

## READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH

February 15, 2012

Chair William C. Nugent called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m. 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	absent
Beatrice Muir	present				

**Also Present:** Board of Health Engineer, Ferriero Engineering, Inc. representative Joe Kosinski  
Division of Public Health – not in attendance

### A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Minutes** of January 18, 2012. (- Butula vote).  
*Deferred.*

### B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. **HCDH LINCS** - 1/26/12 UPDATE: NJ Animal Rabies Cases by County and Species, Jan - Dec 2011
2. **HCDH LINCS** - 2/8/12 INFORMATION: 2012 Recommended Immunization Schedules.  
*This information is available through the schools and the pediatricians offices.*
3. **HCDH LINCS** - 2/8/12 ADVISORY: Salmonellosis Associated with Pet Turtle Exposures.  
[www.cdc.gov](http://www.cdc.gov)
4. **HCDH LINCS** - 2/8/12 ADVISORY: Recommendations for Diagnosis & Control of Pertussis.
5. **Block 39/Lot 53.18** – Letter dated 2/1/12 – EcolSciences, Inc., RAO – remediation.
6. **Block 39/Lot 53.18** – Letter dated 1/16/12 – EcolSciences, Inc., RAO – remediation.
7. **Block 62/Lot 1** – Letter dated 1/10/12 – NJDEP no further action.
8. **Block 19/Lot 3** – Letter dated 1/13/12 – NJDEP no further action.
9. **HCDH LINCS** - 2/11/12 ADVISORY: Potential measles exposure at Super Bowl Village on 2/3/12.  
[www.cdc.gov/measles/index.html](http://www.cdc.gov/measles/index.html)
10. **NALBOH** – membership info.  
*Ms. Butula stated that she would get back to Ms. Petzinger with any publications of interest to the board.*

### C. OLD BUSINESS

1. **Freeholders/Reorganization of the Dept. of Health** into the Division of Public Health in the Public Safety Dept.  
*Chair Nugent is working on a letter to the state. The board received an inquiry from the Raritan Twp. BOH. Ms. Butula stated that they had reached out to our board because they also have serious concerns. Raritan BOH has also spoken to the Lambertville and East Amwell Boards of Health who are both interested in attending if one of the freeholders comes to a meeting. They indicated that they would stay in touch. Ms. Muir noted that another possibility is to attend a freeholders meeting. They hold a public comment time that is open. Chair Nugent stated that is a great idea. The freeholders had been invited to attend a township meeting back in the fall, perhaps that could be revisited. Ms. Muir suggested that it may be a good idea to put something in writing, to reach out to the freeholder director and ask what is the process and plan as far as implementing a qualified Board of Health Director. Ms. Butula stated that, she would like to know if they intend to have the in-house attorney being the director of the public health nursing, and how they're going to be reporting, so that the boards can be kept up to date on their accomplishments. If their minutes could be posted more up to date, that would be helpful. Chair Nugent stated that as he is constructing a letter to the state, he will consider a letter that may be distributed to our Twp. Committee, and also a follow up to the Freeholders.*

### D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Rabies Clinic** – 1/28/12 - Readington Twp. Recycling Garage – 95 dogs; 40 cats.  
Dr. Dean Newton, Whitehouse Veterinary Hospital.  
Ms. Petzinger stated that the rabies clinic originally scheduled for 1/21/12 was rescheduled due to the weather, and was held on Saturday, January 28, 2012, with a very positive turn out.

## E. APPROVALS

### Category A. – Single Lots

*Heard at 7:25 p.m.*

#### 1. Block 50/Lot 28 – Erica Busch, Carver/Wind, Springtown Road.

Escrow fees paid 1/5/12, # 2805.

Ms. Erica Busch, NJ licensed professional engineer appeared before the board. Mr. Zarrus Wind also in attendance is the owner of the property at 31 Springtown Road, on which there is a 2 bedroom trailer. The property was for sale, on 9/29/11 a septic inspection was done and the tank was determined to be a homemade tank, made out of block which was leaking. They were unable to determine where the absorption field was. There was ground water at 16" where they probed. On 11/16/11, with Mr. Chalupa witnessing, 2 soil logs were dug, 1 to a depth of 104" where machine refusal was encountered, with more than a 48" zone of disposal, there was no mottling or seepage. The second soil log was dug to 100" where they hit machine refusal and again, non-soil fractured shale with an adequate (*inadequate* ?) zone of disposal with no mottling or seepage. A basin flood test was filled at 10:35, Mr. Apgar and Mr. Chalupa checked at 2:30, and it was almost empty. They decided to go back the next day and fill it the second time. During the night there was 1" of rain, water ran in off of the road to the basin flood test, the side caved in on one side and it silted up. Ms. Busch reported that it drained, Mr. Chalupa reported that it dropped 11". It was cleaned out, refilled, and the next morning it was dry, so it is her opinion that this area will accommodate a subsurface disposal system that will work. The applicant is seeking waivers from the board, to be 100' from the stream, they will be uphill from the house, and will need approval from the board for pumping. Because of the small lot size they can only be 10' from the property line instead of the required 15'. Also, they cannot meet the 10' from the toe of the mound to the property line. In addition they can only be 60' from the stream with the pump and septic tanks.

Chair Nugent stated that the proposed tank is 1300 gallons, and asked about the size, and if there were any intent to expand the number of bedrooms in the home?

Ms. Busch stated that it is a 2 compartment tank, which she prefers to use with pump systems, to allow settling.

Mr. Wind stated that there is no intention of adding bedrooms, 1 person has occupied this trailer since 2004.

Chair Nugent asked about the height of the mound and the reason for it?

Ms. Busch stated that they only dug to 100", that's the limiting zone. They mounded because they needed another 2', it is only 8.5' deep. The expected elevation of the mound is 19" on the high side. The mound can't meet the setbacks because of the telephone pole, the right-of-way and the trailer, and being 100' from the stream. The property is a little over an acre.

Mr. Wind stated that he would be open to looking into having the lines moved underground which would be more esthetically pleasing.

Ms. Busch stated that if the utility pole were put underground, the waiver for the setback from the property line, and for the toe of the slope to the property line, if the size of the bed were reduced for pressure dosing. The waivers for the septic and pump tank only 60' from the stream and the pump tank would still require waivers.

Chair Nugent asked if they would be able to slide the bed to the east and eliminate the closeness in proximity to the property line?

Ms. Busch stated that she may be able to meet the 15' but not the toe of the slope. The distance to the property line hasn't been calculated, but if it was reduced for pressure dosing, both could be met.

Chair Nugent stated that a previous discussion regarding reducing the bed size for pressure dosing, the township ordinance requiring the bed size to be calculated at 1.61 sq. ft./gallon/day, if that were reduced, would that allow the waivers for the closeness to the property line still be required? Within the township ordinance, state code allows increased bed size in challenging soils, allowing the administrative authority to increase the bed size to compensate for that.

There was some discussion of options for placement of a disposal system on the property.

Chair Nugent asked regarding the bed size, if it were reduced to the state minimum for standard, not pressure dosing, what would that do to the position, size, placement and proximity to property lines to the bed?

Ms. Busch stated that she could meet the distance to the property lines and was pretty sure she could meet the toe of the slope to the property line too, the 10' from the property line to the toe of the mound.

Chair Nugent asked if the board members had any other questions.

As there was no response, Chair Nugent asked if there was anyone present who had been noticed for this hearing. Mr. and Mrs. Esposito, 26 Springtown Road, Block 51.03/Lot 4 owners of the property adjacent to the property in question appeared before the board.

Their concern is the property line and its impact, because their lot, 29 Springtown Road, Block 50/Lot 29, is a possible building lot as well. If the neighboring septic system is too close to the property line, it may impact what they have to do with their property in the future.

Ms. Butula stated that buildings which are already established and already have septic systems in place that are not functioning, the goal is to make them better and safer for the community than they are. They have different requirements than a lot with a brand new structure would have.

Mr. Esposito stated that he has no objection to a new septic system being put on the lot, he just does not want it to impact his lot. If they are going to make it smaller, and take it away from the property line, that is fine. The present system has been used fully for years, with more than one person living there.

Chair Nugent stated that there are many environmental and mechanical aspects to a septic system that can alter its functioning in hours, days, years. Chair asked how far the man-made pond is from the property line.

Mr. Esposito indicated that the pond is about 160' from the property line. There is a stream running from the pond towards the subject property.

Chair asked if the proposed system would impact the pond.

Mr. Esposito stated probably not, the septic system would have to be pretty bad for that to happen.

Chair Nugent asked if there were any other concerns?

Mr. Esposito stated no, that was it.

Chair Nugent thanked Mr. and Mrs. Esposito for coming in.

Chair Nugent stated given the concerns expressed one of the goals might be better distance from the property line, what would the engineer suggest?

Ms. Busch stated that the best option would be to reduce the size of the bed, when they pressure dose it, it will be 15' from property lines, and 10' from the property line with the toe of the slope, and as a result, move the bed and the telephone pole. If the pole were moved, they may be able to meet the 15' from the property lines, but they couldn't meet the distance from the toe of the slope to the property lines.

Chair Nugent suggested that one goal is a better distance from the property line, a couple of ideas have been discussed, what would the engineer suggest ?

Ms. Busch stated that she felt the best option would be to reduce the size of the bed, when they pressure dose it. It will be 15' from the property lines, and 10' from the property line with the toe of the slope, and move the bed and the telephone pole. The ration may not have to be reduced, they may be able to meet 15' from the property lines, but not from the toe of the slope to the property line.

Ms. Butula stated that it has to be 10' from the property line, that doesn't change the fact that new construction has to be 50' away from neighboring septs. He would always have to be 40' away, but if they do that reduction he would have the standard buffer.

Chair Nugent stated that the language behind the state code and our code regarding setback applies bed to bed, not toe of mound.

Ms. Busch stated if they reduce the bed, they may be to keep the bed 17 or 18' from the property line. The toe of the mound won't be more than 10'. They will still use a 2 compartment tank.

Ms. Butula suggested that Ms. Busch consider an effluent filter.

Ms. Busch stated that it shouldn't be a problem. The filters do need to be cleaned, which is up to the homeowner to follow up on.

Chair Nugent stated that Ms. Busch should research the pole movement, bed resizing option and the relationship between the two. The recommendations should be presented back to this board.

Ms. Busch asked if the board would consider resizing the bed ?

Chair Nugent stated that the board is open to it, but they want to make sure the options of not resizing have been considered, and complying with that and eliminating as many property line waivers as possible.

Ms. Butula stated that she would like Ms. Busch to go back and do the actual work on it.

Ms. Busch stated they have to come back for the distance of the toe of the slope to the property line.

Chair Nugent stated that if the pole can be moved, what would the result of that be, and then if they are still

unable to achieve not needing the setback waivers to the property line, then look at reducing the bed size.

Ms. Busch stated that she will not be able to meet the distance of the toe of the slope to the property line, no matter what, because the slope of the ground is such that it will have to be built up on the one side. The one side is 43' out of the ground.

Ms. Butula stated that between the two designs, how much can they move the bed with one design vs the other and how much they reduce the lack of being away from the toe of the mound, the board would like to see those figures, and would like to see them.

Chair Nugent asked if Ms. Busch were clear on what they were asking?

Ms. Busch stated yes, and thanked the board.

Chair Nugent stated that the hearing for this application is carried to the next meeting, providing the proper documentation is submitted to the board.

Chair Nugent thanked Mr. and Mrs. Esposito for attending the meeting.

*Heard at 8:03 p.m.*

**2. Block 52.01/Lot 17 – Doug Fine, Bowser, Cole Road & Pleasant Run Road.**

**Block 64/Lot 34.01**

Escrow fees paid 5/24/2011, # 655 \$750.00.

Previously heard 12/14/11.

Mr. Doug Fine, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board representing the Bowser family. They are looking to expand their home and in doing so determined that the existing septic system would not handle an expansion. Soil testing and 8 weeks of ground water readings were done. 2 passing basin floods were done, a primary area and a dedicated reserve area are proposed in the back of the property. A wetlands investigation was done by Brian Cramer, and any transition area has been avoided. There are some tight spaces between the house and the property line and against the house to move the effluent from the house to the rear of the property. One of the obstacles was meeting the 50' setback, which would be a waiver, from the well, they were under the 100' but they were able to reconfigure, flowing from the house to the septic tank to a pump tank, downhill, then pump back up along the property line between the home and back up into the rear. In doing so, both the septic tank and pump tank will be > 50' from the existing well, eliminating the need for a TWA from the state, although still requiring the board's approval for being less than 100' as required by township ordinance, they still exceed state code.

Ms. Butula confirmed that this house has a treated well.

Mr. Fine stated yes, its an ultraviolet system.

Chair Nugent stated that it should be noted that the proposed system is a greater distance than the existing.

Mr. Fine noted that the proposed will pump twice. It is a gravity feed into the septic tank, which gravity feeds into a small 500 gallon pump tank with duplex pumps, therefore they don't need the reserve capacity. It will be pumped up to the middle of the yard, and then up to the disposal field. It reduced the horsepower needed in the pump.

There was some discussion of the required waivers.

Ms. Butula stated that Mr. Fine would have to be on site for the installation, and report back to this board.

Mr. Fine stated that the areas of concern are the close proximity to the house and the property lines which will be a challenging installation, but the adjustments have been made and it works from an elevation standpoint.

It is an old home built close to the property lines and road, but it will work. The proposed disposal bed is about 102' from the Pleasant Run, the pump tank and septic tanks are about 83'.

There was some discussion of the abandoned basin flood @A in soil log 2A.

Mr. Fine stated that he had discussed this with the witness, and determined that it wasn't moving as fast as the other test, so it was abandoned in favor of the quicker moving test.

Ms. Muir confirmed that it did not go to completion, so it was the witness' assumption that it failed.

Mr. Fine said yes, it was, and he would agree with that.

Chair Nugent noted that BF5A passed with flying colors and BF3B in the proposed reserve also passed.

Mr. Fine stated that they both moved very quickly, that's why they didn't try going back but he tried to stay as far away as possible, but they are somewhat constrained on that side of the property.

Chair Nugent asked what the distance was to the closest improvement on the adjoining property, B1 52.01/Lt 16?

Mr. Fine stated that he didn't have a measurement on that, but there is a house and garage between the well and the property line.

There was some discussion of why noticing was not required.

Chair Nugent stated that the focus was on the fact that the distance of the components from the property line was increased, making things better. In the original proposal it was 2.5 and 2.5 being moved out to 5. Now its 2.5 to 6 and 3.5 out to 16. Chair stated that since this is an improvement over what is there, he would be willing to make an exception.

Mr. Fine stated that there was communication between the neighbors as far as the well location, etc.

There was some discussion of the necessary waivers, the details are included in the motion for approval.

Chair Nugent stated that he had no further questions and asked the board if there were any?

There were no further questions.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 52.01/Lot 17, 133 Cole Road, Readington Twp., owned by David and Tanya Bowser, is currently a 5 bedroom residence. The map is titled Septic System Alteration Design for Block 52.01/Lot 17, Readington Twp., Hunterdon County, NJ, pages 1 – 13, dated 4/28/11, revisions 10/1/11, 12/21/11, prepared by Douglas Fine, P.E., surveyor was David Newton, P.L.S, dated 2/2011. Reports are from Ferriero Engineering, dated 6/7/11, 11/23/11, 1/11/12. Correspondence from Mr. Fine is dated 11/15/11, and 2/2/11. This is an alteration with expansion from a 5 to 6 bedroom residence. This will be a mounded soil replacement system with 2 pumps. For the primary, the engineering and field work was done on 1/5/11, soil log 1A @ 108", no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon, mottles @ 36" and below. Soil log 2A @ 72", no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon, mottles @ 32" and below. Soil log 5A @ 105", no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon, mottles @ 40" and below. Permeability test basin flood 5A @ 6.67', 1/5/11 – 1/6/11, passing results. In season ground water monitoring done 1/7/11 – 2/25/11 in soil log 5A, highest reading on 2/18/11 @ 77". Regional water determined for the primary by soil log 2A with mottling @ 32". For the reserve area, 1/5/11, soil log 3B @ 92", no seepage, no no hydraulically restricted horizon, mottles @ 42" and below. Soil log 4B @ 108", no seepage, no no hydraulically restricted horizon, mottles @ 60" and below. Permeability test basin flood 3B @ 80', 1/5/11 – 1/6/11, passing results. In season ground water monitoring done 1/7/11 – 2/25/11 in soil log 3B, highest reading on 2/18/11 @ 77". Regional water determined for the reserve by soil log 3B with mottling @ 42". A wetland water evaluation from Brian Cramer was done 11/16/2011 verifying 80' and 102' from the Pleasant Run, summarizing that this investigation concluded that freshwater wetlands and transition areas are located on the septic property and State open waters associated with Pleasant Run are located off site. Wetlands were delineated and surveyed on the property as illustrated on the attached site figure. The on-site freshwater wetlands would likely be classified as intermediate resource value and would be assigned a 50' wetland transition area by the NJDEP and do not contain threatened and endangered species habitat and tributary to non-trout water, therefore, this offsite State open waters would be assigned a 50' riparian buffer by the NJDEP.

Mr. Fine will supervise the installation and do a final inspection of this because of all the constraints and the unusual aspects of the installation of this system. A certification of this must be filed with the County, the engineers Certificate of Compliance will be submitted. Revision of 2/21/11 should be made on page 2 of 13, also, the revisions for pages 4 and 5 of 13 should be submitted to the Board Secretary. Also noted and discussed at this meeting, the information regarding Basin Flood 2A as witnessed by Mr. Chalupa and in agreement with the engineer was probably going to fail at 72"

but there is a 47' distance from 2A and 5A passed with good results, so the board feels there is no relevance between the two at this time.

There are waivers for 2 pumps which must be filed as a deed restriction with the County Clerk's office, a copy to be returned to this board's secretary. The homeowner should also be given the paperwork so that they are aware of the deed filing and the maintenance requirements.

5 waivers were requested for this property, 1) the well to the septic tank will be 71', in lieu of the usual 100'; 2) the well to pump tank will be 69', in lieu of the usual 100'; 3) the property line to septic tank at 6' in lieu of 15'; 4) the house to septic tank, 5' in lieu of the usual 10'; 5) house to pump tank, 5' in lieu of the usual 10' Waivers 4) and 5) are waivers from NJDEP 7:9A in effect 5/15 /95, page 20 on the Minimum Required Separation Distances, septic tank to occupied building 10' and pump tank to occupied building 10', which

allows the Administrative Authority to do give the waiver down to 5'.

Ms. Butula added that this is a wonderful step forward in light of all of the constraints, and that she admires both the property owner and the engineer for doing such a good job on this.

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

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

*Heard at 8:50 p.m.*

**3. Block 67.01/Lot 19.18 – Kurt Hoffman, Carey, Coopers Circle.**

Escrow fees paid 2/14/12, # 4124.

Mr. Kurt Hoffman, Kurt Hoffman Engineering, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is for Readington Township Block 67.01/Lot 19.18, 3 Coopers Circle. This is an existing 4 bedroom dwelling, no expansion, with a proposed system including soil logs 1 and 2, and basin flood conducted in soil log 2. The house is for sale. This is a preemptive measure for the sale of the home, the system is not failing at the home, or running out on the ground. There were some issues with it being full of water, and could fail an inspection when sold, so the homeowners decided to take action. This is a proposed gravity system utilizing an existing 1,000 gallon septic tank. There should be no waivers on this application. The septic system is going to be 37' to the closest property boundary, 20' with the toe of slope is 183' from the existing well. There are no neighboring wells on adjacent properties within the 150' septic circle as designated on the plan. Soil log 1 to a depth of 96", machine refusal, the lower horizon being non-soil red shale, tested with the basin flood from 40 – 96", in soil log 2 to a depth of 99", machine refusal @ 99", non-soil red shale from 42 – 99". The basin flood was conducted in soil log 2 at a depth of 66", with passing results.

Ms. Butula confirmed the 50 and 100' distance requirements for neighboring wells and septic.

Mr. Hoffman stated that is correct. On his plan, he utilized the property boundaries from the septic design by Van Cleef dated 9/22/76, and included a more recent survey dated 11/8/95 by Louis R. Polo, and the topography by Mr. Sniffin.

Ms. Butula asked if the existing septic tank is 35 years old, why was the decision made not to replace it?

Mr. Hoffman stated the tank appeared to be fine, there is an effluent filter on the existing tank, and everything appeared to be in order. It is a concrete tank, the baffle looks relatively new with the effluent filter added.

Chair Nugent asked the board if there were any further questions?

There were no further questions.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for Block 67.01/Lot 19.18, a 4 bedroom residence at 3 Coopers Circle, Whitehouse Station, Readington. The map is titled Septic Design for Jim Carey, Block 67.01/Lot 19.18, Readington Twp., Hunterdon County, NJ, dated 1/20/12, revision 1/31/12, prepared by Kurt Hoffman, P.E. Surveys are from Louis Puopopo, P.L.S dated 11/8/95; comment that they are working from a septic design from Van Cleef Engr., dated 9/22/76. A topo from George A. Sniffin, P.L.S. dated 1/16/12 is also included. A HCHD report is dated 2/2/11. This is an alteration with no expansion for a proposed gravity mounded soil replacement system. For the primary, and only area, done 1/2/12, soil log 1 @ 96", no mottling, no ground water, seepage, or hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 2 @ 99", no mottling, no ground water, seepage, or hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability is basin flood 2-1 @ 66", done 1/2/12 – 1/4/12, passing. There is no regional water, determined by the depth of the excavation. A wetland investigation and septic system replacement from Jeff Tariela dated 12/23/11 stating in conclusion it is their determination that no freshwater wetlands, freshwater wetland transition areas or state open waters were present within the proposed replacement septic system to be located on Block 67.01/Lot 19.18.

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

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

*Heard at 9:00 p.m.*

**4. Block 25/Lot 51 – Bayer Risse Engr., Kolmer, Dreahook Road.**

Escrow fees paid 2/1/12, # 9801.

Mr. Bill Jupinka, Bayer Risse Engineering, licensed engineer in the state of NJ appeared before the board. The proposed plan is for an existing 3 bedroom dwelling, the home built in the 1940's and the seepage pit portion and overflow lateral are original to the home. They are in failure and breaking out onto the ground surface, primarily due to age and full of sludge. The tank was replaced in 1998, permitted by HCHD. The tank is in the driveway, and the assumption is that it is load bearing. If the tank is water tight and functional it will remain, if not a new tank will be installed and will be guaranteed to be load bearing, moving it closer to the pump tank to have everything in one location would be a better choice. Testing was done in the back of the property, behind the detached shed. Two soil logs, one with a basin flood were done, the soils are primarily clay loam transitioning to a sandy clay loam to a very loose permeable shale. The basin flood fillings were both completed in a couple hours, in one day. There are no wetlands or wetland transition areas within 150' of that location, no wells or neighboring wells within 100' and no disposal systems or neighboring disposal systems within 50' of that field location. The system will include a pump tank, it is not a mounded system, but pumps up from the house to the field. The deed restriction, filing, and the maintenance will be discussed with the homeowner.

Chair Nugent asked regarding the tank location, what state code stipulation or ordinance states that a tank may or may not be placed in or under a driveway?

Mr. Jupinka stated that he was not aware of a stipulation, but you note whether there is anything over the tank, there are load bearing tanks for that reason, to be placed in the driveway. There is no way to get into that garage without going over the tank, and it has been there for 14 years and hasn't collapsed, so it is an assumption that the contractor put in a load bearing tank.

Chair Nugent asked if Mr. Kozinski was in concurrence with that?

Mr. Kosinski stated that is correct, and asked Mr. Jupinka if the tank was cylindrical?

Mr. Jupinka stated yes, it is.

Mr. Kosinski stated that the tank lends itself to being a load bearing tank if it is cylindrical because they usually carry more load than a rectangle tank.

Chair Nugent asked what the difference was between a regular tank and load bearing?

Mr. Kosinski stated that in a cylindrical tank, the difference may be nothing more than the lid going from 4" to 6".

Mr. Jupinka stated that it depends on the manufacturer, each one is a little different.

Chair Nugent asked the board if there were any further questions?

There were no further questions.

A **MOTION** was made for approval for Block 25/Lot 51, 3 bedroom residence located at 27 Dreahook Road, Readington Twp. The map is titled Septic System Alteration Design for Jeffrey Kolmer, Block 25/Lot 51, Readington Twp Hunterdon County, NJ, pages 1 – 10, no revisions, prepared by Stephen M. Risse, P.E. The survey is by Robert Watson, 5/15/90, with 1998 additions. Topo is from Charles Saladin, P.L.S. dated 1/24/12. Hunterdon County report is dated 2/2/12, for an alteration with no expansion. The proposed system will be a soil replacement bottom lined pressure distribution system with a pump. The primary and only soil testing was done 1/19/12. Soil log 119-1, @ 102", at which point the basin flood was done and extended to 126", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water and no hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 119-2, @ 128", no mottling, no ground water, no seepage, and no hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability was basin flood 19-1, @ 102", done 1/19/12, positive results. The regional is determined by the depth of the excavation. This requires a deed restricted pump system, with maintenance requirements, the information should be forwarded to the owner and after recording with the County Clerk, a copy provided to the Board of Health Office. This board agrees with Mr. Vaccarella that since approval is given, the design engineer must inspect the tank and provide a letter to the County and to this board stating that the tank is satisfactory and water tight because of its location underneath the gravel driveway.

This motion for approval for Block 25/Lot 51 was seconded by Ms. Albrecht.  
On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

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

Mr. Jupinka thanked the board.

**F. ADJOURNMENT**

A *MOTION* was made by Ms. Muir to adjourn at 9:15 pm, seconded by Ms. Butula with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger  
Board of Health Secretary