

The regular meeting of the Board of Health was called to order at 7:31 p.m. Present for this meeting were Tracy Carluccio, Les Hamilton, Pauline Serafin, Larry Tatsch, Tony Berberabe, Bogdan Slecza, and David Wang-Iverson. Charles Van Horn was absent. Also present: Board of Health Secretary Christine Rosikiewicz and Dan Wyckoff from the Hunterdon County Division of Public Health.

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, this meeting was advertised as a regular meeting in the January 28, 2016, issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat. Notice of this meeting was forwarded to the Township Clerk's office, posted on the Township bulletin board, and sent to the Hunterdon County Democrat on August 3, 2016.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/AGENDA REVIEW

Under Hunterdon County Division of Public Health, add Remediation Project B. 41, L. 15 and 8/3 Letter from D. Wyckoff re: NJ DEP SRP Preferred Identification #627903

Under Preview Committee, add B. 34, L. 2.06 Discussion on Location of Proposed Alternate Treatment System.

Under Items of Discussion, Education and Health Issues, Hunterdon County Division of Public Health LINCS, add:

- 8/10/16 Public Health Update: Zika Virus Phone Script Update
- 8/15/16 Public Health Update: Burkholderia Cepacia Contamination of Certain Liquid Products
- 8/16/16 Public Health Info: Oriental Packing Co. Recall Due to Lead in Curry Powder

Under Correspondence for Hunterdon County, add 8/11/16 email from Lambertville City Clerk Cindy Ege re: Act Now to Stop PennEast

Under Bills of the Evening, add Ferriero Engineering, Soil Witnessing, B. 34, L. 2.06 - \$580.00

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES - July 19, 2016

Motion by Mr. Tatsch, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, and carried with three abstentions, Mr. Slecza, Mr. Berberabe, and Mr. Wang-Iverson, to approve the minutes with one correction on page 3, line 1, spelling correction of "percolation."

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Frances Gavigan, 123 Wertsville Road, spoke about round two of water sampling protocol by The Ridge at Back Brook being submitted to the Planning Board and a hearing that may take place in September. Ms. Gavigan looked at data in files but did not find any original approval or modification to the required twice a year testing in May/June and August/September. She said that this testing was stopped after the initial application and now they only do it in December. There was a lot of information on testing regiment in the files, which was discussed with Ron Myers at NJ DEP, where he is the head of enforcement. There was no escrow for review of data by Steve Souza, and in the absence of money, data

has only been recently reviewed. Ms. Gavigan did not believe that Mr. Myers was asked about his thoughts on the testing modification. She believed that this should be brought to the Board of Health's attention and discussed. She added that this should be correlated with the comments made a few months ago as to what was there in the past to make review easier. She mentioned scanned PDFs being available and that Zoning Officer Peter Kneski was involved with details. She mentioned that these changes won't sunset, that there is still December testing and lower frequency testing over time but she believed that there were still issues. She said that it could be argued that farmers are using chemicals and pesticides, but there was more depth and scope on this particular piece of acreage, and golf courses use a lot more over smaller areas, which break down sooner. If applied in April, it is unlikely that it will be there in December. Ms. Gavigan asked that the Board of Health take another look and reach out to Mr. Myers at the DEP and get his opinion before a modification or weakening of testing is considered.

Ms. Gavigan continued that besides the May/June, August/September, and December testing, there was a quick stream health test for macro-invertebrates, and she did not see the data for it. Additionally, the data and reports in the file from the most recent water expert for The Ridge did not have a proper chain of custody, i.e., the collector and submitter were the same person without secondary verification as necessary for a scientific review. She felt that basic standards were not fulfilled, and she also mentioned a 1998-99 reference to the same expert getting certification as a tester.

Mr. Tatsch explained that it is standard practice for a sampling technician to take a sample, seal it, bring it to a laboratory and sign off. Ms. Gavigan said that she would check on this again. She again asked that the Board of Health would read the record. Ms. Carluccio thanked Ms. Gavigan for her comments.

Ms. Carluccio said that the matter will come to the Board of Health for review. Mr. Tatsch said that this was already discussed and recommendations were made. Mr. Wang-Iverson said that there was a new application resubmitted. Mr. Hamilton asked about Ron Myers; Ms. Carluccio said that she originally "pulled him in." Mr. Hamilton mentioned Ms. Gavigan's comment about "a stack of documents not looked at"; Ms. Carluccio did not know about that.

Motion by Mr. Wang-Iverson, seconded by Mr. Tatsch, and carried unanimously to close to the public.

UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS

A. HUNTERDON COUNTY DIVISION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY – INSPECTOR'S REPORT

1. Owens (aka Woody's) B. 16, L. 11 – Update: Mr. Wykcoff reported that they are working on the final items, and there would be no further action. On a question from Mr. Wang-Iverson, Mr. Wykcoff said that the seven monitoring wells were decommissioned.

2. NOV 9/3/14, Hess/Speedway, B. 15.01, L. 2 – Update: Mr. Wykcoff said that there was some progress last Friday. There was a repair permit for a temporary holding tank sent to the Hunterdon County Health Department, and there are building permits sent to the Township for the entire project. A contractor has been assigned, and permits were submitted for approval. The project has been approved. The County will be inspecting the tanks, which will be pumped regularly; then the septic installation will

start. Once the tanks are severed from the bed, there is a 180 day window to install a system or shut down. The County postponed the court activity for a month because significant progress was being made. Russell Reid was hired as a pumper and a secondary pumping company from Fairfield was hired as backup if Russell Reid is not available.

Plans approved by the Township and the NJ DEP will not be changed. Ms. Carluccio asked about shutting down the business during construction. Mr. Wyckoff said this might happen during a two week period, but it was unclear whether it would be shut down entirely. He mentioned a lot of things going on, e.g., installation of a well, work on existing well, getting tanks on site in a constrained area, etc. He said that there would be a timeline closer when they call for inspections. Ms. Carluccio asked how often pumping would take place. Mr. Wyckoff said that there was a high water alarm for a full day of flow and 24 hours to respond. He hasn't seen the settings yet, but he added that once the alarm goes off, it auto dials Russell Reid. Mr. Wyckoff has the last pumping receipt for July and an August pumping invoice. He said that he would have more to report next month, but he believed that the holding tank repair would be within the next week.

Ms. Serafin asked if both the gas station and Dunkin' Donuts would be closed during the work. Mr. Wyckoff did not know, but he believed that the food service would be closed. He mentioned a well to be drilled out in the front, which may result in the gas station being closed. On a question from Ms. Carluccio, Mr. Wyckoff said that there would be a porta-potty for the workers, and they will have to apply for a permit per the ordinance.

3. Remediation Project – B. 41, L. 15: Mr. Wyckoff said that this was the Menchek property. There was a letter from LSRP about two separate groundwater samples, which shows no contamination by anything in the sheds. He has asked LSRP to copy the Township on any correspondence they send. There is a project timeline through 2021, and Mr. Wyckoff didn't know why it was so long. He will continue to monitor the situation, adding that he hoped that the Township would now receive copies of correspondence along with the County. He added that the County no longer inspects underground storage tanks. On a question from Ms. Carluccio regarding next steps, Mr. Wyckoff said that the soil would be removed only if it was contaminated. Water sampling was part of the package received, and Ms. Carluccio mentioned V.O. and lead.

Ms. Carluccio thanked Mr. Wyckoff for his report, and she said that she would make sure that Mr. Van Horn knew about this item.

B. PREVIEW COMMITTEE

1. Septic Alteration Application B. 12, L. 5: Charles Tiedeman, a Professional Engineer, introduced himself. Ms. Carluccio said that the preview committee met to discuss the application, and there is a letter from the County outlining waivers needed. Maps and soil tests were reviewed.

Mr. Tiedeman said that the property is 44 John Ringo Road and is .388 acres. Ms. Carluccio said that the size was not on the plans, and the Board would like to see this. Mr. Tiedeman said that there was a two, two-bedroom apartment building, which would require 700 gpd (350 gpd for each). The lot is 40 feet in

the back and 70 feet in the front. There is a driveway to the rear, where tenants park. There is currently a 1,000 gallon septic tank with a single lateral coming out the back with breakout coming out the lateral. This will be a "shoe-horn fit" system. There was a basin flood test at about 8 feet, and it flowed out in 12 hours, missing the 3 hour number that would reduce of size and design. He had to design a conventional system, and the design presented was a pressure dosed bed. There was a request for reduction in dimensions, including a request for reduction of two feet zone of disposal with sand and include four feet of treatment. On a question from Ms. Carluccio, Mr. Tiedeman explained that they could not dig past than what was dug for the basin flood test, so the bottom of the bed was stuck at eight feet. If a conventional bed was built at four feet of zone of disposal and four feet treatment and a foot of stone, he would have to a retaining wall of five feet because there was no room for slope. He was asking for a reduction of the zone of treatment and zone of disposal of 700 gpd and still maintain the driveway on the property.

The separation distance from an existing disposal bed was 72 feet, with that system previously designed by him in 1995 or 1996. There will be reduction from the well distance to the disposal bed to 82 feet rather than 100 feet. There is also a waiver requested from the septic tank to the pump tank. The well on L. 4 is greater than 100 feet from the septic field. Ms. Carluccio asked what direction L 4 would be; the engineer said on the left of the property. Ms. Carluccio located the property on the drawings for the benefit of the Board.

Mr. Tiedeman did testing last year trying to collect well data. A well inspection determined about 21 feet of casing. On a question from Ms. Carluccio, she was told that it was there prior to 1979. The requested waivers are on sheet two and are referenced in the Health Department's letter.

Ms. Carluccio said that the first waiver was for the basin flood test and two soil logs. She spoke about a tight sized lot so the system is on the narrow end of the property since the house is on the wider end, and tests could not fit elsewhere. Mr. Tiedeman said that the second waiver was for the disposal beds to be only 5 feet from the property line, less than the 25 feet requirement by the Township. The mound will be about 2 feet from existing grade with 1:3 slopes on the side. He did not anticipate an erosion problem with plantings and no velocity to cause the erosion. Ms. Carluccio did mentioned concerns with erosion in proximity to the neighboring lots. Mr. Tiedeman mentioned topsoil, seeding and stabilization. The disposal bed would be 82 feet from the existing well rather than the required 100 feet. Although the distance can be decreased to 50 feet if the well has 50 feet of casing, it only has about 21 feet. There is a proposal of an ultra-violet treatment device, i.e., a UV light on the water supply system.

Ms. Carluccio said that the preview committee had some questions about the wells. Mr. Berberabe said that they were curious about wells on the adjacent properties. Notes say being over 100 feet, but the Board of Health would like to see the wells located on the plans. Mr. Tiedeman could provide a sketch, and on L. 4 , it's about 50-60 feet from existing well on the subject property. Ms. Carluccio spoke about the radius of the wells, adding that it looked like that well could fall within 100 feet. She said that it was important for the Board of Health to know, and Mr. Tiedeman agreed to redo the plan. Ms. Carluccio said that this was a state requirement, and the neighbors would want to know to perhaps test their water annually. Ms. Carluccio asked about the two lots on the other side. Mr. Tiedeman could not place the wells there, but he thought that one was about 75 feet from the existing septic system; he would

add that on the new plan. Mr. Tiedeman then agreed to show the wells on L. 23, L. 6, and L. 4 on the plan. Ms. Carluccio said that a waiver would have to be included if they are closer than 100 feet.

Mr. Tatsch spoke about well distance arcs, showing distances to arcs and he found them confusing, pointing out a 100 feet on the first arc but it doesn't coincide. The first arc is 100 feet and the second arc is 50 feet. Mr. Tiedeman said that it was near the concrete pad. Ms. Carluccio suggested moving the 100 feet note on the new plan so the first arc doesn't look like a 100 foot arc. Mr. Tiedeman said he would do a separate plot with this information and the wells.

Mr. Berberabe asked about the UV light system, i.e., who will monitor, the landlord or tenants and how often. Mr. Tiedeman said that typically the landlord would do it. The tenant will tell the landlord if there was no pressure, and the light is part of the water system. Sometimes the light bulb goes out, and a red light comes on as a reminder to change the bulb. It is usually next to the pressure tank. Ms. Carluccio mentioned some concerns about a UV light being maintained properly. Mr. Tiedeman said that the water is tested periodically.

Ms. Carluccio asked the Board if they would want to have a UV light installed and tested regularly. Mr. Tatsch suggested it just be maintained. Mr. Tatsch spoke about the experience with the light at the municipal building and having water testing which may show the level of total plate count; when bacteria other than harmful bacteria, goes up, then the light is losing effectiveness. Typical replacement is once a year for those lights, and this would be a maintenance item. Mr. Tatsch said that the condition would be to maintain the UV light according to manufacturer's recommendations, which may be 6 months to a year.

Ms. Carluccio asked if the Board would want to require annual water testing since there are tenants. Ms. Carluccio asked Mr. Case if he lived there; he did not. Mr. Tatsch mentioned the deli in Ringoes and whether the state inspects and regulates rental units. Ms. Carluccio said that the state requirement for their jurisdiction is more than two tenants. Mr. Tatsch said that more than a certain number of apartments required a non-community water supply testing. Ms. Carluccio said that the Township could pass an ordinance for maintenance for these types of items not now under the Board of Health.

Mr. Tatsch suggested that the Board could require an initial test and require maintenance of the system, and he would be confident that there wouldn't be a problem. It would be up to the landlord to do due diligence.

Ms. Carluccio said that the septic tank will be 50 feet and the pump tank only 64 feet from the existing well and does not meet the 100 feet in the local code. Mr. Tiedeman said that he could not move it closer to the bed since the back slope is tight. The bed comes up to 82 feet. Mr. Tatsch spoke about testing the tanks for tightness; Ms. Carluccio said that this is a state requirement, and Mr. Tiedeman has a note on this.

Ms. Carluccio said that the disposal bed is only 42 feet from the neighbor's property on L. 6, which does not meet the 50 feet setback. She asked if there was a note on the plan that the other two properties were greater than 50 feet. Mr. Tiedeman thought that they had 50 feet from L. 23, and Ms. Carluccio

asked that a note be placed on the plan that they were greater than 50 feet or note their distance. Mr. Tatsch agreed that there was no other place to put the system, and something has to be approved.

Ms. Carluccio asked about the 24 inch disposal and an explanation of why it would work. Mr. Tiedeman mentioned a condition in the code that says if permeability rate is greater than two inches an hour, you can reduce the disposal bed and zone of treatment to 24 inches. This goes with a basin flooding test that runs out less than 3 hours. If he would put the four feet of treatment, there would have to be a five foot retaining wall, have to align it, and it would stick up out of the ground 4-5 feet with lawn maintenance being difficult. By reducing it to 2 feet, it will drain out, based on the basin flood test. The zone of disposal can be saturated, and it will work. There will be 4 feet of treatment that will treat the effluent before it reaches the zone of disposal.

Ms. Carluccio asked if the engineer could go from 4 feet to 3 feet instead of 2 feet; Mr. Tiedeman said that he would still need a wall around it at 3 feet. Keeping the profile down was the goal, and he spoke about logistics of squeezing the system into the lot.

Mr. Tatsch noted that if the system was bumped up 4 feet, there would also be a problem on the left side of the property getting a decent slope. Mr. Tiedeman again said retaining walls would be needed all around it, which would stick up out of the ground.

Ms. Carluccio asked if he thought about an alternate system in that it would not require as much space and a lower profile. Mr. Tiedeman said he could not use a peat system because it could not drain out within 3 hours. He spoke about advanced wastewater treatment systems (AWTs), saying he could use one to replace a septic tank with it, but an AWT for 700 gpd would be pretty big and still would need a pressure dosing tank. The pressure dosing tank for an AWT could reduce the zone of treatment to 18 inches and the area of application from 1.33 to .98 square feet per gallon per day. He did not consider one for this application, although it would be some minor benefit in the size of the disposal bed, but for 700 gpd he wanted a conventional pressure dosing for the septic tank.

Mr. Tatsch agreed that retaining walls would mean trouble for maintenance, and he would not like to see them. Mr. Hamilton asked how far the system would stick out of the ground with this design; Mr. Tiedeman said about 1 to 1.5 feet. Mr. Hamilton asked how high an advanced treatment system would stick out; Mr. Tiedeman said maybe 2 – 3 feet because the zone of disposal would have to 4 feet. Ms. Carluccio mentioned the concern of “building a bathtub.” Mr. Tiedeman said that this was not one. He mentioned a good basin flood test that drained in 12 hours. Ms. Carluccio asked about the advantage of the pressure dosing system; Mr. Tiedeman said that it reduced the area from 1.61 to 1.33 square feet gpd.

Ms. Carluccio called for any other questions, adding that the last waiver was the size of the bed based on 1.33 square feet instead of 2.08 square feet (sizing). She asked about flow calculations, noting two apartments with two bedrooms in each one. She asked if there was extra for the two kitchens or based just on the bedrooms. Mr. Tiedeman calculated 200 gallons for the first bedroom and 150 gallons for the second bedroom in the same residence for a minimum design flow of 350 gallons, and there were two units. He said he had 375 gallons for each of the two units, which was equal to almost a six bedroom house in his calculations. Ms. Carluccio confirmed that he added an extra amount in his calculations.

There were some comments made about the gallons, and Mr. Tiedeman said it was actually 350 gallons for each; Ms. Carluccio noted that the preview committee did acknowledge that this amount still included some extra gallonage in the calculations.

Ms. Carluccio asked about evergreens in the way of the system; Mr. Tiedeman said that they were 15-20 feet tall and would be removed. She noted that there was one lateral and asked about filling in the field. Mr. Tiedeman said that it would be abandoned in place; he's done this in the past rather than having a void in the ground when it was removed – as long as no sewage is going to it, it becomes inert. They may remove the distribution box. Ms. Carluccio confirmed that the tank would be removed and asked if the code allows a lateral to remain; Mr. Tiedeman said that there was no code that covered that. Engineers and regulatory authorities have the discretion. Mr. Hamilton suggested a note on the plan to remove the trees and tank. Ms. Carluccio looked for a note about removing the tank. Mr. Tatsch found a note on the plan that the existing tank and a lateral would be removed. Mr. Tiedeman then said that the lateral “will be pulled out.”

Ms. Carluccio mentioned that this is a malfunctioning system, and the state and local codes allow for waivers to make the system closer to compliance to state code than it is. Ms. Carluccio said that the Board could consider the waivers and add to waiver #3 that the UV treatment device be maintained according to manufacturer's instruction and that after installation of the UV treatment device a well water test was required. Mr. Tatsch added that it was a bacterial test taken by a certified laboratory. Mr. Hamilton spoke about the need for a passing water test to assure that the UV light is working. Ms. Carluccio added that a water test be done to assure that the system is working. Mr. Tiedeman asked for specifics for the water potability test and what parameters were being examined, i.e., coliform, etc. Mr. Tatsch said it was the standard potability test with total coliform, fecal coliform, and total plate count. Mr. Hamilton asked about bacteria and viruses; Mr. Tatsch said that the UV light will kill those, but the big concern is coliform and fecal coliform and their bacteria. Ms. Carluccio said that the letter should include the word “certified” before each of these tests. Mr. Tatsch added that the Board of Health should receive copies of these results; Ms. Carluccio added the words, “in a timely manner.”

Mr. Tiedeman will provide a plot of the well locations. Ms. Carluccio said that a condition of approval was a dimensional map; Mr. Tiedeman added some language, and Ms. Carluccio said it was a dimensional plot showing neighboring wells and septic systems with distances from the proposed septic system components (tanks and field). The Board would also like to see acreage on the plan as a number two condition, and a note on the plans that the trees will be removed (can be placed on the plan that shows the trees).

Motion by Mr. Tatsch for approval of this system with the waivers and conditions as stated. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wang-Iverson, and it was carried unanimously.

B. 34, L. 2.06 Discussion of Proposed Alternate Treatment System: Ms. Carluccio said that there is no application, but this is only for discussion. The engineer may come in next month with an application. Paul Harenberg, a licensed engineer in NJ, identified himself and said that he was here about the Frederick property. He provided the Board with a copy of a letter he submitted. There is also a plan for

the design. Ms. Carluccio explained why it was added for discussion tonight, but the preview will review the design prior to Board action in the future. It is hoped that the County letter will be with the application in the future.

Mr. Harenberg said that the property is located at 345 Rileyville Road, is 1.86 acres, and has an existing house with 3 bedrooms. The property owner was looking at putting the house on the market back in July and had a septic inspection done. He hired an engineer to design a new system. There is no breakout, but the field has less than 12 inches of dry area under the laterals. He would have to put a new system in to satisfy a buyer although the owner can continue to live there without doing anything. There is a buyer "lined up," so the process of the design is now in progress. On July 5, there were seven soil logs dug. The well is in the back and the existing system is in the front of the property with the house centered on the Rileyville Road lot. The driveway is on the left hand side and the septic is out front on the right hand side. Testing was done in two locations near the existing bed in the front and found topsoil, silt loam, and course fragments with silt loam fillings but no passing tests. There was one hole with a basin flood test, but others were dug to refusal. There were some areas where they did try basin flood tests with some water. In the rear yard two holes were dug on either side of the well violating the 100 yard setback just to determine if there was anything better in that area. Nothing on site passed. On an attempted basin flood test in the back, water did not move. The next day some soil samples were taken in case the owner wanted to pursue a drip disposal system, similar to designs the firm has used before. The topsoil came back with a K1 rating with 2.6 inches per hour. With everything looked at on site, including rock hardness, nothing was going down more than 81 inches with most holes less than that. The prospect of a traditional system is very low, so an advanced treatment system is recommended, and they are designing a Hoot system with a pressurized drip disposal placed on top of the topsoil and will work in select fill.

Mr. Tatsch asked if any mottling was found in the soil logs. Mr. Harenberg said yes, and a waiver being requested is mottling within 24 inches. There were 7 soil logs, and he provided depth for each: soil log #1 - 18 inches; #2 - 31 inches; #3 - 28 inches; #4 - 14 inches; #5 - 13 inches; #6 - 22 inches; #7 - 28 inches. Not all of them made the 24 inches, but across the site there is an elevated high water table. Mr. Tatsch asked if there was any seepage into the pits; Mr. Harenberg said that one had slight seepage but not in the others. It was in soil log #6 away from the bed, but it was thought that it might be coming from the older bed.

Mr. Tatsch asked if a peat system was considered. Mr. Harenberg said the Hoot system was similar to a peat system, i.e., you would replace the aerobic tank with a septic tank and a peat system. This would be more expensive on the install, but it could be installed. On a question from Ms. Carluccio about choosing the Hoot System, Mr. Harenberg said he would recommend an advanced treatment system on this site due to the lack of permeability. The comparison is the Hoot aerobic v. the peat aerobic. The drip field itself is being proposed rather than a traditional bed. Mr. Tatsch said that the drip disposal will allow for evapo-transpiration upward and percolation downward, which would mean that the bed will not be as saturated. Mr. Harenberg agreed, adding that it was controlled dosing; with a traditional system, there may be 125 gallons at a time sent through. This is dispersing 12 times a day and each bed six times a day, which is less. Ms. Carluccio spoke about a pre-treatment tank before it goes through drip-disposal. Mr. Harenberg said yes, and while it could be peat, Hoot is being proposed because it supplies the whole package. Ms. Carluccio said that the effluent was more liquid and free of solids and would eliminate

clogging. Mr. Harenberg said yes, and it was much cleaner. Mr. Hamilton asked how deep the disposal tubes were in the ground. Mr. Harenberg said 3 – 6 inches; they won't freeze because they are pressurized and go back to the pump tank by air pressure.

Mr. Wang-Iverson asked about marking the field so people don't dig up the system; the owner would have an As Built to show location of the system. Some discussion was held about putting a fence, flowers, etc. in the area to prevent this from happening. Mr. Tatsch said that a statement is usually in the deed that this system is installed and must be maintained without disruption. Ms. Carluccio asked if there were code requirements to have a statement about the system in the deed. Mr. Harenberg said yes, along with maintenance requirements. Mr. Tatsch recommended putting something in the deed, and Mr. Wang-Iverson asked about corner markers. Mr. Harenberg said something could be included, but questioned if someone wouldn't just rip them out. The field is going to be close to the tank in a less intrusive area on the property, but Mr. Harenberg was open to what the Board of Health wanted to do. Mr. Wang-Iverson thought that flush markers be used. The field gets 2 feet of select fill on top of soil, so that the owner would know it was there so flush markers would not be useful.

Ms. Carluccio reminded the engineer that there is a maintenance requirement with these systems, and the Board of Health has to keep a file on them. There are some snags with maintenance issues, so it is a responsibility for the Township. The goal is to protect the Township and the property owner.

Ms. Carluccio asked if there was a consensus that the engineer could come in with an application for the system at the next meeting. She said that the preview committee would be reviewing it, that a County letter should be received, and witness notes would be available. There was no objection by the Board members.

Mr. Harenberg said that there was a system like this proposed for 204 Mountain Road, which is currently being installed in case any Board member wants to see how the installation is done.

ITEMS OF DISCUSSION

A. EDUCATION AND HEALTH ISSUES

There were no questions about any of the items from the County, including the additions included earlier in the evening.

B. BOARD OF HEALTH BUDGET STATUS AS OF AUGUST 1, 2016

The budget is in line except the County hasn't sent their bill yet.

C. BOARD SECRETARY'S REPORT – None

D. GARDEN STATE LABORATORIES, 7/22 Water Report for Clawson Park is satisfactory.

CORRESPONDENCE

Two notices regarding the PennEast Pipeline hearings were mentioned. There is a hearing in Clinton tonight and one in Trenton tomorrow. Ms. Carluccio referenced the Township Committee's resolution about PennEast that was sent to the Federal Energy Regulation Commission last year, and in order for them to consider that resolution, it needs to be resubmitted during the public comment period for the environmental impact statement, which is happening through September 12. She suggested that the Board of Health pass a motion supporting the resolution and recommend that the Township Committee resubmit during this public comment period. **Motion by Mr. Hamilton, seconded by Mr. Berberabe, and carried unanimously to approve it.**

Bills of the Evening were approved on a motion by Mr. Hamilton, seconded by Mr. Slecza, and carried with one abstention, Mr. Tatsch.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

The secretary sent a notice of the deadline date for the VIP to Ms. Carluccio and Mr. Hamilton as an "fyi."

Ms. Carluccio mentioned that the Township will have a booth at the 4H fair from August 24 - 28, and there are still slots available for volunteers to cover.

Motion by Mr. Wang-Iverson, seconded by Mr. Berberabe, and carried unanimously to close to the public.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Wang-Iverson, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, and carried unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

Teresa R. Stahl, RMC/CMC
Municipal Clerk

Transcribed from the Tape

