The regular meeting of the Board of Health was called to order at 7:31 p.m. Present for this meeting were: Tracy Carluccio, Tony Berberabe, Les Hamilton, Larry Tatsch, Charles Van Horn, Bodgan Sleczka, and Pauline Serafin. Ted Peyrek III and David Wang-Iverson were absent. Also present: Board Secretary Christine Rosikiewicz. 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 29, 2015 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 February 13, 2015.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/AGENDA REVIEW:

There were no announcements or additions to the agenda.

PRESENTATION OF THE MINUTES –January 20, 2015

Mr. Tatsch and Mr. Hamilton commented favorably on the minutes. There were two typographical corrections on page 1. On Page 6, paragraph 2 the first line should be changed to read "Mr. Tiederman said he will replace the old 1000 gallon tank with a new 1500 gallon tank and will empty and decommission the existing septic tank. On Page 7, the third sentence should read "The difference between the upper and lower level is based on the area of the tank". **Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the January 20, 2015 minutes with two typographical corrections and the two changes noted; Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.**

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Being no comments from any public Mr. Van Horn made a motion to close to the public. Ms. Serafin 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 remediation is ongoing. There are no new updates.

2. NOV 6/17/14 B 11 L 5 – update

This NOV is for 12 Boss Road. The County is still awaiting receipts from the disposal of the solid waste from the responsible party. There are still items behind the garage that need to be removed. There have been no further communications with the property owner at this time.

3. NOV 9/3/14 B 15.01 L 2 – update

This item is on the agenda this evening under Preview Committee. The progress of this NOV is contingent on the Board's action tonight.

4. NOV 1/12/15 B 41 L 21

This is a new solid waste complaint at 99 Snydertown Road. Acknowledgement of receipt of the NOV has not been received by the County; it is unknown if the property owner is aware there is an issue. The inspector requested the property be cleaned up by February 6th. Mr. Van Horn commented that the home appears to be vacant and no solid waste can be seen from the road. Mr. Wyckoff commented on the large amount of solid waste that was on the property when the NOV was issued.

B. Preview Committee

1. Septic Alteration Application B 15.01 L 2

Patrick Lynam, the engineer from Maser Consulting for this application for Hess approached the dais. Andy Lautenbacher from Hess Corporation and Vincent Kelly from Maser Consulting also approached the dais.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the Board has discussed this application in the past and communicated with Maser Consulting and the County regarding it. The Preview Committee met and reviewed the application. She confirmed that the Board could view the most recent plot plan.

Mr. Lynam said the current system is failing; Hess is pumping the system often. The proposed system will have a pretreatment device and utilize some of the existing structures. A new field will be installed. The existing building is to be replaced with a new building. The island and pumps will also be replaced in the future. Replacing the septic system is the priority to be done first.

Ms. Carluccio referred to the County approval letter which explains that the proposed system is to correct a malfunctioning system for the existing Dunkin Donuts and gas station. The letter states that the proposal is to reconstruct the existing structure and gas station configuration. Maser Consulting has met with the DEP. The number of gallons per day the system should be designed for was discussed at a previous Board of Health meeting. The County representative Bob Vacarella had previously explained to Ms. Carluccio that because this system is for a commercial food establishment DEP will review the application and will determine the flow numbers; they are not determined by the local authority. No expansion is planned. Soil testing was completed. The regional high water table was established at 29 inches. The system is designed for 1810gpd and will use a pressure dosed mounted soil replacement system.

Ms. Carluccio asked that they go through the waivers and conditions. The first waiver is for the toe of the mound to be only 3:1 and not 5:1 as required by Township ordinance. Mr. Lynam said the 3:1 slope is due to the site limitations and where on the property the system will be installed noting the existing roadway and the need to install the system above the seasonal high water elevation. He explained that the system needs to be high enough to tie into the existing grades. Ms. Carluccio inquired if Mr. Lynam tried to place the system in a different part of the property or purchase property on the other side of the road. Mr. Lynam said they did not do this. Ms. Carluccio asked if there were any questions from the Board regarding the slope.

Ms. Carluccio said the second waiver is that the proposed system will only be one foot from the property line; the Township setback requirement is twenty-five feet. Mr. Lynam said the one foot distance is to the soil replacement which is three feet beyond the edge of the field to the property line. On a question from Ms. Carluccio Mr. Lynam clarified where the property line was on the drawing. Mr. Lynam said the distance is three feet as there is a two foot replacement zone around the system. Mr. Lynam showed Ms. Carluccio on the plan where the replacement zone and field are and noted that it is not in conformance with the Township setback distance but it is in compliance with the DEP standards which allows for zero feet given that there will not be any future improvements to the roadway. Ms. Carluccio asked if Mr. Lynam would have to get a letter from DOT to determine this or if there is an application to determine this. Mr. Lynam said a request for future plans will be made to DOT to confirm that there will be no future improvements to the jug handle. Ms. Carluccio inquired if the Board had any questions on this.

Mr. Hamilton inquired about the dark line on the plan. Mr. Lynam said it is a mistake from when they used the deeds to create the drawing. Mr. Hamilton inquired about the location of the old system; Mr. Lynam explained where it was on the drawing. The underground storage tanks and pavement were identified on the drawing at Mr. Hamilton's request. Mr. Tatsch inquired if the property between the property line and the ramp is owned by the state. Mr. Lynam said it is and pointed out the property the state owns on the drawing.

Ms. Carluccio asked if the plot plan is correct where one foot is shown from the line that is marked 264. Mr. Lynam said yes; the one foot is to the line which is the soil replacement zone. Mr. Berberabe said that the application stated the toe of the mound was two feet from the property line. Mr. Lynam said the toe of the mound is two feet from the property line but the field under the mound is actually further back. Ms. Carluccio asked if it is correct that the proposed system will be only one foot from the property line if the buffer of soil replacement is considered part of the system. Mr. Lynam said the regulations specify that it is from the toe so the one foot distance is correct.

Ms. Carluccio referred to the third item in the County letter. The Township requires two pit bail and four soil logs be done when a pit bail is used. Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Lynam to explain why just three soil logs and one pit bail were used. Mr. Lynam said that two pit bail tests were done as they were looking to get infiltration rates for the pit bail tests. This information was obtained from the four soil logs as well based on the horizon of the soil logs. He further explained that the soil was consistent. When the pit bail test was done for the horizon this was applied to the other soil logs as they had the same soil profile. Ms. Carluccio said the Township has this requirement as they find that the soil can change and can be very different a few feet away and confidence is desired in the pit bail test. Ms. Carluccio referred to the engineer's response to the County that the testing was completed based on the available space. She explained that the point of the testing is to do it all unless there is some restriction that prevents it and not to end it when the data desired is obtained. She inquired why the other tests were not completed. Mr. Lynam said the two pit bail tests were done outside the existing field as the existing field would have to be "ripped up" to perform a test. He felt the one pit bail and soil logs had consistent results and felt confident to apply the one pit bail test to the entire area. Mr.Tatsch inquired if the existing field was a soil replacement field. Mr. Lynam said it was. Mr. Tatsch said that it wouldn't have helped to test there as there is select fill. Ms. Carluccio asked if the Board had any other comments. Ms. Carluccio commented that it was a tight spot.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the Township requirement is that systems be designed to 2.08 feet per gallon per day. The state code is being met as 1.33 is being used. Mr. Lynam said they tried to max out the area for the septic field and push it as far as they could to meet the DEP requirements. He spoke of balancing waivers for the toe and slope with maxing out the system and trying to meet some of the other requirements as well. He referred to the drawing where the new septic field is on an angle, which is uncommon, and noted that the old septic system was rectangular. Any issue area would be near the trash enclosure; all the treatment will be to the rear of the building. He explained that to move the system near the trash enclosure would not help the system as the waste would have to go around a corner. The system as proposed has different sized laterals going in one direction. Ms. Carluccio inquired if the trash enclosure could be moved and briefly went over this part of the drawing with Mr. Lynam. He explained that the soil replacement is up against the trash enclosure itself. Alternate places to move the system to were discussed. Ms. Carluccio expressed concern that the current system was installed recently and failed. It was a small system in a tight spot that was very heavily used. Mr. Lautenbacher said the new design is for a larger building than what is there. The current building is approximately 1500sqft. The new system is designed for a 2500sqft building. The plans for the future building are in the "way distant future now". He commented that this system should be adequate to handle the much larger building but it is not going to have to. Ms. Carluccio noted that what was is there now was not adequate for the smaller building.

Mr. Lautenbacher said the trash enclosure could be moved if they have to. Ms. Carluccio explained that the Township code should be met to make sure that the system is adequate and does not "blow out" as this one did. Ms. Carluccio requested the engineer recalculate to get as close to 2.08 as possible. Mr. Lynam agreed to do this. He explained that while the current system is failing the new system will be an advanced pretreatment to "head off" the problems that are currently happening. Ms. Carluccio commented on this being an improvement. Ms. Carluccio inquired about what the new well distance would be between the well and the bed. Comments were made about it not being significant. Mr. Lynam said a new well will be constructed and encased. The Township requirements will not be met; the DEP requirements will be. Mr. Tatsh asked if well testing is required quarterly for water quality as it is a community system. Mr. Wyckoff confirmed this. Mr. Tatsch noted that this provides "a little protection".

Ms. Carluccio referred to #5 of the County letter which states that the disposal bed will be only 84 feet from the new proposed well; the Township requirement is 100 feet. The state code allows for fifty feet if you have fifty feet of casing. The Engineer will insure that fifty feet of casing is provided. Ms. Carluccio said an application will need to be submitted to the Board for the new well and the well certified per the Township water supply ordinance. One well requirement for commercial establishments is that a meter is installed on the well to provide the Board with the amount of flow. Installing the meter on the well will be a condition of the septic approval.

Ms. Carluccio referred to #6 in the County letter stating that the septic and pump tanks will be only 81 feet from the proposed well which does not meet the East Amwell Township setback requirement. She asked the engineer if the new well will be placed where it will meet the requirement. Mr. Lynam said the distance could be increased; he will check back to determine why that location was chosen. Ms. Carluccio inquired how the well head will be protected since it is shown as being located in a parking space. Mr. Lynam said the new well will be further towards

the driveway to increase the distance. He went over the other tanks on the property. There are two points of effluents; sanitary waste and sink waste. Ms. Carluccio said the main point is to achieve the well distance but it should not be exposed to further traffic, she inquired how the well will be protected and asked if it was required to be above grade. My Lynam said it is not required and the existing well is not above grade. Ms. Carluccio commented that the existing well is old and that it is not good that it is not above grade. Mr. Tatsch said that most modern residential wells use an adaptor so they can be easily accessed noting that the older style used buried casing. The casing can still be buried on new wells but it makes the well difficult to access. Mr. Lynam said the new well will have a manhole type structure to provide better access to the well. Ms. Carluccio said the Board would want to insure that there is access to the well, there is as much protection to the well head as possible, and the well is marked on the plan. Mr. Hamilton inquired if water could get into the well. Mr. Lynam said it could be constructed to make it waterproof and went over ways to do this.

Mr. Tatsch inquired about the sewage system's "grey water" pipe leading out to what is labeled as an advanced pretreatment device, and then through grease trap and then out to the septic field. The other pipe which carries sanitary waste "black water" is going only to the tanks. He inquired why the advanced pretreatment would not be done on the septic effluent from the toilets. Mr. Lynam explained that the grey water has grease in it which will be removed by the advanced treatment. Mr. Tatsch inquired why the Hoot pretreatment system is before the grease trap. Ms. Carluccio explained that the waste goes through the Hoot system and then is put through the grease trap to remove any grease from the food preparation. Ms. Carluccio referred to the drawing of the Hoot system on page S-2 labeled advanced pretreatment device and asked Mr. Lynam to explain how it works. He said the first chamber is for separation. Ms. Carluccio referred to the drawing which says that air is introduced into the sewage in the aeration chamber. She further read "the pretreatment chamber for anaerobic digestion occurs in storage for nonbiodegradable materials." Mr. Lynam referred to the notes and explained that they system has T connections to the laterals. Pipes bring the effluent to the next chamber where air is pumped and helps break down the sewage quicker. There is both anaerobic and aerobic treatment of the sewage.

Mr. Tatsch said this magnifies his point. He defined "grey water" as water that has a discoloration due to soap in the water which comes from sinks and washing machines. Grey water does not have sanitary waste in it. By definition grey water is cleaner than sanitary waste. Ms. Carluccio referred to a conversation she had with Mr. Vaccarella earlier today. The County felt it was very important to have a pretreatment device for the grey water to go through because of the food preparation. She explained that in similar establishments the grease trap gets overloaded and the system blows out. By providing a pretreatment system before the grey water goes into the grease trap it digests and takes out some of the grease before the grey water goes into the grease trap. This allows the grease trap to function better. Mr. Tatsch said the sanitary waste is not going through the pretreatment system and is being treated conventionally. He said that the greywater is usually not so much of a problem from a health standpoint because it has detergent in it; it is more or less sanitized. He noted that grey water also has grease and bacteria but there is also water that has human waste and the proposed treatment system for it is conventional.

Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Tatsch is he was suggesting it be redesigned to have all of the waste go through the pretreatment. Mr. Tatsch said if the engineer is admitting that the size and location is minimal and saying there is an advanced treatment system then that is inaccurate as there is

advanced treatment on the grey water but not on the black water, which is sanitary waste that could contain pathogens, which only goes through a normal system. This could be okay, especially if close to 2.08 can be reached on the field, but there is no advanced treatment on the waste that is of greatest concern.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the State and County have found that most of these types of systems that serve fast food or convenience stores blow out because the grease trap gets clogged. The State and County want pretreatment systems installed which help to digest this material before it goes into the grease trap. Mr. Vaccarella advised Ms. Carluccio that signed maintenance contracts for the advanced treatment system and the grease trap should be a condition of approval for the application. The Hoot system has a maintenance plan and requires service. The biggest cause of blow outs for convenience store septic systems is that there is not pretreatment system and the grease trap clogs.

Mr. Tatsch referred to a letter which said the new facility would only sell prepackaged food resulting in no grease being discharged; however a grease trap would still be installed. He inquired if future plans for the site include food preparation. Mr. Lautenbacher said there would not be food preparation. Ms. Carluccio referred to the recent sale of the Hess gas stations and convenience stores. Mr. Lautenbacher said Hess Retail Holdings was sold on October 1st to Marathon Petroleum Corporation and will be marketed as Speedway Gasoline and be 100% company owned and operated as Hess is. Speedway's business model is a little different from Hess although the food offerings are almost identical. Hess does not prepare food in stores this size; they only prepare food in bigger stores. Mr. Lautenbacher said no food preparation will be done on the site.

Mr. Tatsch inquired why the additional cost in engineering [for the advanced treatment] couldn't be applied to the sanitary sewer. He didn't see why a separate drain was needed for the sink waste if grease is not being generated; there would only be a small amount of sink waste. Mr. Lautenbacher said there will still be grease generated while Dunkin Donuts is still under lease on the property; they generate a minimal amount of grease. Mr. Tatsch asked how long Dunkin Donuts would be on the property; Mr. Lautenbacher did not know. Ms. Carluccio said the County insisted they wanted the grey water to have advanced treatment therefore the County and State should provide input if the grey water is not going to go through an advanced treatment system. Mr. Tatsch said if Dunkin Donuts is generating grease now and the lease will be for a year or more it makes sense to have advanced treatment on the grey water.

He inquired if the applicant has considered using advanced treatment for the black water. Mr. Lynam said an advanced treatment system was not considered for the black water and only for the grey water due to the grease intrusion to the system. The grease effluent was the priority. Mr. Van Horn inquired if Dunkin Donuts had food preparation at the site. Mr. Lautenbacher said baking is not done on premises; the donuts are brought in frozen and thawed. Some waste is generated when implements and racks are cleaned. Ms. Carluccio said the County believes grease caused the blow out of the current system and Mr. Lautenbacher agreed with this.

Mr. Carluccio referred to the #3 in the letter from Maser Consulting which states there are two wells on the property. There are also monitoring wells on the property. Mr. Lynam said the well in the right of way may have been a water supply at one time but was abandoned when the DOT created the right of way. A new well was drilled at that time. Ms. Carluccio said it would be

beneficial to know if the well in the right of way has been properly sealed as it could be a source of pollution to the aquifer. The well on the property will be sealed as a new well will be drilled.

Ms. Carluccio inquired if there were any questions on #5, #6 or #7 from the letter. Mr. Tatsch said that because we defined where the advanced treatment is going he is of the opinion that unless the bed size is substantially equal to the 2.08 required by the Board he would ask for the system to be redesigned with advanced treatment as we are aware of a problem here and it is a "shoehorned" system. Mr. Lautenbacher said he will commit to this. Mr. Tatsch did not believe the bed could be larger than 1.6 as there was not enough room. Mr. Hamilton asked if the applicant has a choice if they can get to 2.08. Mr. Tatsch did not believe they could get to 2.08 but if they did the Board wouldn't have a basis for recommending advanced treatment. Ms. Carluccio said the advanced pretreatment system and grease trap need to be kept in place for the grey water. Mr. Tatsch said they are dealing with a very minimal bed size; the more they can insure to have good treatment before the effluent gets to the disposal bed there is a better assurance that the system will operate for a long time.

Ms. Carluccio asked if they are keeping the 1500 gallon existing septic tank. Mr. Lynam said they are. It will be upgraded with an effluent filter at the outlet of the tank as it doesn't have one now. Ms. Carluccio expressed the Board's concern about using older existing tanks and asked if the tank had been looked at and the age of the tank. The tank was installed in 2001. Mr. Hamilton said he always recommends installing a new tank when installing a new system while stating it was the applicant's choice. Mr. Lautenberg said the tank looked structurally sound; Mr. Hamilton said this can't be determined by looking at the tank. Mr. Tatsch said a pressure test of the tank will be required to insure it is not leaking. Ms. Carluccio said the tank would need to be replaced if it does not pass the *in situ* test.

Ms. Carluccio referred to page 3, #14 of the letter from the County regarding Form 4 General Design Date and Form 5 Dosing System and noted that the Preview Committee could not locate these. The County asked the engineer to complete and resubmit them. Mr. Lynam said this was done; Ms. Carluccio asked for a copy for the Board's records.

Ms. Carluccio said the engineer will next go to the New Jersey DEP for Treatment Works Approval. The Preview Committee looked at the TWA application and document provided. The DEP will be making the decision about the flow. Ms. Carluccio referred to a past Board of Health meeting when the numbers for the flow were discussed and were much larger than the proposed 1810gpd based on the calculations in the code. DEP will look at various data to determine the flow including data provided by the applicant regarding use at other facilities that are convenience stores that serve mainly products that were prepared elsewhere but in addition have coffee and some other items prepared on site. Ms. Carluccio said the DEP numbers were much greater than 2000gpd and included 125gpd per fuel pump. Ms. Carluccio said she spoke to Mr. Vaccarella about the type of TWA permit needed. He explained that this is a different type of TWA permit than has been issued in the past for other establishments in the Township, for example the deli and the school, which also required a New Jersey DEP Discharge Elimination System Permit. There are three different types of TWA permits. The Township Committee usually has to vote to approve the TWA and insure it complies with all the municipal regulations. For this type of TWA the Board of Health is required to vote and state that they understand that the application is going to the State for the State to provide an analysis of what the design flow will be. If the gallons per day are determined

to be over 2000 then the State will provide approval instead of the Board of Health. The process with the Board of Health will continue if the gallons per day stays under 2000. The applicant has to show the State that they have gone through the Township process, including obtaining waivers and determining conditions, before they can go apply the State. Mr. Lynam explained that this is a new process; all food service applications now must be submitted to the State.

Ms. Carluccio referred to the statement in the County letter on page 2 which reads "The Board can condition the approval based on the applicant obtaining a TWA permit from DEP for the gallons per day per site. If the Board conceptually approves the application then the Board designated representative can sign the TWA application so that the engineer and applicant can then apply to DEP." She explained that if the Board gives approval then the Board Chair can sign the application and the applicant can start the approval process with DEP.

Ms. Carluccio referred to #18 on page 4 of the letter from Maser Consulting which reads that there is a half inch hole in the outlet pipe for the water to drain back at the end of the cycle. The letter refers to sheet one but it should read "sheet 2". Mr. Lynam pointed it out on the drawing at Ms. Carluccio's request.

Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Lynam if the soil logs and pit bails were the only ones taken. Ms. Carluccio said testing was only done around the area of the existing system.

Mr. Hamilton referred to paragraph #15 where a deflection device for the 2000 gallon tank is mentioned and inquired about this. Mr. Lynam explained that the deflection device deflects the gas from the tank. It was noted that it is not needed for this system. The baffle serves the same function.

Ms. Carluccio inquired if the Board had any other questions. Mr. Berberabe asked about the TWA and referred to the project description on page 2-4 of the permit. The last line said that a 7580 gallon grease trap will be installed; the plan says 750 gallon. Mr. Lynan said that 750 is correct on the plan.

Ms. Carluccio asked if there were any other questions. She said the Board will not be able to move ahead on this application this evening as the engineer needs to perform calculations and advise the Board how close he is to 2.08 for the disposal bed. An advanced treatment system needs to be considered to provide treatment for this "tight spot" on a commercial property for a nonresidential use. Moving the well will need to be considered to increase the distance from the system. Additional information regarding the manhole is requested as it needs to be watertight and provide access to the well. There must be a maintenance contract that can be filed for the pretreatment system and the grease trap (if there is one for the grease trap). Mr. Lynam referred to the stormwater plan that will be recorded with the County. He said he could do something similar with the pretreatment system but he can't file the contract as that would be proprietary. He suggested he supply the Board with a contract that would not be recorded. Mr. Tatsch explained that normally with a peat system the distributor for the manufacturer knows how to check the system, replace the peat, and how to monitor it. Mr. Lautenbacher said a contract could be provided. Ms. Carluccio said that service providers provide quarterly reports to the Board on these systems. Ms. Carluccio said there will be other conditions such as testing the water tank, installing a meter on the water well, and confirmation from the DOT that they will not be making any

improvements near the property line along with the other waivers the Board has already considered. The Board will be unable to move on this approval tonight.

Hearing no further questions from the Board Ms. Carluccio thanked the applicant and engineer for coming to the meeting.

On a question from the applicant Ms. Carluccio advised that the sooner the revisions are submitted the sooner they can be heard and that the Board meets on the 3rd Tuesday of the month.

C. New Business

1. Request from South County Soccer League to have a portable bathroom in place for the remainder of 2015 at the school soccer fields

The Board Secretary explained that the South County Soccer League (SCSL) has a portable bathroom at the school year round that does not have a permit; nor is it allowed more than nine months per year by ordinance. Mr. Wang-Iverson had requested the possibility of permitting this portable bathroom for the remainder of the year be added to the agenda. Ms. Carluccio said the SCSL would like to know if they have to remove the unit after nine months. According to the ordinance it would need to be removed. It was noted that it is more expensive to keep it the whole year while not in service. It was suggested the SCSL apply for a permit from March through November of this year and then remove the unit at the end of November.

D. Unfinished Business

A. Approval of Professional Contract – Hydrogeologist

Ms. Carluccio referred to the professional contract from the hydrogeologist, Peter M. Demicco with Ground Water Associates, which was e-mailed to all Board members. There are no changes in the fees.

Mr. Van Horn made a motion to approve the contract; Mr. Hamilton seconded it. All were in favor; the motion passed.

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

A. Education and Health Issues

Mr. Hamilton commented on the Rabies information (in the LINCS) being interesting.

B. Board of Health Budget Status as of February 13, 2015

Mr. Hamilton commented on 30% of the secretary salary being used. The Board Secretary believes this is because the Township is on a temporary budget.

C. Board Secretary's Report

Ms. Rosikiewicz reported that well testing will be the week of March 16th. Test kits will be mailed out the week of March 9th to residents in the study. The cost of each test is $50; seven kits were ordered. Mr. Hamilton will try and reach out to the home near the grit yard this weekend to ask them to rejoin the study. Mr. Tatsch recalled how in past discussions he recommended wells, including his, be dropped from the program. He explained that his well has a good record, the results have not changed, and it was designed as a background well. He does not believe the Board should spend the money to test his. Originally there were nine wells, there will only be seven with these two wells removed. Another test kit can be ordered if the well by the grit yard comes back into the program.

CORRESPONDENCE

There were no comments on any correspondence.

BILLS OF THE EVENING

Mr. Tatsch moved the approval of the bills of the evening, seconded by Mr. Van Horn. The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Being no comments from any public Mr. Van Horn moved to close to the public. Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Tatsch motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 p.m. Mr. Berberabe seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Rosikiewicz

Board Secretary