

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH MINUTES
November 14, 2012

Chair William C. Nugent called the meeting to order at 7:09 pm and announced that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting has been duly advertised.

Attendance Christina Albrecht absent Robert Colburn present William C. Nugent present Wendy Sheay absent
Roll Call: Jane Butula present Beatrice Muir present Tanya Rohrbach absent Donna Simon absent

Also Present: Board of Health Engineer, Ferriero Engineering, Inc. representative Joe Kosinski
Division of Public Health Public Safety Dept. – Deb Vaccarella

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Minutes of May 16, 2012.** (- Rohrbach, Sheay, Simon vote).
Deferred.
2. **Minutes of August 15, 2012.** (- Butula, Muir, Sheay, Simon vote).
Deferred.
3. **Minutes of September 19, 2012.** (- Albrecht, Muir, Sheay, Simon vote).
Deferred.

B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. **NALBOH – Newsbrief , 3rd quarter 2012.**
Noted: Pg. 3 – Affordable Care Act; Pg.10 #1 Cause of Preventable Death and Disease – Tobacco use.
2. **Block 67/Lot 19.42 – Letter dated 9/25/12 – NJDEP no further action.**
3. **Block 70.01/Lot 16.17 – Letter dated 9/26/12 – NJDEP no further action.**
4. **Block 67/Lot 19.15 – Letter dated 10/18/12 – NJDEP no further action.**
5. **Block 6/Lot 2 – Letter dated 10/1/12 – NJDEP Notice of Deficiency.**
6. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 9/13/12 regarding oil heating #2.
7. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 9/27/12 regarding oil heating #2.
8. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 10/3/12 regarding oil heating #2.
9. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 10/14/12 regarding natural gas.
10. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 10/17/12 regarding oil heating #2.
11. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 10/18/12 regarding oil heating #2.
12. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 10/18/12 regarding oil heating #2.
Ms. Vaccarella reviewed items 6. through 12. for the board.
13. **NJDHCDS – MMR week 40.**
14. **NJDHCDS – MMR week 41.**
15. **NJDHCDS – MMR week 42.**
16. **CJFHC – Presentations.**
Ms. Butula stated that this is a collaboration between the public health nurses in the county.
17. **NJDEP News – 10/15/12 – Fall activity for bears** www.njfishandwildlife.com
18. **HCDH LINCS – INFO: 10/19/12 - Pet food recall.**
19. **HCHD LINCS – Update: 10/24/12 – CDC issuance of guidance on management of asymptomatic patients who received epidural or paraspinal injections with contaminated steroid products.**
20. **FDA Statement on fungal meningitis outbreak. 10/18/12.**
21. **HCHD LINCS- 9/20/12 Advisory. Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Medication.**
22. **HCHD LINCS- 10/7/12 Alert.** 23. **HCHD LINCS – 10/4/12 Alert.**
24. **HCHD LINCS- 10/8/12 Update.** 25. **HCHD LINCS – 10/12/12 Hunterdon Emergency Notification System.**
26. **HCHD LINCS- 10/15/12 Update.**
27. **HCHD LINCS- 11/7/12 Info. FEMA Extended to all 21 NJ counties.** www.DisasterAssistance.gov
28. **HCHD LINCS- 11/7/12 Update. Immunizations, Vaccines and Public Health.**
www.emergency.cdc.gov/disasters/disease/immunizationqa.asp
29. **NJDEP release dated 11/6/12 – Emergency Order easing infrastructure repair permit requirements.**

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **10/20/12 – Rabies Clinic. 25 dogs, 20 cats were inoculated.**
Ms. Petzinger noted the number of animals attending the clinic.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Free Rabies Clinic – Saturday, Jan. 12, 2013, 10 a.m. – 12 noon, @ Recycling Garage, Mountain Road.**
UPCOMING FREE RABIES CLINICS: www.co.hunterdon.nj.us/health/rabiesclinics.htm#clinics

Ms. Petzinger noted the next free clinic is 1/12/13. In the event of inclement weather there will be a recorded message at 908-534-4051 ext. 234.

2. 2013 Dog Licensing fee increase to \$15.00 (\$18.00 for non-spayed/ neutered). Application forms available at www.readingtontwp.org or in person at the Municipal Building.

Ms. Petzinger noted that this increase is effective 1/1/12 and will be advertised in the Readington News and the township website.

3. Partnership - *Ms. Butula stated that the Safe Communities Coalition has been recognized as the best new Coalition in the United States. There is a ceremony in February in Washington D.C. Ms. Butula was interviewed as part of the key steering committee.*

4. Be a Hero Campaign for Designated Drivers – *Prosecutor Tony Kearns is promoting a program to encourage designated drivers. Upcoming meeting at the County Courthouse on Tuesday 11/20/12 at 12:00 noon.*

5. Hurricane Sandy - *Chair Nugent offered best wishes to all Readington Twp. residents having been through this very stormy season. If there are any questions of public health residents are free to contact the Board of Health secretary. Also, thanks to our Police Dept. and OEM, OEC and CERT organizations and to Readington Farms for the water supply. The response was very well done and very well communicated. Thanks to the Township Committee and Mayor Auriemma for their participation.*

E. APPROVALS

Category A. – Single Lots

time heard: 7:32 pm

1. Block 66/Lot 19.48 – Hoffman, Barletta, Powderhorn Road.

Escrow fees paid 9/25/12, #1037, \$750.

Mr. Kurt Hoffman, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This property is on the corner of Biggs Lane and Powderhorn Road. This is a failing system as part of a real estate transaction. It is a 4 bedroom dwelling. They are proposing a new 1250 gallon concrete septic tank and a 1300 gallon pump tank which will pump to 4 peat pods, this is a mounded system due to hard rock machine refusal and also a water table that exists on the property. This property is very limited with room that conforms to state code which lead to the reason to go with the type of system decided upon. Mr. Hoffman stated that he had additional information for the board, the certification that Bord Na Mona are certified units in NJ; Mr. Hoffman's certification to design these systems in the state of NJ; certification from the contractor for installation as noted in the County's 10/16/12 letter, items 1. through 16. Ms. Muir asked what variances were applied for and what are the distances for the drainage easement and also the gas line and the road?

Mr. Hoffman stated the zone of treatment is reduced as part of the peat moss system to 24"; the inlet there is a 100' circle noted, also from the inlet in the road; the 100' well circle is noted.

Chair Nugent noted that there is no waiver from state code, the only waiver from Readington Twp code is regarding the zone of treatment and the fact that it is an advanced wastewater treatment device and specific approval is required.

Chair Nugent asked why they were proposing a zone of treatment reduction?

Mr. Hoffman stated the decision was mostly esthetics, without reducing the zone of treatment grading would have extended onto the driveway and onto the front sidewalk, requiring additional waivers for distance of toe of slope to property boundaries and or a wall to catch grade along the driveway and walkway.

Chair Nugent asked why the peat moss allows the reduction of the zone of treatment?

Mr. Hoffman stated that the peat moss cleans the effluent sufficiently, per the State, to reduce the distance by 30".

Ms. Muir asked how often the peat moss filters need to be changed?

Mr. Hoffman stated anywhere between 9 to 12 years.

Ms. Butula stated that she would like the most recently revised version of that material in their pamphlet.

Chair Nugent stated that prior approved advanced wastewater treatment devices by this board have done 2 things differently from this design. 1) The board has always been concerned about the peat system failing and having to be replaced or just outright failed. The zone of treatment is usually the standard depth of zone of treatment so that they could fall back to old standards. That questions the reduction. 2) The absence of a distribution box in the lateral field raises the question of how the effluent partially treated gets into the bed and to be distributed throughout

the bed in sufficient distribution area to take advantage of the 2' of select fill?

Mr. Hoffman stated it is an open bottom unit so that the plastic unit, the effluent forced into it by the pump and then works through the peat, can exit the bottom of the unit into a bed of gravel and then out into the septic field just as if piping or closed units were used it will get into the stone and distribute across the entire bed.

Chair Nugent stated under normal bed size 20 X 50, 4 laterals, 40 or so feet in length, the overall square area of disbursement is pretty large, the 4 modules with holes out the side what allows for the liquid to be disbursed?

Mr. Hoffman stated with a gravity system you are putting the effluent into a distribution box running gravity from one end of the bed to the other. With the 4 pods evenly spaced across the field the effluent is pressurized into the 4 pods it is coming into the bed at 4 large locations. As far as distribution, it is probably better than with a distribution box where most of that effluent is entering the bed at the beginning.

There was some further discussion of the effluent dispersal.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the right most pod contains a sample chamber. Part of the maintenance is the sampling at the sampling chamber to make sure that the peat moss is doing what it should and can be sampled on the increments indicated in the maintenance contract.

Chair Nugent stated that the code allows for a reduction in the depth of the zone of treatment. What are the dimensions and dosing based upon? The depth of the zone of treatment and size of the bed have been reduced.

Why can't they have 4' zone of treatment?

Mr. Hoffman stated that the bed size is the same. There is impermeable rock at the bottom, machine refusal at 74", so they have to build up. The code allows for a reduction in the zone of disposal but with the testing done on the site it couldn't be done, a reduction is only allowed with a certain type of testing.

Mr. Kosinski stated you have to demonstrate that you have permeability of K3 or better.

Ms. Vaccarella stated and a certain soil classification rating which he doesn't have because he has massive rock.

Mr. Kosinski stated that one of the benefits of this system is the reduction in the height of the mound because it could be argued that mounds have greater potential to break out through the side of the mound when you are up 4' rather than 2'. It is advantageous to have the level of infiltration as close to the natural ground surface as possible. There was some discussion as to whether or not the board has ever heard an application requesting a reduction in the zone of treatment.

Ms. Muir stated that the board has a responsibility to the homeowner to make sure it is a safe and workable system, but also the board has to be careful to not set a precedent for these types of systems that do not meet code, because we do have bedrock shale in this township in abundance and it isn't always at 74", sometimes it is at 24".

Chair Nugent stated that his concern is that the reduction in depth is undermining the bed size increase. If the bed size increase compensated for our soils and the difficulties they present then it was intended to take advantage of a larger distribution capability which this particular design doesn't take advantage of.

Mr. Hoffman stated that is assuming that all the effluent is dropping down and out, in reality it is going to go down and disperse across the bed.

Ms. Butula asked if the homeowner were here and if she would like to speak to the board.

Ms. Melissa Martin, homeowner addressed the board. Ms. Martin stated that she and her husband are aware that it is in their best interest to have a system that works, they have read through the blueprints and read about the system online. It is their understanding that this system is better than a traditional system between the maintenance required and the monitoring that is done through the sample chamber seems better than a traditional system. By law, you don't have to report to the township, and there is maintenance to perform. If it were causing a problem in the environment, you would know it with this system, more so than the traditional system.

Ms. Butula confirmed that they understood the maintenance, deed restriction and requirements.

Chair Nugent asked if Ms. Martin understood the board's discussion so far.

Ms. Martin stated yes.

Mr. Hoffman stated that they had had several discussions about the proposed system.

Chair Nugent asked what other types of installations do the manufacturers approve in these circumstances.

Mr. Hoffman stated that you could utilize a closed chamber that pressure doses, but this system eliminates another pump, mechanical device and is in essence a pump to gravity system.

Mr. Kosinski stated that they are familiar with these systems and the advantages that they offer. The state has incorporated into the code giving the engineers the opportunity to utilize the system to reduce mounds, the size of disposal areas. There are applications for it, that is why the state has left it at the discretion of the administrative authority.

Ms. Butula stated that the board is looking for the following:

- 1) a pamphlet including their scientific data – latest version and the one most particular to this design
- 2) the owners manual; the regulators checklist
- 3) Mr. Hoffman should read the minutes and motions of the past two applications that are identical to this in the sense that there is no drip dispersal or anything connected with it. The motion will have to be fine tuned and is about 2 pages long, so Mr. Hoffman should be aware of that. The things from the guidance document will be included in the motion since they can't refer to it.

Chair Nugent stated he notice a reference to 'annual' maintenance and 'every 3 years' maintenance, if that could be clarified. Also a reference to adjoining wells 'if found', items 16. and 17, the 'if found' should be stricken.

Mr. Hoffman stated the pods need annual maintenance; the pump system is every 3 years. All wells and septic are indicated on the plan.

There was some discussion of the agenda for December 12, 2012. It was recommended that the engineer provide the data to the board secretary as soon as possible.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Hoffman to provide data or something to the board to convince them that this is why the peat module system will work better than a standard system.

time heard: 8:33 pm

2. Block 53/Lot 11 – Kearney, Kershules, Roosevelt Road.

Escrow fees paid 8/20/12, #213, \$750.

Mr. John Kearney, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This property is a 5+ acre lot extending northwesterly from Roosevelt Road, an existing 4 bedroom house and existing septic system with a new tank as of 2011. The soil tests were done 8/23/12, 2 soil logs and a basin flood test, the basin flood was rather quick. The proposed system is fill enclosed gravity fed, meets all of the distance requirements. There are no wetlands, the property is sloping and well drained.

Chair Nugent confirmed that page 1 indicates tax map sheet 15, Block 53 should indicate Lot 11. Note #18. No underground storage tank. Why was that added? And what is the name of the road that fronts this property?

Ms. Vaccarella stated that due to the fact that new construction well code requires the County to certify well location to UST's, that information is routinely added.

Mr. Kearney stated the Lot # is 11. The storage tank information is determined from the homeowner and is routine on the form. The name of the road is Roosevelt Road.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Kearney to give audible testimony to notes 1. and 2. on page 1. And is the current owner aware of the effluent filter maintenance?

Mr. Kearney stated with regard to distance to adjoining wells, there are no wells or septic on adjoining lots within 250' of the disposal bed or the existing septic tank. The next nearest house is to the east, about 250' closer to Roosevelt Rd., their well is adjacent to the house, about 350' from this proposed system. The house to the west on Roosevelt Rd. is about 1,000' away. Also, there are no wetlands or wetland transition areas on this lot or within 300' of this proposed disposal bed. The owner is aware that there is an effluent filter. The maintenance can be added to the plan. The manufacturer recommends that the filter be cleaned every time the tank is pumped or at least every 3 years.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any questions or comments from the board?

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 53/Lot 11. This application is by John Kershules, 11 Roosevelt Road, 4 bedroom residence. The map is titled Septic System Design for John Kershules, Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ, pgs. 1 – 4, 9/19/12, revisions 10/3/12, 10/10/12. Prepared by John H. Kearney, New Jersey Professional Licensed Engineer. A boundary and topo survey was done by Richard S. Zinn, PLS, dated 9/11 12. This is a proposed gravity flow, soil replacement, bottom lined system, alteration with no expansion. A report from Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 10/15/12. For the primary soil log 1 and 2, 8/23/12, soil log 1 @ 132", no mottling, no seepage, no groundwater. Soil log 2 @ 135", no mottling, no seepage, no groundwater. Permeability test is basin flood 1, 8/23/12, @ 132", passing. There is no regional water, the system is set at the depth of the excavation @ 135". Testimony was given regarding neighboring wells and septic systems and wetlands or transition areas. This system is not failing, it is a pro-active replacement and the current owner will be made aware of the maintenance of the effluent filter.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Colburn. On roll call vote the following was recorded:
Ms. Butula Aye Mr. Colburn Aye Ms. Muir Aye Chair Nugent Aye

Mr. Kearney thanked the board.

time heard: 8:51 pm

3. Block 74/Lot 30 – Busch, Cottrell, Lazy Brook Road.

Escrow fees paid 10/17/12, #3623, \$750.

Ms. Erica Busch, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board with the homeowner Mr. Cottrell who purchased the home in June 2012. Ms. Busch was hired to design a new system for them. This is a 3 bedroom home, no expansion is proposed. There is an existing well on about 3 acres with a wet weather ditch going through the middle. There is an easement to the right of the property which goes to a house in the back. There is a farm to the left of the house, with wide open fields. Soil logs were done with testing, soil log 1 had shallow refusal so they moved to the other side of the field where soil logs 2 and 3 were done, the design was based on soil log 2. Soil log 4 was done down the hill, there was shallow refusal with bedrock at 50". The pit bail test was 12.6"/hour, depth 113". The basin flood drained twice in 2.5 hours each. There is definitely fractured rock allowing the water to go through. The highest evidence of ground water was 62" due to mottling. A new 1300 gallon 2 compartment septic tank is proposed with a 1,000 gallon pump pit. The existing tank will be filled in and the lateral abandoned. They will pump across the wet weather ditch and encase the forced main in a 1X1 concrete encasement extending 2' beyond the embankment of the ditch which is about 5' wide.

Chair Nugent stated that soil logs 2 and 3 are outside of the bed.

Ms. Busch stated that soil log 2 is about 10' away, 3 is the pit bail test in the bed, 5 was the basin flood test, and wasn't dug all the way down. The pit bail was 12.6"/hour at 113", basin flood drained twice in 2.5 hours each. There is definitely permeable fractured rock allowing the water to go through. The highest evidence of ground water was 62" due to mottling.

Chair Nugent asked what the dimensions of the ditch were?

Ms. Busch stated 5 or 6' wide, and 1 or 2' deep, it is a shallow ditch. The bed is a mound and will extend 29" out of the ground on the low side and will blend in on the uphill side. The depth of the bed is designed to the depth of the basin flood test with a 4' zone of disposal and a 4' zone of treatment.

Chair Nugent stated that the new proposed tank is 66' from the existing well, and the proposed pump tank is 77'. What is the distance to the well from the existing tank?

Ms. Busch clarified that the distance from the well to the existing tank is 75'. The existing tank is really more of a pit with an overflow.

Mr. Cottrell stated that the existing system is 60 years old. When the home was purchased they were aware that the system was completely failing. Since they purchased the home, they have been pumping the tank every two weeks. Since that time, there have been no odors, and the ground has been dry, which is what they have been trying to maintain for their neighbors. There is an actual concrete tank but no lateral, its got an outlet going to a stone bed. When it was inspected it had an outlet going 2 – 3'. They have tested the well water and the results were perfect.

Ms. Muir stated that it was probably a stone or clay pipe that is now just disintegrated.

Chair Nugent asked why is the proposed new tank closer to the well, and could it not be placed at least as far away from the well as the existing?

Ms. Busch stated that there is a very big tree there and with the 20' from the property line and the proximity to the wet weather ditch, this was the best placement for the tank.

Ms. Butula stated if any other area was considered besides the location of soil logs 1 and 4?

Ms. Busch stated that they considered the right of the house, but with setbacks it would be right at the ditch.

Chair Nugent stated that the wet weather ditch was observed to not be a stream because it is dry during the summer months, why would something that is dry during the summer months indicate anything when that is normal? The concern is that the wet weather ditch may be a stream.

Ms. Busch stated that the wet weather ditch does not meet the definition of a stream.

Mr. Cottrell stated that the water in the wet weather ditch comes out of a basin.

There was some discussion of the wet weather ditch.

Mr. Kosinski stated the definition of a water course is any stream or surface water body or any ditch or subsurface drain that will permit drainage into a surface water body. This term does not include swales or roadside ditches which convey only direct runoff from storms or snow melting.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that the pond on the neighboring property is man-made.

Chair Nugent asked if that would be considered a water body?

Mr. Kosinski stated that it may be defined as open water, but it is unclear as to how that would be regulated.

Typically man-made ponds are not regulated if they have a drainage area of less than 50 acres, and certain other criteria have to be met. How that dovetails with this classification of this ditch as a watercourse is another issue and may require a qualified wetlands consultant to make that determination.

Ms. Muir stated that it is referred to as a swale on the survey.

Mr. Kosinski stated that a swale is typically a conveyance, and is typically not designed to hold water.

Chair Nugent stated his concern that this is being mis-perceived as not being a stream. That means that the set-backs have to be taken into account and proceed as if this were a water course. The fact that it terminates into a pond off property gives even more reason for concern.

Ms. Muir stated that Readington Twp. code setback requirement is 150' so a variance would be required. The state code is 100'.

Mr. Kosinski stated if this is the only site on the property suitable for the location of the system, then the requirement may be waived down to 100' for the bed. The board has the right to approve a system that is designed as close as possible to compliance with the state code.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Kosinski what the setback distances to a stream or septic tank are?

Mr. Kosinski stated the setback to a septic tank is 25' and a disposal field is 50' per state code. Readington code is 100' for both.

Ms. Butula confirmed that this proposed design is 83' from the septic tank to the wet weather ditch and 76' from the pump tank.

There was some discussion of the waivers that would be required if the wet weather ditch were defined as a water course.

Ms. Vaccarella asked Ms. Busch, the design engineer, if anything would change with the proposed design if this board considers this to be a water course?

Ms. Busch stated no it doesn't and the only additional waiver would be from the bed to the water course since they are already asking for the waivers from Readington Twp..

Ms. Busch stated that she has looked at the property and NJ Geo wetlands webmap, and there are no other wetlands or wetlands transition areas or other watercourses on the property within a 150' radius.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any questions or comments from the board?

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for Block 74/Lot 30, applicant Clifford and Karen Cottrell, 21 Lazy Brook Road, Readington Township, existing 3 bedroom residence. The map is titled Septic System Alteration Block 74/Lot 30, Readington Twp., Hunterdon County, NJ, dated 10/6/12, revision 10/23/12 prepared by Erica Busch, NJ professional engineer. Boundary survey is by Jay A. Stuhl, Jr. N.J.L.S., dated 6/29/12. Topographical map is by Wayne Jarivs, L.L.S. dated 10/3/12. Correspondence date 10/26/12 from E. Busch, well water test report, passing, dated 5/31/12, review letter by Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 10/31/12. This will be a 2 compartment proposed tank with an effluent filter, the engineer is proposing a solid cast tank, mounded soil replacement system, pump, the owner is aware of the deed restriction and maintenance involved with the effluent filter. The deed is filed with the Hunterdon County Clerk and a copy returned to the Board of Health office within 90 days. The depth of the well casing is unknown, the placement of the tanks in relation to the well is acceptable to this board. There are no septic tanks or wells on neighboring properties. For the primary, the only testing, done 10/3/12, soil log 2 @ 100", mottling 62 – 100", soil log 3 @ 113", mottling 62 – 70", seepage 101 – 113", flooding @ 99". Soil log 5 @ 67", mottling 62 – 67", 2 permeability tests, basin flood 1 10/3/12, passing; pitfall 1 10/3/12 – 10/4/12, @ 5.58', 12.6"/hour, @ 9.4'. Regional is 62" with all soil logs. There is no reserve area. The applicant has applied for and is granted waivers from Readington Township Code for distances from the pump tank 77' from the well; the septic tank 66' from the well; the septic tank 83' from the water course and the pump tank 76' from the water course. This is a failing system, the health and safety of the family is involved, as well as the neighboring properties in Readington Township. This board is allowed to waive the code for these reasons according to NJ State Code, 7:9A 3.3 E2 i.

This motion was seconded by Ms. Muir. On roll call vote the following was recorded:

Ms. Butula Aye Mr. Colburn Aye Ms. Muir Aye Chair Nugent Aye

Ms. Busch thanked the board.

time heard: 9:53 pm

4. Block 70/Lot 22.01 – Fine Engineering, Conner, Hillcrest Road.

Escrow fees paid 10/10/12, #1948, \$750.

Mr. Doug Fine, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is for 138 Hillcrest Road, the home is under contract for sale and the existing septic system was found to be saturated. Soil log 1 was done in the vicinity of the existing system and high mottling was found at 18" with very tight fractured shale, and machine refusal at 52", saturated disposal trenches approximately 30 – 40 years old. Soil logs 2, 3 and 4 were performed within the proposed disposal field. Soil log 4 was the basin flood test. Soil logs 2, 3 and 4 was much blockier, much more fractured shale, and was found to be suitable for a basin flood. Soil log 4 was set up at 56", 375 gallons of water was added, the first filling drained in about 5 hours, was refilled and was empty first thing the next morning. They identified decent soils, good permeability via the basin flood, some soil logs without mottles. Fractured rock substratum was found at shallow depths, but no sign of ground water and no mottling. There was rather shallow machine refusal but well drained. They propose to abandon the existing tank, pump it out, crush in place and backfill. A 1300 gallon 2 compartment septic tank will feed into a 1300 gallon pump dosing tank which will run a force main to the disposal field which is sized per requirement at 1.61 sq. ft./gallon/day, total excavation is 27' x 49.5' extending down to 78". There are map identified wetlands along the driveway with a small drainage ditch in a pipe along the driveway. There are no other wetlands within 50' of the proposed system. The existing well is shown and no other existing wells or septic systems within 150' of the proposed septic system. Chair Nugent asked the direction that the home faces, since it is missing on the map?

Mr. Fine stated the house is facing north, and it was confusing to both himself and the witness when they were on site. The property lines on the rough witness drawing were somewhat off.

There was some discussion of the layout of the driveway and house on the property, and the location of the soil logs as indicated on the map.

Chair Nugent asked about the gradient lines, which indicate that they went up hill?

Mr. Fine stated they did, but not much. It is pretty flat out there. The appearance is that the laterals are lower. They are up at about 96 – 98, and the previous one is about 92 – 94.

Chair Nugent asked if the homeowner was advised about the effluent filter and maintenance? and the pump system maintenance?

Mr. Fine stated yes, she has been advised, and a poly lock 625 will last in between 2 – 3 year pump outs.

Ms. Butula asked if the new owners are also aware of the maintenance?

Mr. Fine stated the realtor involved has been communicating between them.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any questions or comments from the board?

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for Block 70/Lot 22.01, Susan Connor, 138 Hillcrest Road, Readington Twp. 4 bedroom residence. The map is titled Septic System alteration design for Block 70/Lot 22.01, Readington Twp., Hunterdon County, NJ, dated 10/9/12, revision pg. 3, 10/22/12, prepared by Douglas E. Fine, NJ P.E., boundary map from Peter E. Tamburini, 11/11/03, topo survey from David Newton, PL.S., 10/9/12. Report from Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 10/25/12. This is an alteration with no expansion, proposed mounded soil replacement system with a pump, 2 compartment tank with effluent filter. The present owner is aware of all maintenance and deed restrictions and has asked this to be passed to new owners. The primary soil log 2, 9/25/12, @ 78", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water. Soil log 3, @ 68", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water. Soil log 4, @ 78", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water. Permeability test is basin flood 4 in soil log 4, @ 56", 9/25 – 9/26/12, passing. Regional zone is determined by the depth of soil log 3 at 68". There is a deed restriction and pump maintenance requirement associated with this application. The deed should be filed with the Hunterdon County Clerk and a copy returned to the Board of Health office within 90 days.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Colburn. On roll call vote the following was recorded:

Ms. Butula Aye Mr. Colburn Aye Ms. Muir Aye Chair Nugent Aye

F. ADJOURNMENT

A *MOTION* was made by Ms. Muir to adjourn at 10:15 pm, seconded by Mr. Colburn with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger
Board of Health Secretary