

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH MEETING

September 15, 2010

Chair William C. Nugent called the meeting to order at 7:10 and announced that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting has been duly advertised.

Attendance Roll Call:

Christina Albrecht	present	William C. Nugent	present	Wendy Sheay	absent
Jane Butula	present	Tanya Rohrbach	absent	Donna Simon	present
Beatrice Muir	present				

Also Present: Hunterdon County Health Dept.: Debra Vaccarella

Not in Attendance: Board of Health Attorney, Stanley T. Perlowski, Esq.
Board of Health Engineer, Ferriero Engineering, Inc

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Minutes** of June 16, 2010. (-Albrecht, Sheay vote).

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Muir to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Butula.

On roll call vote, the following was recorded for approval of the 6/16/10 minutes:

Ms. Butula Aye Ms. Muir Aye Ms. Simon Aye Chair Nugent Aye

2. **Minutes** of July 21, 2010. (-Albrecht, Butula, vote).

Deferred to 10/20/10.

B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. **Block 56/Lots 3 & 6** – Hatch Mott MacDonald dated 8/17/10 - LOI within footprint of disturbance.

2. **Block 98/Lot 2.21** – NJDEP –dated 8/9/10 – UST No further action letter.

3. **HCDH LINCS** – dated 8/17/10 – Public Health ADVISORY – infection control and diabetes care.

4. **Block 97/Lot 2.04** – NJDEP –dated 8/18/10 – UST No further action letter.

5. **NALBOH** – 3rd quarter 2010 newsletter.

Ms. Butula asked that the article ‘Homeland Security Sector Encouraging Private Sector Preparedness’ be forwarded to the Chamber of Commerce.

6. **DHSS** – letter dated 9/7/10 regarding funding for hepatitis B inoculations.

C. SEPTIC REPAIRS

1. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 70/L 19.14. *Final Field 8/17/10*

2. Septic System Repair Approval from HCHD, B 55/L 13.26. *Final field 8/23/10*

D. OLD BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Readington Township Land Use Ordinance #22-2010.**

Ms. Vaccarella asked if this exempts septic systems?

Ms. Butula stated it seems that an existing system is exempt, but it is not clear on the installation of a new system and how it would fit into the 24” limitation.

There was some discussion of the intention of the ordinance.

Chair Nugent asked that the board engineering firm’s input be requested.

Township resident Bob Colburn addressed the board. Mr. Colburn stated that he agreed with this Ordinance about saving topography, he has spoken to the Planning Board, but he felt that they didn’t understand about building retaining walls. Some drainage has to be put behind the retaining wall and if you are limited to 2’, and there is an 8’ drop, you will destroy more vegetation by making 3 - 2’ walls than you will with 1 - 8’ wall, you may not be saving topography by doing that. The other thing is that you may not want a retaining wall around a septic system or mound system, because you need drainage, which is why you are putting in a mound to begin with, because you have poor drainage.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that you wouldn’t actually put a retaining wall around a septic field. A retaining wall would have to be approved by the BOH because it wasn’t meeting the 3 to 1 grade requirement.

Mr. Colburn stated it was his impression that this is only for steep slopes, and new construction, but he is not clear on their intention.

Ms. Muir questioned the fact that no one has addressed the mound systems that are greater than 2’.

Ms. Butula stated that this may be unclear as written because they may not have all the information that they need.

**2. Rabies Clinic – Saturday, October 2, 2010, 9:00 – 11:00, at Three Bridges Firehouse.
Distribution of ‘Pet Waste’ pamphlets.**

3. Partnership update.

Ms. Butula stated that this is a summary of events:

- 1) Dental Clinic – Zufall has received federal funding and expects a late 2010 opening.
- 2) YMCA – Health initiative program is in the planning stages.
- 3) Highlands Health Van – a new coordinator has been hired, and starts this month.
- 4) Action Team Updates, HPR safe communities coalition, 35 initiatives have been completed.

4. DHSS – funding for Hepatitis B inoculations.

The Board asked that this be forwarded to Ms. Mekovetz to determine any interest. Mr. Kerwin has also received a copy of this document.

F. APPROVALS

Category A. – Single Lots

Heard @ 7:40 p.m.:

1. Block 21/Lot 19 – Bayer-Risse Engineering, Cabellero, Weather Hill Road.

Escrow fees paid 8/10/10, ck#142, \$750.00.

Mr. Bill Jupinka, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This proposed alteration is for a 3 bedroom dwelling, with no expansion or change of use. The soil tests used in this design were before this board in 2003 as a part of a subdivision of this lot. That property was cut off and a location was tested on this lot, 19, in the event that an area was needed for a new system, which is where they are today. This is an estate sale. The current system is aged and doesn't function as well and is slow to drain. A soil log was done to confirm the findings from 2003, and no changes were found within the existing ground conditions. Mottling was found at 48", whereas the documented mottling in 2003 was 38". Groundwater was around 96", which was the same elevation as found in January 2003. The system will require a pump system, the entire system from the house out will be refurbished, new 1,000 gal. 2-compartment septic tank with effluent filter, pump tank and a mounded soil replacement system. There are wetlands and wetlands transition areas on the property which are documented on the property, none of the elements of the design will encroach upon these areas, note #1. Note #2. states there are no existing wells within 100' or disposal systems within 50'.

Chair Nugent asked if the future owners are aware of the deed restriction and maintenance requirements associated with that deed restriction, and the effluent filter.

Mr. Jupinka stated yes, they have moved in, and they are aware of and have discussed the requirements.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval of this alteration design for Vivian Caballero, Block 21/Lot 19, Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ. This was prepared by Stephen M. Risse, NJ Professional Engineer, the surveyor was Carl Herrman, dated 3/17/03, revisions 4/15/03, 4/17/03, 6/25/03 and 7/15/03. Correspondence from the HCDH is dated 8/5/10. This is an alteration with no expansion, mounded soil replacement pressure distribution system. Soil log 3, Soil log 4, Pit bail 4, 1/20/03 and 1/21/03, approval given 5/21/03 Board of Health meeting, motion by Mr. Krauth. A follow up motion was given to approve the soil logs and minor subdivision plan for Block 21/Lot 19 for a new reserve area for Soil log 3, Soil log 4, Pit bail 4 at 38", map dated 3/17/03. A new confirmation soil log, 614-1 on 6/14/01, depth 117", mottles at 48" and below, seepage at 98". Regional water is determined

at 38". The applicant is seeking approval for the pump, the new owners are aware of the requirements. The new owner is Michael Lorenzi.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Simon, on roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Albrecht	Aye	Ms. Muir	Aye		
Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Simon	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

Heard @ 7:50 p.m.:

2. Block 4/Lot 101 – Gladstone Design, Sblendorio, Halls Mill Road.

Escrow fees paid 8/16/10; ck#115, \$750.00.

Mr. Ed Herrman, NJ licensed engr., Gladstone Design, represented Ms. Sblendorio before the board. This property is on Halls Mill Road, in the vicinity of the Merck complex. The subject tract is 3.8 acres. There are some environmental constraints on the property. The existing septic system is malfunctioning, a home inspection revealed that there is a cesspool, a camera inspection determined that the water level was approximately 2” below the inlet of the tank. There is a tributary to the Rockaway Creek, also a tributary runs north and south, bisecting the back corner of the property as well. There is a pond on the property, in the center. There are three buildings on the property, the main building is located to the westerly side, there is a small shed behind that, and to the easterly side there is a masonry barn. This is located in the Research Office zone of the township, the intended use is an office for a landscaping business, it has been vacant for some time.

Ms. Maria Sblendorio addressed the board. Prior to purchasing the property she had the septic inspected, and was told that there is no septic, it is a cesspool which is full. The property has been renovated, the property is in a historic area. They are looking to possibly move their business there, or possibly rent it out.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Herrman how they proceeded with the design given that they weren’t sure exactly the number of people that would be working in the building.

Mr. Herrman stated that given the difficulties encountered on the site, they weren’t going to be able to put the full property to use as originally intended, using the barn and other buildings. The septic design capacity will be less than a 4 bedroom home, 550 gallons per day. The stated code requires the number as stated, or 15 gallons per day per employee.

There was some discussion of the history of the property.

Ms. Butula asked if there was a wetlands investigation done, considering the streams and pond on the property.

Mr. Herrman stated that according to the imap there are no wetlands on the site. Considering the lay of the land, it is hard to tell one way or the other, as indicated on the plans, they decided to go for a GP25.

There was some discussion of whether or not a wetlands investigation may be required for a GP25.

Ms. Vaccarella stated there is no continued occupancy requirement, so we could go from a building that is not used to a building being used with a malfunctioning septic system. Whereas they are being asked to go above and beyond with prior to the GP25 requirements, in theory, this property is best looked as being an actively malfunctioning system.

Chair Nugent stated that the GP25 would imply that you are in the buffer zone, however the design doesn’t indicate that the bed or the disturbance area was going to be in a wetlands located area. Why is the GP25 needed?

Mr. Herrman stated given the lay of the land, the environmental constraints and the amount of stream corridors going through there. They felt the GP25 would be insurance that if there are wetlands they would go through the state process.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that they have to put on the application that this is for disturbance of a wetland, therefore, approval is needed.

Ms. Butula stated that it was her feeling that this application is incomplete, there would need to be a wetlands investigation, and they would need to see the buffer zone on this map.

There was some discussion of the requirements of the GP25.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that the County would sign off on that.

Mr. Herrman stated that General Note #22. states that outside agency approval is needed.

Chair Nugent stated to refer back to the house, the witness notes indicated that it is a house, and that the 1 story masonry shed is a spring house.

Mr. Herrman stated that the property dates to at least 1800’s. The masonry shed was noted as a spring house previously, and the house was a farmhouse, not a commercial building. There was a continuing zoning approval for the office space granted in 2008.

Chair Nugent asked if there was any speculation of the number of employees, given the various uses that have been presented?

Mr. Herrman stated no, that the design would be based on the square footage of the building, which in an office use would be the highest intensity design use.

Ms. Sblendorio stated on any given day there are 5 employees present in the building.

Chair Nugent asked if there were a kitchen as part of the renovation?

Ms. Sblendorio stated yes, an office kitchen, there is no garbage disposal.

Ms. Vaccarella stated this applicant is very familiar with the regulations, due to a separate rental property.

Ms. Butula asked that Mr. Herrman give some detail regarding both sites for the soil logs and his reasoning.

Mr. Herrman presented a color map indicating the stream corridor, the pond, existing well, and existing cesspool. Four tests were conducted in the front of the property, the soil structure was reasonable; unfortunately, a basin flood test did not prove satisfactory. The back of the property was tested, there were suitable soils and they got a passing pit bail, however the groundwater monitoring rose up to 17" and 26" in the two logs. They decided to enhance the first test location with the highest mound possible, and oversized the system by 25% as a safety factor to provide the best possible chance for it to work.

Ms. Muir asked what the height of the mound would be?

Mr. Herrman stated 4'.

Ms. Muir stated there is a swale on the western side, and they are asking for a waiver from the watercourse offset to the disposal field, 100' is required and the proposed disposal field would be approximately 37' at its closest point to the existing swale along the western property line, could Mr. Herrman indicate where on the map?

Mr. Herrman indicated the area in question, and stated that there is a concrete drain pipe, it is basically a ditch, generally not a flowing stream. Water is collected from the other side of the road and transmits it under the road, onto the property, it runs down along the property line and ties into the existing stream.

Ms. Muir asked if the waiver was for the water course?

Ms. Vaccarella asked if the engineer was saying that he considered this a water course?

Mr. Herrman stated it is purely a rainwater function, so when you have a storm the water that collects is channeled away. They had defined it as a water course to be conservative.

Chair Nugent questioned that the basin flood that dropped about 1" in 18 hours, and how much would the bed be elevated? If the basin flood passed and a regional zone at 30", what height would the mound have been?

Mr. Herrman stated 4' above existing. If the basin flood passed, 2 1/2'.

There was some discussion of the existing cesspool.

There was some discussion of sewer capacity and existing sewer hook up in this area.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Herrman to clarify why you wouldn't want to cross the stream to get to an area that would perc, even if it is only 6" higher.

Mr. Herrman stated there are several factors involved, the regional ground water was at 17", the state flood hazard area requirements; the same as a category 1 stream which implies 300' buffers which would cover the entire property; the viability of constructing infrastructure in the back would mean a permanent structure under the stream which would be complicated and damaging to the stream. Also the amount of time involved in a flood hazard area, and the significant cost factor.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Herrman to put on record that this proposed system is more in compliance, or if not, what portions are not in compliance with the state code than the existing system; and if it would provide, absent of abuse, long term use.

Mr. Herrman stated the existing system is a cesspool, but under today's code cesspools are not permissible. Under 7:9A the ability exists for a malfunctioning system with no expansion, for the administrative authority to approve the system that is more in conformance than the existing system. Mr. Herrman stated that it is his belief that the proposed system is an improvement over the existing system and is the best system that can be put on this property.

Ms. Butula asked if the proposed system has been designed to the best of the engineer's ability for future service.

Mr. Herrman stated that that is a true statement.

Ms. Butula stated that there were some items that the board still required to make a decision; a topographical survey, the exact location of the well, a wetlands investigation report on all 3.88 acres, and the Board of Health Engineer to look at this.

Ms. Muir stated that she would like some additional information on the setback to the tributary to Rockaway Creek.

Ms. Butula stated that that information could be given with the wetlands evaluation, and also the Board of Health Engineer's information.

Ms. Butula asked if Mr. Herrman felt that he had done enough topography for installation on this map for design purposes?

Mr. Herrman stated for design purposes, yes.

Ms. Vaccarella confirmed that there was 1 ½' of elevation change, for this disposal field, and that it is more than enough.

Chair Nugent asked how the topo lines on the map were arrived at and who did them ?

Mr. Herrman stated they were taken from a record plan that was submitted to the Planning Board, it was the record map performed by a licensed surveyor.

Mr. Herrman stated when they go back to locate the well, they could add the topography to the map.

Chair Nugent stated that reference should be made on the revised map to the initial map and the surveyor, and at least one copy of the survey map should be provided for the Board of Health records.

Mr. Herrman asked what the board would like in the wetlands letter ?

Ms. Muir stated reference should include distance to the brook that runs south of the property.

Chair Nugent stated distance to the pond, the tributary, and the swale should be referenced.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that the County's letter didn't reference the brook to be a watercourse, the waiver that was referred to was for the distance from the tanks to the pond because of the 100' requirement.

Ms. Vaccarella asked if this were a monolithic tank due to the distance to the pond, or does Mr. Herrman feel that there needs to be special tanks since it meets state code?

Mr. Herrman stated that it is shown as a monolithic, but as stated the watercourse offset is only 25' and Readington Township code is 100'.

Ms. Butula stated that the proposed is 86.3.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any tests on the well ?

Mr. Herrman stated they did not believe any had been done at this point.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that as part of the private well testing act, the well should have been sampled at closing.

Chair Nugent stated since they are not sure exactly where the well is, in identifying the location, the board would like to see a passing potable well test.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that this is in standing with Board of Health past practice.

Ms. Butula stated that they would like to see a copy of the well test from the closing in 2008.

Mr. Herrman confirmed that the wetlands evaluation would only be done on the northwestern quadrant.

Chair Nugent agreed that that would be fine.

Chair Nugent stated that the soil log that encountered fill should be included on the map as well.

Chair Nugent stated that since this hearing was noticed for, that it is carried to the next meeting.

Chair Nugent stated that this would be reviewed by the Board of Health engineer, for feedback on the design and the overall proposal.

Ms. Albrecht left at 9:09 p.m.

Heard @ 9:15 p.m.

3. Block 61/Lot 19 – RBZ Enterprises, Inc. Berkley, Stanton Station Road.

Escrow fees paid 8/25/10; ck#3957, \$750.00.

Mr. Robert Zederbaum, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board with design engineer James Dougherty.

Also attending was the farm manager Tom Arch. The existing system at this residence was inspected and determined that some items were in violation of Readington Twp. rules and regulations, one of which was that the system is within 100' of the existing well, is within 300' of the South Branch of the Raritan River. Rather than repairing the existing system, it was decided to put in a new system. The property has a 3 bedroom structure, and a 1 bedroom structure, both of which will be tied into the proposed system. They will be pumped up to the northerly portion of the property, outside of the 300' buffer which was field measured from the top bank of the South Branch. It is a horse farm, the proposed design worked around the riding rinks and corrals

in the area, there are also some training areas and barns on the property. It is a very clean operation, good permeability and pit bail tests were conducted. The County review commented that this Board had to approve the soil logs and pit bail test, and approve the pump system.

Ms. Butula asked that Mr. Zederbaum testify that there would be no other uses of the proposed septic system on this property, other than the three bedroom and one bedroom houses.

Mr. Zederbaum stated there are no other facilities tied into the septic system. The waste from the horses is taken out by disposal companies. The facilities are strictly for human habitat.

Chair Nugent asked if there was any consideration in the design of the length of the delivery pipe?

Mr. Zederbaum stated other than making sure the pump was sized properly, it is somewhat long for a septic system, but not really for a sewer system.

Ms. Muir asked that Mr. Zederbaum explain the proposed burial area, and does it have to be approved by the DEP, and is there a setback area?

Mr. Zederbaum stated that when they will be going through some areas of the existing disposal bed, so any of that material that is excavated will be brought up and buried.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that it does not have to be approved by the DEP, and other than the 100' from the well there are no setback requirements.

Chair Nugent asked what the anticipated height of the proposed would be?

Mr. Zederbaum stated that on the high end it is on grade, on the low end it is at 197, they are going to 199.

Ms. Muir asked if the flood plain was indicated on the map?

Mr. Zederbaum stated the flood plain is within the 300' buffer, they designed it staying out of the buffer of the stream, the line is indicated by the broken line on the southerly side of the disposal bed.

Ms. Butula asked if there were enough topo information on the map for the HCDH and the location and installation of the septic?

Mr. Zederbaum stated absolutely, all the topo that is shown was field established by his firm, indicated by note 5.

Ms. Butula confirmed that the client is aware of the deed restriction and the associated maintenance?

Mr. Zederbaum stated yes.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any further questions from the board.

There were no questions or concerns.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval of Block 61/Lot 19, map entitled Septic System Alteration for Ken Berkley, Block 61/Lot 19, Readington Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey, 5 pages, dated 8/4/10, revision on 8/17/10, prepared by Robert B. Zederbaum, NJ licensed professional engineer. The surveyor was Frank Warren, survey done 6/1989. Mr. Zederbaum has note 5 indicating all topography and updated site locations including barns, riding rings, barns, corrals and access driveways were observed directly by him in July 2010. This is an alteration with no expansion, report from the HCDH dated 8/24/10, gravity dosed, fill enclosed system. For the primary, soil log 1 @ 132", 7/28/10, seepage @ 112", pit flooded 50" up in 48 hours, regional zone @ 82". Soil log 2 @ 120", 7/28/10, seepage @ 100", pit flooded 46" up in 24 hours, regional zone @ 74". Permeability was pit bail 1 @ 120", 7/28/10, results K2, which was 0.29"/hour. The regional water was determined by 3 day monitoring done on 8/2, 8/3, 8/4/2010, soil log 2 @ 74". The wetlands investigation by Jeff Tariela, Environmental Consulting is dated 7/21/10, summarizing "it is our determination that no freshwater wetlands, freshwater wetland transition areas or state open waters were present on or with 50' of the proposed replacement septic system to be located on Block 61/Lot 19. Monitoring done on those 3 days, 82" for soil log 1, 8/3/10; 73" for soil log 2, 8/2/10. This system will require a pump and the board has testimony that the owner is aware of the fact that a deed restriction will be placed on this at the Hunterdon County Clerk's office and a copy provided to the board secretary within 90 days. There is a maintenance program. The property is located at 526 Stanton Station Road, comprises of a 3 bedroom existing house and a 1 bedroom existing house. There is a difference in the 2b recordings, in soil log 1 the flooding 50" is from the base of the pit up, giving the regional zone @ 82". In soil log 2 flooding 46" is from the base of the pit up, giving the regional zone @ 74". An error was on the HCDH report dated 8/24/10, stating that the 50" should be 74".

The motion was seconded by Ms. Simon, on roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Simon	Aye
Ms. Muir	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

Heard @ 9:44 p.m.

4. Block 38/Lot 14 – J.H. Kearney Consulting Engrs., Colalillo, Pearl St.

Escrow fees paid 9/1/10; ck#3840, \$750.00.

Mr. John Kearney, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application for Block 38/Lot 14 is for a septic system alteration, due to an unsatisfactory septic system inspection for a real estate transaction. This is a 3 bedroom house, and the proposed system will be a soil replacement fully in ground system, about 810 square feet. Soil tests were performed on 8/9/10, two soil logs and a basin flood test. The soil logs were 168” and 148” respectively, both were dry, the first soil log was granular material with a small amount of rock. The second soil log encountered weathered shale.

Ms. Butula asked why the existing system failed.

Mr. Kearney stated the inspection due to the real estate sale revealed a cement block tank, which they had trouble getting through the line from the tank. The house dates back 50 years, and there is no record of what was installed there. There was no surfacing, but it is unknown where or if there are laterals.

Ms. Butula asked that Mr. Kearney testify to notes 18, 19 and the distance marked on the map of the proposed system to the neighboring existing system.

Mr. Kearney stated that the owner of the neighboring property identified where his field is and about 70’ from where they proposed to be, 189’. There are no underground storage tanks on the property, and no wells within 100’. The well on the adjoining property is 189’. Lot 13, to the east, the well is over 200’ away.

Ms. Butula asked if Mr. Kearney felt that the map provided has enough topographical info for the county?

Mr. Kearney stated yes, there isn’t much grade change there. For the record, they were unable to contact the surveyor, Mr. Prochoren, to obtain a sealed map.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any further questions from the board.

There were no questions or concerns.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval of Block 38/Lot 14, submitted by Michael Colalillo, 6 Pearl Street, Whitehouse Station, Readington Township, 3 bedroom house, map entitled Septic System Design for Michael Colalillo, Readington Township, Hunterdon County, New Jersey, dated 8/18/10, revision 9/1/10. The materials were prepared by John H. Kearney, professional engineer. A map survey from Gregory Prochoren dated 7/25/97. A HCDH letter dated 9/1/10, this is an alteration with no expansion, a gravity soil replacement bottom lined system. For the primary, 8/9/10, soil log 1, 168”, dry, no mottling. Soil log 2, 148”, dry, no mottling. The permeability test was basin flood 1, done 8/9/10 @ 112”, passing. A letter from Mr. Kearney dated 9/1/10 states an inspection was made of the referenced property and surrounding areas, there are no wetlands on the subject property. The soil logs extending to 14’ showed no water or mottling and are definitely not hydric. There are no UST’s or wells within 100’ of the new disposal bed, and gave distances to Lots 13 and 15.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Simon, on roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Butula	Aye	Ms. Simon	Aye
Ms. Muir	Aye	Chair Nugent	Aye

Heard @ 10:00 p.m.

5. Block 37.01/Lot 15 – Bayer-Risse Engineering, Zavoda, Pulaski Road.

Escrow fees paid 8/31/10, ck#1038, \$750.00.

Mr. Bill Jupinka, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This proposed alteration is for a 3 bedroom dwelling, with no expansion or change of use. The home is more than 50 years old, the current system is a single lateral trench in the back, and is inadequate for a 3 bedroom home.

The site is 9 acres, there is a pond on the property, and isolated wetlands around the pond. There is a 50’ transition area around that location. The location for the proposed system was chosen because it is more than 50’ from any neighboring system, there are no neighboring wells within 100’, including the onsite well. This location does not encroach upon any of the site features, and meets the 100’ minimum to the pond. Both soil tests showed mottling around the 6’ level, 72” below the ground surface. Ground water depth was 126”, pit bail rate was 17.7”/hour. With the grades, elevation and pitch of the pipe, a gravity system, soil replacement bottom lined system was maintained. The new septic tank will be a 1,000 gal. 2 compartment tank with an effluent filter,

both the current owner and purchasers of the property are aware of the maintenance for the filter. @ 144", mottling @ 72 – 76", seepage @ 126", and soil log 805-2.

Ms. Butula asked if there were any water facilities for any of the out buildings ?

Mr. Jupinka stated no.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 37.01/Lot 15. This application was submitted by Patricia Zavoda, executrix for the estate of George Zavoda, 49 Pulaski Road, Readington Twp. This is a 3 bedroom house, Block 37.01/Lot 15. The map is named Septic System Alteration Design for the Estate of George Zavoda, Block 37.01/Lot 15, Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ. This was prepared by Stephen M. Risse, NJ Professional Engineer, dated 8/30/10, 10 pages. The surveyor was by Charles S. Saladin, NJ licensed surveyor, dated 8/26/10. Correspondence from the HCDH is dated 9/10/10 This is an alteration with no expansion, the proposed system will be a gravity distribution system. Soil log 805-1, 8/5/10, @ 144", mottling @ 72 – 76", seepage @ 126", and soil log 805-2, @ 144", mottling @ 72 – 84", seepage @ 132", permeability is pit bail 805-1, 144", 8/5/10, results K- 17.7"/hour. Regional water is determined by soil logs 1 and 2 @ 72". Testimony was given by the engineer on wetlands and distances. This new system will have an effluent filter, the engineer has testified that the owners are aware of its maintenance.

G. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Muir to adjourn at 10:30 pm, seconded by Ms. Butula with a vote of Ayes all, Nays, none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger
Board of Health Secretary