

The regular meeting of the Board of Health was called to order at 7:32 p.m. Present for this meeting were: Tracy Carluccio, Les Hamilton, Bodgan Slecza, Pauline Serafin, Larry Tatsch, Charles Van Horn, and David Wang-Iverson. Tony Berberabe and Ted Peyrek III were absent. Also present: Board Secretary Christine Rosikiewicz.

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 May 13, 2015.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/AGENDA REVIEW:

There were no amendments to the agenda.

PRESENTATION OF THE MINUTES -April 21, 2015

Mr. Hamilton commented favorably on the minutes. **Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the April 21, 2015 minutes with the addition of the word "grade" on page 4 first sentence after the word "steep"; Mr. Slecza seconded the motion. All were in favor with Ms. Serafin abstaining. 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 – Dan Wyckoff

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

Mr. Wyckoff was not in attendance; he provided a written report which was provided to the Board at the meeting. There was nothing new to report on this item.

2. NOV 9/3/14 B 15.01 L 2 – update, 4/27/15 letter, 5/5/15 2nd NOV

Ms. Carluccio referred to the report from Mr. Wyckoff. The well on this property was last tested in March. The tanks were pumped on April 23rd; 2000 gallons were removed. Maser Engineering has acknowledged the second NOV and has made arrangements to have the well water tested as requested by the Board. It is unknown when the tanks will be pumped next; this should be made known. The Board has asked if the TWA has been approved and is awaiting the answer on this. The report states that Maser Consulting is forwarding the second NOV to Hess as it was returned unopened from Hess. The County will monitor the violation at the Board's request.

Ms. Carluccio reported that the County sent a letter to Hess and issued the second NOV right after the April Board of Health meeting. A letter was sent to the neighboring property owners advising that there has been another malfunction at the Hess property, that they had previously received a letter, and that the Board is recommending they have their well water tested and requested to be copied on the results. There were no responses from any residents the last time the letter was sent

but Living Waters Lutheran Church provided well test results that were within normal limits. It was noted that the church is the furthest property from Hess.

Ms. Carluccio provided the Board with a draft letter to Hess from the Board regarding the second NOV. She asked the Board to review it and provide any suggested changes to the Board Secretary via e-mail. The Board discussed who should receive the letter and determined it should be sent to Hess, as the property owner, and the County and owner of Dunkin' Donuts should be cc'd on it. The letter from the County that was sent to the owner of Dunkin' Donuts was returned to the County unopened. It was suggested the letter be sent registered mail.

Mr. Tatsch asked if it was known how quickly the tanks fill up and said last month's minutes stated that the County was asking for pumping to be done at least monthly. Ms. Carluccio said the Board had suggested it to be done daily. It is unknown if the County has the authority to require daily pumping of the system. Mr. Tatsch said the requirement should be reasonable while insuring there isn't another issue. The rate that the tanks are filling needs to be determined, and how frequently they reach a level to be pumped, so a time period for pumping can be determined. The receipt dates should coincide with this time period. The Board would like Hess to tell them what the usage is, there is no meter on the well. Installation of a meter had been requested by the Board but Hess didn't agree. At the time the Township did not have an ordinance to require a meter but the ordinance now requires non-residential properties to have meters. When the new well on the property is certified the Board will be able to require a meter be installed on the well. It was suggested Maser Consulting also be CC'ed on the letter as they responded to the County letter and tested the well water.

Mr. Tatsch asked if there was any response to the letters to nearby residents regarding well testing. Ms. Rosikiewicz reported that there have not been and that letters were sent to five residents and to Living Waters Church.

Mr. Van Horn inquired about the cost of the test for coliform. Mr. Tatsch said it is under \$50. Mr. Van Horn inquired if there were funds in the budget. Ms. Rosikiewicz advised that there were funds in miscellaneous and \$145 under sodium chloride well testing for funds that weren't used. Ms. Carluccio suggested the Board wait until the results come back from the Hess property. She explained that the water generally flows away from the residences. The homes are up gradient from Hess property so it is unlikely there would be contamination although the well tests should be done to confirm that on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Hamilton inquired about who is responsible for the septic system. It was agreed that the property owner is; this may be why the owner of Dunkin Donuts rejected the letter.

Ms. Carluccio said feedback from the meeting should be provided to Mr. Wyckoff. The Board would like to know what to do about the non-responsiveness from the property owner and owner of Ringoes Donuts. Mr. Wang-Iverson referred to a contact from Speedway that was in a Lehigh Valley Live article and said a letter should also be sent to Speedway. The article listed the Hess stations that would be changed to Speedway; the East Amwell location was on the list. He believes Hess isn't involved in the station anymore. Ms. Carluccio asked Mrs. Rosikiewicz to include this information in the letter to the County.

Mr. Hamilton inquired if Mr. Wyckoff will provide an update to the Board Secretary before the next meeting. Ms. Carluccio said he would.

B. Preview Committee

1. Septic System Alteration Application B 14 L 16.01

Mr. Paul Harenberg approached the dais. Ms. Carluccio advised that this application for a malfunctioning system with no expansion was reviewed by Preview Committee and asked Mr. Harenberg to go over it with the Board.

Mr. Harenberg said the home is owned by a bank; he was hired by a company that will be renovating the home. The home is a three bedroom residence located at 1049 Old York Rd on 0.4 acres. It is bound by the park in the rear, residences on each side, and fronts Old York Rd. The lot is long and narrow. The well is located right behind the house. The soil logs were done 100 feet away towards the rear of the lot. Four soil logs were done with pit bails along with two additional logs. Mr. Harenberg went over the soil logs which included fractured rock and exhibited a high water table. For this reason a pressure dosed mounded system is being proposed. Since the soil will be a few feet above ground a waiver is needed for the setback for the toe of the mound to the property line. A waiver is also need for the slope as it is proposed for 3:1 instead of 5:1. Ms. Carluccio referenced the County letter, where it indicates a waiver is needed for the 7.2 feet distance from the property line (the shortest distance), and noted that a waiver is needed for all three sides of the mound on the east, north, and west property lines. She asked Mr. Harenberg to clarify the distances to the property line for each side of the mound. Mr. Harenberg said there is 9.9 feet on the east side, 10.7 on the north side, and 7.2 on the west side. Ms. Carluccio asked about the implications of the slope with regard to erosion. Mr. Harenberg said the contours would be off the property if the slope was 5:1, especially on the west side. He further explained that once the property is seeded and grass is growing this part of the property will be higher therefore there will not be water coming through this area and explained how the water will drain on the property.

Ms. Carluccio asked if there were any questions. Ms. Serafin said the Preview Committee was interested in the well locations on the lots on either side of the property. She inquired about the proximity of the well and septic on the property on the left and the septic system and well on this property. Mr. Harenberg did not know the location of the neighboring septic system; the wells are shown on sheet five of the plans and are greater than fifty feet away from the proposed septic system. Ms. Carluccio asked the distance from the septic system on the property to the well on the neighboring properties. Mr. Harenberg said the exact distance is not on the plans but there are "circles" on the plans indicating that the wells are over 100 feet away from the proposed septic system. Mr. Tatsch said there is a 200 foot circle around the proposed septic system which depicts that wells across the street would be over 200 feet away. Mr. Tatsch asked if the proposed system was a conventional system. Ms. Carluccio said it is a mounded soil replacement gravity fed system. Mr. Tatsch noted that the two waivers go "hand in hand"; the system is close to the property line requiring waivers and the waiver for the 3:1 slope is because of the closeness to the property line. It was requested that the 200 foot circle on the drawing be removed for clarity.

Ms. Carluccio asked if there were any other questions. She confirmed with Mr. Harenberg that additional waivers for the septic field were not needed. Mr. Tatsch commented favorably on the design with consideration to the small lot. The old system will be properly abandoned and the septic tanks removed.

Ms. Carluccio explained that the Board can grant waivers when a new system is correcting a malfunctioning system with no expansion, the new system will be an improvement, and the new system is closer to code than what is there now.

Mr. Tatsch made a motion that the system be approved with waivers for the distance to the lot lines (9.9 feet on the east side, 10.7 feet on the north side, and 7.2 feet on the west side rather than the 25 feet distance that East Amwell requires) and the slope. Mr. Wang-Iverson seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion was carried.

2. Review of septic alteration application for B 21 Lots 8 & 8.01- Use of advanced treatment unit-replacement system – (discussion – not an approval of application)

Mr. Paul Harenburg is the engineer for this application. Ms. Carluccio explained that this application is for discussion tonight and not for approval. This application is for a new system on a small piece of property (.34 acres). There is a two bedroom home on the property which won't be expanded. A Hoot aerobic system is being considered. Ms. Carluccio said the Board is reviewing this application to determine if they agree that this is the type of system that would address the challenges on this property and whether a conventional system would work on the property.

Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Harenberg to walk the Board through the application. Mr. Harenberg explained that the property is located at 124 Amwell Rd; it is 0.34 acres. The property contains the two-bedroom residence and two parking areas (one small one in the front and a driveway with a garage in the rear). It is bound by residential properties and Amwell Rd. The property is currently listed for sale. The existing system was repaired ten years ago but failed inspection during a real estate transaction. Ms. Carluccio asked what was repaired. Mr. Harenberg reported that a new tank was installed and the fields were replaced. It was noted that the property is located on the right side of the road going towards Neshanic.

Mr. Wang-Iverson inquired about the tank and fields being replaced ten years ago and the system failing again. Ms. Carluccio commented on the property being challenging noting that the well is only 20.7 feet away from the septic system due to the small lot. The neighbors well is less than 100 feet away from the system. She explained the challenge of meeting any of the distances and noted that State code of fifty feet isn't even being met.

Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Harenberg to show on the map where the new field will be on the rear of the property. Mr. Harenberg explained that the goal was to put it in the rear of the lot as far away from the well as possible. Soil logs 1, 2, and 3 were performed there and resulted in high seepage in the soil layer but very little seepage in the fractured rock layer. The chances of a septic system working in the fractured rock layer would have been minimal. There is a very high water table in the rear of the lot. The only other open spot on the property is next to

the house and very close to the well. At Ms. Carluccio's request Mr. Harenburg outlined where the current system is on the plans.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked if the current system failed due to the high water table. Mr. Harenberg believed so as there was water in the first 24 inches. In addition the soil test showed mottling. Mr. Harenberg said there is high water all over the property. Ms. Carluccio explained that per the application the system is an alteration with no expansion or change of use with a malfunctioning system. The system is full of effluent and not draining at all. Mr. Harenberg further explained the soil log testing and different spots that were tried. There was seepage up top and down below. There was a fully complying pit bail test in soil log four which is close to the house and close to the well. Ms. Carluccio asked if soil log 5 failed. Mr. Harenberg said it did not fail, it is okay, and it was dug as the companion to soil log 4. The water table is roughly 2.5 feet higher on soil log 5.

Ms. Carluccio asked about moving the well. Mr. Harenberg said that would be the least desirable way for the homeowner to go due to cost but they can do it if they have to. Mr. Harenberg would rather use UV treatment. The neighboring lot is half the size; if the well was moved it would be closer to the neighbor's well.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked if there was fifty feet of casing on the well. Mr. Harenberg said the casing is unknown; the well is very old. Ms. Carluccio inquired about moving the well to the rear of the property. Mr. Harenberg said this is a possibility noting the septic system for the neighboring property is to the rear. In addition the existing system is in the rear of the property.

Ms. Carluccio asked about the Hoot system with regard to the high water table. Mr. Harenberg said that per state code you are allowed a reduction in field area and mound height with this system as there is cleaner effluent. The Hoot system has three chambers, aerates the water as a mini-treatment plant would, and produces cleaner water. Ms. Carluccio asked why this was chosen over a peat system. Mr. Harenberg said they are interchangeable but in this case this system, although more complicated, has fewer tanks than a peat system would. Mr. Wang-Iverson asked about the maintenance for an aerobic system versus a peat system. Mr. Harenberg said it is about the same noting that the peat requires maintenance. The aerobic system has a control panel for the aerobic panel and pump tank plus a sampling station. The aerobic system has more electronics than the peat system. Ms. Carluccio asked about the cost of the systems. Mr. Harenberg said they are comparable. Both have maintenance contracts which are comparable. Ms. Serafin asked what the annual maintenance cost for a Hoot system was. Mr. Harenberg said it is around \$300 a year. The tank comes with two years of maintenance included. The cost depends on the local dealer.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked if there currently is a UV light on the well. Mr. Noble said there wasn't; there is only a water softener. Mr. Harenberg said the well test came back negative except for arsenic. Ms. Carluccio asked if the well was up gradient from the system. Mr. Harenberg said the lot slopes towards the eastern corner; there is no high point. Mr. Tatsch asked about the arsenic level. Mr. Noble said it was 6.1. Mr. Tatsch noted that this is slightly above the state level but below the national level. Mr. Tatsch commented about the benefit of

having this baseline water test. Mr. Noble will provide the Board Secretary with a copy of the results.

Ms. Carluccio asked the Board if they had any other questions or ideas about what could further be done to protect the well. Mr. Tatsch commented favorably about the appropriateness of the alternative treatment system in this case. Since the peat and aerobic systems are comparable he will defer to the engineer to determine which would be better for the site. He recommended a UV treatment system be installed on the well to forestall any future problems.

Ms. Carluccio commented about the two lots, 8 and 8.01. They are joined on the deed so they are treated as one lot. She asked if they were both on the drawing. Mr. Harenberg said they both were. The garage is on one lot and the house is on the other.

It was decided by the Board that moving the well would not improve the situation as there is no bacteria in the water at this time and the property in the rear is saturated with effluent.

The Board agreed that the applicant could move ahead with an alternative treatment system.

C. New Business

1. Certification of Analysis- New Jersey Analytical Laboratories: Sodium and Chloride residential well results

Mr. Tatsch provided charts to the Board. He added the new data along with data from 2009 and 2014 but had difficulty putting it on the chart; he has reached out to Tim Martin for assistance as he composed the original chart. He hopes to provide an update next month. He referred to the 2015 results and explained that they are "pretty much in line" with past results. It looks as though there are no major increases in any of the samplings. Positive comments were made about being able to see the ten year history. The results have been shared with the Environmental Commission in the past. Once the graph is complete the information can be sent to them and also to Dr. Spade at the DEP. Mr. Van Horn inquired about one high chloride result in the first sample done at a property in 2006. Mr. Tatsch said this is because of a water softener at that residence. Subsequent samplings showed much lower levels. The Board briefly discussed the pros and cons of water softeners and the benefit of reverse osmosis systems.

2. 4/30/15 Memo from Margaret Pasqua, CFO re: 2015 Adopted Budget and Purchasing Procedures

Ms. Carluccio asked if there were any questions regarding this item. Mr. Wang-Iverson said the only issue with purchasing procedures that has come up with other boards is that volunteers make purchases and then solicit reimbursement from the Township. A purchase order is needed from the CFO before purchasing.

D. Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business.

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

A. Education and Health Issues

1. Hunterdon County Division of Public Health LINCS

a. 4/23/15 Update: Guide to Proper Handling of Bat Exposures

Mr. Hamilton commented on this article being interesting.

B. Board of Health Budget Status as of April 30, 201

Ms. Rosikiewicz reported that there are a few more food permits that have been issued this year then this same time last year. There has been a lot of interest in the food trucks. There have been septic systems to the County so far this year; this time last year there were only two. The soil log witnessing is about the same as last year.

C. Board Secretary's Report

The Board Secretary previously reported under the budget status.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

BILLS OF THE EVENING

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

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Van Horn moved to close to the public. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Van Horn motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. Mr. Tatsch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Rosikiewicz

Board Secretary