed the report; the water at Clawson Park was tested for bacteria. The coliform bacteria were not present; general bacteria was 5, which is a low number and acceptable. Nitrate was 3, which is also low. Ms. Carluccio inquired if the test was required; Mr. Tatsch believes it is required quarterly.

BILLS OF THE EVENING

Ms. Carluccio noted that additional bills were added to the agenda during agenda review.

Mr. Wang-Iverson made a motion to approve paying the bills of the evening; Mr. Slecza seconded the motion. All were in favor with Mr. Tatsch abstaining.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Being no public present Mr. Berberabe made a motion to close the meeting to the public; seconded by Mr. Van Horn. All were in favor; the motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Van Horn motioned, seconded by Mr. Tatsch, to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine A. Rosikiewicz