

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH

June 20, 2012

Chair William C. Nugent called the meeting to order at 7:04 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 Christina Albrecht absent Robert Colburn present William C. Nugent present Wendy Sheay absent
Roll Call: Jane Butula present Beatrice Muir present Tanya Rohrbach present Donna Simon absent

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

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER – Mr. Robert Colburn was sworn in for a term of three years.

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. **Minutes** of May 16, 2012. (- Rohrbach, Sheay, Simon vote).
Deferred.

B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. **NALBOH – NEWSBRIEF** 2nd Quarter 2012.

There was some discussion on the articles as follows:

pg. 3. – Partnership for Public Health Law - Ms. Butula asked Mr. Vaccarella that this be passed on to the Medical Reserve Corps.

pg. 8 – Public Health Priorities – Alcohol Concerns – Ms. Butula stated that this is the primary concern of the Health Partnership Safe Communities for the next 3 years.

pg. 3. – E cigarettes – Chair Nugent asked that this be passed on to the Township Committee.

pg. 9. – The Model Aquatic Health Code – Chair asked that this be forwarded to the Township Committee and Code Enforcement.

pg. 10 – Introducing the NACCHO – Chair asked that this be forwarded to OEM.

pg. 13 – MRC Supports Million Hearts.- Ms. Butula asked that this be forwarded to OEM and that Mr. Vaccarella forward it to the MRC.

pg. 16 – A Good Man and a Great Story – Ms. Butula recapped the article; storytelling is a great communication tool.

2. **Block 63/Lot 53.08** – Letter dated 5/14/12 – NJDEP no further action.

3. **Block 51/Lot 25.01** – Letter dated 5/11/12 – NJDEP no further action.

4. **Block 11/Lot 10** – Letter dated 5/30/12 – NJDEP no further action.

5. **Block 64/Lot 27.04** – Letter dated 6/4/12 – NJDEP no further action.

6. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 5/17/12 regarding oil heating 2.

7. **Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 6/8/12 regarding gasoline.

8. **UNDNJ – News release** - NJ Poison Experts Warn About Concentrated Packets of Detergent.

Ms. Butula asked that this be sent to the schools and put on their list serve. Mr. Vaccarella will check that the distribution of this covers nursery schools.

9. **NJDHSS – May 2012** – Bird testing for WNV Surveillance.

Ms. Butula asked where Hunterdon County falls into this? Mr. Vaccarella stated that 3 birds have been tested since the season began in March.

10. **HCDH LINCS** - 5/12/12 Communicable Disease Service – MMWR week 19.

11. **HCDH LINCS** - 5/19/12 Communicable Disease Service – MMWR week 20.

12. **HCDH LINCS** - 5/18/12 UPDATE: Pertussis in Hunterdon County.

Chair Nugent noted the increase.

13. **HCDH LINCS** - 5/23/12 UPDATE: NJ Animal Rabies Cases 1/1/12 – 1/31/12.

14. **HCDH LINCS** - 5/24/12 NJ Communi-CABLE, Spring 2012 <http://nj.gov/health/cd/pub.shtml>.

Chair Nugent pointed out the link to the communication.

15. **HCDH LINCS** - 6/6/12 ADVISORY: Pertussis Cases in Hunterdon County.

16. **Onsite Management Advisory** – 5/29/12 – Official rules available online.

Mr. Vaccarella stated that Mr. Gallos went for this training. There is a power point that Mr. Vaccarella will forward to the board. Mr. Kosinski stated that he attended the training in Bordentown.

17. Division of Public Health Svcs. – letter dated 6/18/12 re: temporary food handlers’ requirements.

Chair Nugent asked Mr. Vaccarella if there were any reasons for concern if the County is not required to inspect pre-packaged foods, and a food handlers’ license would not be required ?

Mr. Vaccarella stated no there is no concern. A thorough investigation of this was done, and they believe that the items in that category of being self-contained/pre-packaged do not require an inspection. The County is asking to waive inspections of those establishments providing such items. A fee would not be collected and they would not receive a license. If the township wished to do so, a license could be issued, but an inspection by the County would not be done. They will continue to inspect the other vendors, but the self-contained/pre-packaged vendors wouldn’t be inspected.

Ms. Butula stated that that is under the purvey of other people who watch how they are packaged and shipped. Chair Nugent asked Ms. Petzinger how this would be implemented administratively?

Ms. Petzinger stated that each vendor fills out a food handler’s license application which requires a description of all food items that will be sold from their individual stand. The applications are collected by an employee of the festival, and for the most part submitted to the Board of Health office all at one time, with one check that covers most of the licenses. There are usually a few vendors that submit their applications and checks individually. The license certificates are then issued from the BOH office to the individual vendors and copies of applications are forwarded to the County in preparation for the inspections on the first day of the festival.

Ms. Butula stated that the license was giving permission from Readington Township for them to sell a food product, it really had nothing to do with whether or not they would be inspected. The County is in charge of what needs to be inspected.

Ms. Muir stated that she would bring it to the attention of the Township Committee. It is their purvey to say that they have to get a permit.

Ms. Butula stated that if the license requirement was dropped, there may be vendors at the festival that the health department are not aware of at all.

Mr. Vaccarella stated that the board could issue a license that would identify each vendor, but the fee covering the inspection could be waived.

Ms. Muir stated that the Township Committee would have to be aware of this, it may not have been brought to their attention yet.

Chair Nugent stated if this fee structure and the inspection is legislatively implemented, we do not have time to legislatively grant a waiver before the actual festival, so if Mr. Vaccarella would take the message back to Mr. Rainey that there may not be enough time to enforce this this year.

Ms. Muir stated that she still felt it would be a good idea to license and charge the fee, to ensure that there is a list of the vendors so that if there were a contamination issue, it would be possible to track them.

Chair Nugent stated there is the issue of the permit fee which covers the inspection by the county and if we cannot un-legislate that aspect of it, it obligates the township to continue to collect that fee, and the county to continue to perform the inspection, and issue the inspection certificate of health.

C. OLD BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Partnership – Ms. Butula stated that the Partnership is meeting on July 16, 2012 for the day. They will be collating the information with a statistian and a professional on the survey that was done. The focus groups to identify the 5 pressing health problems in the county.

2. New health officer – Ms. Butula met with the new health officer from Sussex and voiced the concerns of the board. He is hoping to post information on line monthly.

E. APPROVALS

Category A. – Single Lots

Heard @ 7:35

1. Block 39/Lot 11 - Parker , Nazaryk, Ridge Road.

Escrow fees paid 3/22/12, # 1911, \$750. Data mailed 5/16/12.

Mr. Steve Parker, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is for a septic system for a 3 bedroom home, the existing system is malfunctioning. There is a stream through the middle of the back

of the property limiting the area for a new system. The location chosen uses soil logs 2 and 3, and pit bail 1. The waivers applied for are the system being less than 100' away from the stream and the pond on the property. This will be a gravity system. A letter from the County asks for a waiver because the toe of the mound is right on the property line. In order to get the 10', the proposed system would have to be pushed closer to the stream and the pond. The field could be moved, but it would decrease the separation between the pond and disposal bed. The adjoining lot is a large piece of vacant land, the owner notified, and there should not be any impact to that property at all.

Chair Nugent asked if there were anyone in attendance as a result of the noticing?

There were 2 parties in attendance, Chair Nugent stated that public comment would be opened up shortly.

Chair Nugent asked about the proposed swale that would prevent the water from going towards the property line? Is that indicated on the map with the dotted line to redirect the water?

Mr. Parker stated yes on the uphill side of the disposal field, that would prevent it from running over the field itself. That is correct, as indicated on the map. The intent is to divert the water from getting trapped behind the mound and soaking into the ground.

Chair Nugent asked how the existing system is malfunctioning?

Mr. Parker stated that it is bleeding out onto the ground, the system is at the end of its useful life.

Chair Nugent asked why they didn't propose a repair rather than replacement?

Mr. Parker stated that they wanted to look at the soil logs, the surrounding soil conditions to make sure they didn't construct a system with the same problems as the existing system, for instance, a high ground water table. A new system will provide a higher level of treatment, filtering the effluent, there isn't an adequate zone of treatment below the system that is there now. The new system is an improvement for ground water quality in the area.

Ms. Muir asked if the existing system could be repaired?

Mr. Parker stated that his concern is if the system were repaired based upon the soil tests, it would not be providing the same level of treatment that the proposed system can.

Chair Nugent stated that the elevations where the existing bed is, is higher than where the proposed bed is located, wouldn't that afford more soil and a potentially deeper occurrence of regional zone, and reduce the height of the mound and possibly resolve the problem with the old system in that they may have depended on native soil as opposed to fill and if done with fill originally or redone now, wouldn't it adequately service the home and solve the concerns with proximity to the pond and property line?

Mr. Parker stated that they didn't get a full 10' soil log in any of the logs on the property, which would require an elevated or mounded system. Moving 20' uphill would probably not be drastically different than anything found in the soil logs, which means that it would require a mounded elevated system with a pump. Right now the proposed system is a gravity flow.

Chair Nugent stated that they would hear any concerned residents at this time for Block 39/Lot 11.

Ms. Annette Donofrio, 31 Ridge Road addressed the board. Her concern is the immediate proximity to the streams and pond. It may or may not affect her water, but all of the neighbors have wells, and the 100' guideline must have been established for a reason. By shortening the 100' offset, she is greatly concerned. Also, what steps will be taken to clean up the leakage from the current system?

Ms. Butula stated that the board considers the existing system vs the proposed system and their effects on the community.

There was some discussion of the number of bedrooms in the home.

Ms. Butula stated it is listed on the forms as 3 bedrooms.

Mr. Parker agreed that that is the information he received from the homeowner.

Mr. Ben Yusiewicz, 29 Ridge Road addressed the board, agreeing with Ms. Donofrio that the home has undergone an addition that appears to be able to support more than 3 bedrooms. Mr. Yusiewicz stated that he felt the first course of action would be a repair rather than a replacement of the whole system. His concern is the protection of the water systems in the area.

Ms. Butula stated that the board would consider the engineer's professional opinion as to the reason for a decision to replace rather than repair the existing system.

Chair Nugent pointed out that the term 'repair' not only means to fix the existing system, but also can mean to excavate the existing component and replace it with new fill, pipe, etc., but in a different location. The engineer this evening is presenting what is commonly referred to as an alteration which can mean in the same

spot, or a different spot. In this case, the engineer is proposing a different spot. If it were in the same place, it would be couched under a repair, and wouldn't be before this board.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Parker if the concept of an extensive repair was discussed with the homeowner?

Mr. Parker stated yes. In that location it would have to be a mounded system, there would be a pump required as well. What has been proposed seems to be a better solution than what is there now, and although it is closer to the water course, with the new technology, select fill, fill enclosed, raised system with an adequate zone of treatment below the disposal field is going to provide a higher level of treatment than the existing system.

Ms. Rohrbach asked if select fill could be put in the existing location?

Mr. Parker stated that repair is a replacement in kind of exactly what is there, you can't add more to it or it would be considered an alteration, which means you are changing what is there. Once you do an alteration you are obligated to bring the system closer to conforming to the code than what is there now, once you do that you have to ensure that you have the 4' zone of treatment, 4' zone of disposal, select fill material. That is when you get into the raised system with the mound and pump, etc.

Mr. Vaccarella stated with the ground water there at 34", by state code, you could not replace as is, you would have to mound it.

There was some discussion of whether or not there were wetlands on the property.

Mr. Parker stated that according to the NJ Geoweb website, there are no wetlands on the property. There is a watercourse on the property. The state has jurisdiction over this, and has to be approved by the DEP which is a GP25 permit. That permit can't be applied for until there is approval by this board.

Mr. Vaccarella stated that the proposed system is much better than the existing system, and does meet the 50' requirement from the water course.

Ms. Donofrio asked about the possibility of another location on the property?

Mr. Parker stated that they did look at other areas on the property. They didn't look across the stream because of the cost involved in crossing that stream, but they did look at other areas. Between the constraints on this 3 acre piece of property, soil logs 2 and 3 are the best ones on the property.

Ms. Donofrio asked what the next step in the process would be?

Chair Nugent stated that this board will vote to grant an approval to the application or not, if they approve, they will vote to grant the waiver which is the distance change, if that is granted, they would also grant approval for the applicant to submit a request for a GP25 permit to the NJDEP.

Ms. Butula stated that she would like the engineer to check with the tax office on the number of bedrooms, and also check with the Code Enforcement office on recent construction permits.

Mr. Parker stated that he hasn't been in the home, but is aware that there has been extensive construction.

There was some discussion of a conditional approval.

Chair Nugent stated that the applicant engineer has asked for a conditional approval based on the possibility that the house is as presented with 3 bedrooms. If in fact it is approved for more than that, the board's approval would be null and void. Would any board members be willing to make a motion on that?

There was no response.

Chair Nugent stated that the request was heard, and denied. Procedurally, because of the noticing, this hearing was opened up to the public, 2 homeowners stepped forward with concerns which were heard. This public notification is carried to the next BOH meeting, and no further noticing is required.

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

Mr. Colburn stated that it looks like a long run from the tank to the distribution box, is there enough pitch?

Mr. Parker stated yes, 2%.

Mr. Colburn asked if they were replacing the entire line or connecting to the existing line ? And what is the pitch of that line, and what if it is not 2%?

Mr. Parker stated that they are connecting to the existing line on the downhill side of the driveway. If it is not 2% they will replace it all the way back to the tank.

Mr. Colburn asked if they are going to put schedule 80 pipe under the driveway ?

Mr. Parker stated if they have to replace it they will. If they have to go back to the tank, it will be sleeved in schedule 80, a 6" sleeve around it.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Parker to give testimony on record for notes 38 and 41.

Mr. Parker stated that there are no wells within 100' of the proposed disposal bed and no septic systems within 50' of the proposed disposal bed. A GP25 will be applied for from the DEP because of the stream on the property.

The disturbance will be about 37' away from the pond. Any activity within a wetland or wetland transition area is regulated by the DEP and must be permitted by the DEP.

Chair Nugent asked about the riser to grade and the indication of concrete blocks, is there a sealant between those blocks?

Mr. Parker stated that it should be risers. The map will be revised accordingly.

Chair Nugent stated that the board office would obtain the information from the tax office, and thanked the members of the audience for their comments.

Heard @ 8:30

2. Block 42/Lot 46 – Busch , Intenzo, Scrabbletown Road.

Escrow fees paid 4/24/12, #2961, \$750. Data mailed 5/16/12.

Ms. Erica Busch, professional engineer in NJ appeared before the board. This application is for a 3 bedroom home with a malfunctioning system due to a home inspection for a real estate transaction. The home will be rented after the proposed septic system is in place. Mr. Intenzo had a well driller locate the well and determine the amount of casing, as indicated on the plan. A waiver is requested for the distance of the water course at 66' because soil logs 1 and 2 showed higher mottling. In order to go closer to the back right corner, there is no other place on this lot to put the system.

There was some discussion of the drainage easement.

Ms. Busch stated from the bottom of the ditch it is 66'.

Mr. Vaccarella stated you are looking from the center of the easement.

Ms. Butula asked how much disturbance is anticipated?

Ms. Busch stated approximately 45' – 47' in total width, leaving 60' from the center of the swale. The burn is about 6', and dry. It meets the 50' from the state.

There was some discussion of the type of drainage ditch/water course. The variance requested is from Readington Twp. code, not State code.

Ms. Busch stated in soil logs 1 and 2 high seepage was 27", mottling from 38 – 67". In soil logs 3 and 4 there was no seepage, mottling was 48". The basin flood was almost dry before they left, it is fractured shale. The distances from the existing tank to well is 108', to the proposed pump pit is 20', the well on the current map is inaccurate. Note 20 on the map should be changed. The disposal bed is 50' from the adjacent disposal systems and storm sewers and 100' from streams and wells.

The board determined that a corrected map could be submitted after a motion was made. There are 3 corrections, the accurate placement of the well, removing note 20 and correcting the date on the revision.

Ms. Butula asked if the owner was aware of the pump system requirements and deed restriction, and if this will be a rental, if the tenant has been instructed on the maintenance.

Ms. Busch stated that the owner is aware of it, and he intends to have an agent involved that will handle the maintenance for the tenant.

Chair Nugent asked if the homeowner is aware of and willing to comply with the pump and maintenance?

Ms. Busch stated yes, she has made the owner aware, and he has an attorney that will take care of the deed filing.

Chair Nugent stated that there has been notification on surrounding properties for this application, and asked if there were anyone in the audience here to speak to this application?

There was no response from the audience.

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

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 42/Lot 46, Albert Intenzo, 3 bedroom residence at 217 Scrabbletown Road. The map is titled Septic System Alteration, Block 42/Lot 46, Readington Twp, Hunterdon County, NJ, 1 page dated 4/6/12, revision 4/19/12, prepared by Erica Busch, P.E. Boundary survey is from Robt. Templin, 5/21/05. Topographical from Wayne R. Jarvis, P.L.S., 4/6/12. Report from HCHD dated 4/25/12. Correspondence from Robert Vaccarella clarifying one variance, no longer needed dated 5/1/12. This is an alteration, no expansion, malfunctioning system with a pump. Primary testing done 4/2/12, soil log 3, @ 134", mottling 48 – 58", no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 4, @ 140", mottling 48 – 61", no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability test was basin flood 1 @ 7.75', 4/2/ - 4/4/12, passing. Regional water is determined by the logs, mottling @ 48". This is a deed restricted pump system, filed with the Hunterdon County Clerk and a copy returned to the Board of Health secretary within 90 days. One variance from Readington Township ordinance is granted, the distance from the bed from the drainage ditch/water course @ 60'.

The engineer will provide the Board of Health and the County Health Department with the aforementioned 4 corrections on the map within 5 business days.

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

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

Heard @ 8:55

3. Block 52/Lot 4 - Hoffman, Caprara, Route 523.

Escrow fees paid 6/1/12, # 1450, \$750.

Mr. Kurt Hoffman, professional licensed engineer in NJ appeared before the board. This application is for an existing 4 bedroom home. The existing 1,000 gallon concrete septic tank will be used, a 1300 gallon concrete pump tank is proposed to pump the effluent to the new septic field in the rear of the property, utilizing soil logs 1, 2 and basin flood 1 in soil log 2. There are no waivers required, there are no septic within 50' and no wells within 100' of the proposed septic system. A letter from Jeff Tariela stated that there are no wetlands or transition areas within the septic area. A survey by Brunswick Survey Inc., 8/3/09 and topography done by Newton Land Surveying, 2/2/12 have been submitted to the board. Note #4. page 1. regarding the pump system and the filing of a deed restriction have been acknowledged by the homeowner.

Chair Nugent asked about the date on Form 3g; soil permeability on 3a is 60" then on the basin flood is 72"; is an effluent filter proposed for the septic tank?

Mr. Hoffman stated that it was a typo that will be corrected; 3a should be 60"; an effluent filter is not proposed on the plan.

Mr. Vaccarella stated that they try to upgrade the existing tank with an effluent filter if possible,

Mr. Hoffman stated that if it is a modern tank, the location of the center of the 24" hole is in the center of the tank, not over the outlet so it is physically impossible without extending the line to the center which then voids the distance requirements. This appears to be that type of tank.

Chair Nugent noted pg. 4 of 6, comments 19. – 21. regarding adjoining wells; comment 21.

Mr. Hoffman stated that there were no wells within 150', no septic systems within 150'; the homeowner hired Mr. Tariela to do the wetlands investigation.

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

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 52/Lot 4, application submitted by Katharine Caprara, 784 County Road 523, 4 bedroom residence. The map is titled Septic Design for Katharine Caprara, Block 52/Lot 4, Readington Twp, Hunterdon County, NJ, 2/27/12, revision 4/25/12, prepared by Kurt Hoffman, P.E.. A boundary survey from Brunswick Survey is dated 8/3/09, topographic by Newton Land Surveying, 2/22/12. HCHD report 4/30/12. This is an alteration with no expansion, proposed mounded soil replacement system with a pump. Soil testing done 2/13/12, soil log 1 @ 86", no mottling, no groundwater, no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 2 @ 90", no mottling, no groundwater, no seepage, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability was basin flood 2-1 in soil log 2 @ 60", 2/13/12 – 2/14/12, passing. Regional zone is determined and limited by the excavation depth. Wetland investigation report is dated 2/1/12, Jeff Tariela stating that no freshwater wetlands, freshwater wetland transition areas or state open waters are within 150' of the proposed replacement system. There will be a pump involved, the owner is aware of the pump, maintenance and deed filing requirements. Form 3g requires date and depth of basin flood revision and submission to the Board of Health and the County Health Department within 5 business days.

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

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

Heard @ 9:14

4. Block 70.01/Lot 17.02 - Hoffman, Bibby, Hillcrest Road.

Escrow fees paid 6/6/12, #3490, \$750.

Mr. Kurt Hoffman, professional licensed engineer in NJ appeared before the board. This application is for an existing 4 bedroom home, a septic inspection was done as part of a real estate transaction and failed due to septic effluent running out onto the ground, a true failure. Mr. Hoffman was hired to test and design an alteration septic system for this site. Basin flood 1, soil log 2 were done, two other test pits labeled TP1 and TP2. The system is proposed as a 1300 gallon 2 compartment septic tank with an effluent filter, with a proposed 1300 gallon concrete pump tank, pumping up to a distribution box with a mounded septic system in the rear of

the property. There were no wells within 100', no septic systems within 50' of the proposed septic field. A letter from Jeff Tariela stated that there are no wetlands or transition areas within the septic field area. A survey and topography map from Newton Land surveyors was provided to the board.

Chair Nugent asked if the existing tank to be backfilled is substandard, or just moving outside of the well circle?

Mr. Hoffman stated the issue came up with the code changes, possible leakage, with the topography and the water running through if there was any question of the tank being water tight, and there was infiltration, the brand new septic system would be ruined.

Ms. Butula asked if that conflicted with note 3?

Mr. Hoffman stated yes, note 3 should be crossed off.

Chair Nugent asked if the homeowner is aware of and willing to comply with the pump system, deed restriction and maintenance?

Mr. Hoffman stated yes, the homeowner and the purchaser of the home are both aware, and will comply.

Chair Nugent stated that there may be excessive depth to a substantially deeper zone of disposal, correct?

Mr. Hoffman stated that he possibly could have done the basin flood shallower and saved something on select fill, the issue was that the elevation that the test was done at was the best permeable elevation of the fractured soil that was out there. Typically for basin floods as they are excavating, he puts 1 gallon of water in every foot or so, at 4' it may look promising that they will get a test, they will put a gallon in, then at 5', etc. At the 84" depth was where they felt they had the best chance of a passing test. A hole was opened to the 50 square foot requirement and run the physical test.

Mr. Vaccarella stated that the code reads that at the depth of the basin flood test you have to have 6' above the depth basin flood test before your level of infiltration *inaudible*. Although you may save a little on the bottom, you are still going to raise it higher.

Chair Nugent asked regarding the filter in the tank, what is the service interval?

Mr. Hoffman stated he is working closely with Flemington Precast, and it should be done on a 6 month – 1 year basis. This is a 6" filter, he has already spoken to the homeowner about this.

There was some discussion about the service interval of filters from different manufacturers.

Mr. Colburn stated that there is additional information required on the tag that will be installed, the administrative authorities name, RTBOH, should be added, permit number from the County.

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

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval for Block 70.01/Lot 17.02, Norma Bibby, 4 bedroom residence at 102 Hillcrest Road. The map is titled Septic Design for Norma Bibby, Block 70.01/Lot 17.02, Readington Twp, Hunterdon County, NJ, sheets 1 – 6 dated 6/1/12, revision 6/6/12, prepared by Kurt Hoffman, P.E. A boundary survey and a topo map by Newton Land Surveyors, report from HCHD dated 6/7/12. This is an alteration with no expansion for a proposed mounded soil replacement system with effluent filter and pump. Soil log 1, @ 84", 5/9/12, mottling 36 – 84", no seepage, no ground water, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 2, @ 86", mottling 36 – 86", no seepage, no ground water, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability test was basin flood 1-1, 84", 5/8 - 5/9/12, passing. Regional water was 36" due to mottling in both logs. Jeff Tariela, report 5/25/12 stating that no freshwater wetlands, freshwater wetland transition areas or state open waters are within 150' of the proposed replacement system. There will be a pump involved, the owner is aware of the pump, maintenance and deed filing requirements, and also the maintenance of the effluent filter. The new owner will be made aware of this. Sheets 1 and 4 will be corrected and 3 copies submitted to the BOH office and 4 to Hunterdon County Health Dept. within 5 business days.

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

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

Heard @ 9:42

5. Block 62/Lot 16.03 – Bohren & Bohren, Melchione, Stanton Road.

Escrow fees paid 6/14/11, #213, \$750.

Mr. Robert Templin, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board representing Mr. Melchione, Block 62/ Lot 16.03. They are seeking soil log and permeability test approval. The soil tests were performed on 4/4/11, on Lot 16.03, soil logs 3 and 4 for the primary disposal area and soil log 1 and 2 for the reserve area. Soil log 3 was performed on 4/4/11, basin flood in soil log 3 @ 84", soil log was performed on 4/4/11, passing results. All the testing was done in a couple of hours, the permeability was very fast. The soil log was excavated to 120"

fractured rock substratum at 60", excessively coarse substratum at 32 – 120". There was no seepage, no ground water, no mottling, roots to 72", hard bottom with machine refusal, no limiting zones as far as ground water. 8 weeks of ground water monitoring was performed and no ground water observed in the monitoring well for soil log 3. This will be a gravity fed system, there is several feed of drop from the house to the proposed system. Soil log 4 was performed on 4/4/11, to a depth of 120", no seepage, no ground water, no mottling in the 8 weeks of ground water monitoring, fractured rock substratum at 60", excessively coarse substratum at 60 – 120". For the reserve area, soil log 1 was performed on 4/4/11, to a depth of 120", basin flood was performed @ 86", passing results on the same day, refusal was 120", fractured rock substratum was @ 32", excessively coarse substratum at 32 – 120", roots observed to 72", no seepage, no ground water, no mottling. Soil log 2 was performed on 4/4/11, to a depth of 120", fractured rock substratum was @ 36", excessively coarse substratum at 36 – 120", no seepage, no ground water, no mottling, and roots observed to 42". That was for the reserve area. This is a gravity system, there are wetlands associated with the small stream that runs across the property. The reserve area will be 45' from the 50' wetland buffer. There will be a 30' separation to the primary area. That will be 75' plus the width of the buffer from the wetland area.

The applicant engineer presented the board with a map of the wetlands.

Chair Nugent confirmed with Mr. Kosinski the set back requirement for intermediary resource value wetlands.

Mr. Kosinski stated it is a 50' transition area.

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

Mr. Colburn stated that the concrete distribution box is perfectly level on a 6" concrete slab, the code says the slab has to be down to frost level, or it is put on a stone bed. There is a 1300 gallon single compartment septic tank. Usually that size tanks are 2 compartment and have a filter in them now.

Mr. Templin stated that it will be below the frost line, modifications will be made for the County..

Mr. Kosinski stated that this was actually received by the administrative authority and his company prior to April 2, 2012.

Ms. Butula asked how they determined the intermediary value?

Mr. Kosinski stated it was on the last page, last paragraph, stating it was non-trout production waters, no threatened native species.

Chair Nugent stated for the record, the March 23, 2011 report stamped received June 14, 2011 is missing conclusion page 6.

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

There was no response.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval of Block 62/Lot 16.03 the applicant is William Melchione, Stanton Road, the number not yet designated. The map is titled Septic Design prepared for William Melchione, Block 62/Lot 16.03, Readington Twp., Hunterdon County, NJ, single sheet dated 5/31/11, no revisions, prepared by Robert J. Templin, P.E. . A topo map by Ryan G. Warford, P.L.S. dated 5/31/11, designated on the map is the wetland delineation prepared by Mr. Warford, was on the property 3/22/11, the report was received on 3/27/12. This board is working from the written delineation report for Block 62/Lot 16.03 of the wetlands, a report dated 3/23/11, received in the Readington Twp. BOH office on 6/14/11, per Mr. Warford, 'since the wetlands discharge into an FW2/NT-non trout bearing stream, and there were no threatened or endangered species observed at this site during the investigation, he would categorize the freshwater wetlands with an intermediate resource value with a 50' transition area. A report from Ferriero Engr. dated 6/23/11, 4/11/12 and 5/11/12. This is a proposed 5 bedroom home, new construction, gravity select fill system. For the primary soil testing was done 4/4/11, soil log 3 @ 120", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 4 @ 120", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability test is basin flood 1 in soil log 3, 4/4/11, 7', passing. In season ground water monitoring was done 1/21/12 – 3/10/12, all dates were dry. Regional water is determined by the depth of the excavation of the logs. For the reserve area, 4/4/11, soil log 1 @ 120", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Soil log 2 @ 120", no mottling, no seepage, no ground water, no hydraulically restricted horizon. Permeability test is basin flood 1 in soil log 1, 4/4/11, 7.16', passing. In season ground water monitoring was done 1/21/12 – 3/10/12, all dates were dry. Regional water is determined by the depth of the excavation of the logs.

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

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

The following application was not heard.

6. Block 62/Lot 16.04 – Bohren & Bohren, Melchione, Stanton Road.

Escrow fees paid 6/14/11, #214, \$750.

Chair Nugent stated that the application which wasn't heard would be listed second under the new construction applications on the July 18, 2012 agenda.

Mr. Colburn asked Mr. Kosinski about the Readington Twp. requirement for select fill in this last application Mr. Kosinski stated that the Readington Twp. requirement for select fill is superseded by the C33 requirement now, but this plan was submitted previous to that. Moving forward in the zone of treatment, C33 will be required per state code. If this is specific to the zone of treatment, which it may not be, it is probably specific to select fill that 25% value may still be applicable. In zone of treatment vs zone of disposal, zone of treatment has to be C33, per state code requirement. Select fill may be used in the zone of disposal at the engineers discretion and it would still have to meet the 25% sand requirement. The specifics of the code would have to be checked, if it is written that its specific to zone of treatment, it is probably just specific to select fill, it is probably more restrictive than the state code requirement because the state allows select fill in the zone of disposal. There was some further discussion of select fill.

F. ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger
Board of Health Secretary