

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH
February 18, 2015

Chair Robert Colburn called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and announcement was made that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting was duly advertised.

Attendance Roll Call:

Christina Albrecht	present	John Kalinich	present	Tanya Rohrbach	absent
Jane Butula	present	Beatrice Muir	present	Wendy Sheay	absent
Robert Colburn	present	William C. Nugent	present		

Not in attendance: Division of Public Health
Board of Health Engineer, Ferriero Engineering

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. Minutes of 1/14/15. (*-Butula, Sheay vote*).

A motion was made by Mr. Nugent for approval of the 1/14/15 minutes as revised, pg. 3, 1st paragraph.

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

Ms. Albrecht Aye Mr. Kalinich Aye Ms. Muir Aye Mr. Nugent Aye Chair Colburn Aye

B. CORRESPONDENCE

- 1. Block 67/Lot 19.51 – Letter dated 1/5/15** – NJDEP no further action.
- 2. Block 93/Lot 21.01 – Letter dated 1/7/15** – NJDEP no further action.
- 3. NJDEP – letter dated 1/9/15** regarding ground water contamination site, Old Route 28.
- 4. Block 67/Lot 19.51 – Letter dated 1/15/15** – NJDEP no further action.
- 5. Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 1/17/15 regarding oil heating 2.
- 6. Block 44/Lot 24 – Letter dated 1/15/15** regarding RAO, Stavola Quarries, LLC.
- 7. NJDEP** – Notice of public hearing.

There were no comments regarding correspondence.

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. Minutes of 8/20/14. (*-Albrecht, Butula, Muir vote*).

The minutes of the 8/20/14 meeting have not been approved to date. They will be placed on an upcoming agenda for approval when Mr. Colburn, Mr. Nugent, Ms. Rohrbach and Ms. Sheay are present. An advisory memo will be sent to alternate member Ms. Sheay.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Resolution BH-R-2015-3.

A motion was made by Mr. Nugent for adoption of Resolution BH-R-2015-3 as written and presented by township counsel to this board's secretary for inclusion and passage in this meetings agenda.

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

Ms. Albrecht Aye Mr. Kalinich Aye Ms. Muir Aye Mr. Nugent Aye Chair Colburn Aye

E. APPROVALS

The following application has withdrawn from the agenda:

1. Block 62/Lot 3 – Kurt Hoffman, Attanasia, 75 Woodchurch Road.

Escrow fees paid 9/18/14, ck.#118, \$750.00

At 7:15 p.m. Chair Colburn recused himself from hearing the following application due to the fact that the applicant is an adjoining property owner, and had joined the audience as a resident.

Mr. Nugent assumed the role of Chair for hearing Block 56/Lot 9.

Time heard 7:20 pm

2. Block 56/Lot 9 – Parker Engr., Rayburn, 11 Thor Solberg Road.

Escrow fees paid 1/7/15, ck.#1047, \$750.00

Acting Chair Nugent noted that the original maps received by the board were dated 12/21/14, a revised map with no revision date was received for this application, identified by the BOH received stamp date of 2/6/15.

Ms. Butula noted that a request for a variance for the pump has been indicated, and is a waiver. There are different variances also requested, and will be approached as such.

Mr. Stephen Parker, Parker Engineering, and a NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board representing 11 Thor Solberg Road. This application and plans are for a septic system alteration based upon the sale of the property.

Acting Chair Nugent stated that according to the May 2012 code, the determination of whether or not a system is malfunctioning is restricted to this board or an agent of this board.

Mr. Parker stated that a new septic system has been designed, a basin flood test was performed, results worked out very well. The site on the northwest corner of the property is very suitable for a disposal field, as indicated on the plan. There was no accumulation of water in the basin flood test while they were putting it in there, that is how quickly it ran out. The existing tank and field are located behind the house, the proposal is to continue in the present location, proposing the septic tank and pump tank in the back yard. It is a pump situation because the septic field is uphill. There is very limited room for the disposal field meeting the 100' setback. Variances are requested for placement of the tank and the pump tank to be less than 100' from the well both on this property and adjacent lot #10. 100' separation distance is required between any well and the septic and pump tanks.

The proposal is that the distance from the proposed tank to the well is 76' and the distance from the pump tank to the well is 87'. The variances are requested because in order to meet the 100' set backs, the tank has to get deeper in the ground, which creates difficulty in maintaining the tanks, pumping, effluent filter, etc. The state requirement is 50', Readington Twp. is 100', in this case the distance is greater than 50' but less than 100'. The benefit in keeping it less than 100' is greater than any potential negative of having the tank less than 100' from the wells. The tanks will be vacuum tested in accordance with state regulations, are tested while in the ground to make sure they don't leak. That is basically it regarding the distances. Based upon inspection and the DEP website, there are no wetlands or wetland transition areas on or adjacent to the property.

Acting Chair Nugent asked what the depth below grade would be of the tank in order to achieve a 100' setback from the well both for the subject and adjoining properties?

Mr. Parker stated that on the plan is a radius line drawn from the well on the subject property almost to the disposal field location. From where the sewer line leaves the house, the tanks would be about 90' away, there is about 2' of pitch across that distance. The sewer line out of the house is about elevation 96', would be about 94' where setback requirements are met. The existing grade that is about 100' away from the wells is about 100.5, there is about 6.5' of cover on top of that tank.

Acting Chair Nugent asked what it would take to achieve a non-waiver request for the adjoining well?

Mr. Parker indicated trees on the map that are about 95' from the well, so that is about where the tanks would have to be.

Ms. Butula asked why that wasn't done since it seems to be parallel to the proposed place?

Mr. Parker stated that he was concerned because to put the tanks in that area is further away from the house, there is a longer line between the house and the tanks. It would be an additional 40' from where it is now.

There was some discussion of moving the proposed tanks, possibly cutting down the maple trees in back of the house, obtaining 100' from the neighboring well.

Ms. Butula asked if Mr. Parker had obtained the well casing information for the neighboring well? And were water quality tests done? And are the prospective buyers aware of this situation?

Mr. Parker stated he did not, but he suspected it would be 20' deep based on the age of the house and well. A well test was done on the neighbors well, Mr. Colburn has provided a copy of that results. The prospective buyers are aware that this application is on the agenda tonight, but may not be aware entirely of the situation.

Acting Chair Nugent stated regarding the options available for this design, impacting a well on adjoining property is a struggle. The proposal of extending the length of the pipe between the house and the tanks and moving the tanks further out, but there is some nervousness regarding the engineer's concerns expressed regarding the increased depth and more difficulty in maintenance. What are the other options to at minimum achieve the setback requirement for the adjoining property and get the tanks more in line with where they are ultimately going anyway? For instance, moving it more towards the southwest, perhaps on the other side of the 24" maple tree.

Mr. Parker stated that this design will have a positive impact on the neighbors well. They are moving the septic field more than 100' away. The new tanks will be vacuum tested to insure that they are leak proof and they will be further away than the existing tank. This design represents a positive impact to the well, which there is no problem with currently.

There was some discussion of removing the trees in order to move the proposed system over. The proposal was made to contact the prospective homeowners to discuss the removal.

Acting Chair Nugent asked what was the maximum achievable setback distance obtainable by moving the tanks as discussed near the maple tree, possible causing the moving of the maple tree?

Mr. Parker stated that the maple tree is about 71' from the well on this property. The words on the map 'force main' are about 76' away from the well on the subject property. If the tank is placed on the map where it says 'linear foot', that is 100' away from Colburns well and 76' away from the well on the existing property.

Acting Chair Nugent asked if there were any plans to expand to 4 bedrooms? and would Mr. Parker ask the prospective homeowners?

Mr. Parker stated none that he is aware of, but he would find out if possible.

Acting Chair Nugent stated that the well casing information will still be required, and a revised County letter including all the changes is required.

Acting Chair Nugent asked if noticing has been done, and if there is anyone in the audience wishing to speak to this application?

Mr. Robert Colburn, 9 Thor Solberg Road, adjoining property Lot 10 addressed the board.

Acting Chair Nugent asked if the engineer's suggestion to move the proposed system a minimum of 100' from the well on his property provided a level of comfort?

Mr. Colburn stated yes.

Acting Chair Nugent stated that there was some reference to the gradient lines, and why was the 100' line dotted, and 101 and 102 solid?

Mr. Parker stated it was just for differentiation.

The following was summarized for resubmission:

- Well casing depth of existing well.
- Moving bed further away from wells.
- Involve future homeowners – any plans to expand to 4 bedrooms?
- Revised HCHD letter.

Mr. Parker thanked the board.

Acting Chair Nugent asked that this application be placed on the March agenda as one of the first applications.

Acting Chair Nugent closed the public hearing portion of the meeting, with only 1 resident speaking to the application in question.

Acting Chair Nugent closed the hearing on this application and returned the position of Chair to Robert Colburn.

Chair Colburn returned to the dais at 8:13 p.m.

Time heard 8:15 pm

3. Block 63/Lot 47 – Parker Engr., Dandeo, 154 Stanton Road.

Escrow fees paid 1/9/15, ck.#138, \$750.00

Mr. Stephen Parker, Parker Engineering, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board representing 154 Stanton Road. This application is for a home that is for sale, the septic system was determined to be non functioning, it is an existing pump system, the field is located behind the house. The proposed system will be a pump system, the field a little farther away, it is a mounded system because there was ground water at 30". The system has been raised above that to provide the minimum separation distance. The existing well is in the basement of the house, so a variance is requested for the setback distance from the well to the new proposed pump tank. The existing septic tank and pump tank will remain and will be used as two septic tanks, combined will provide 1400 gallons of capacity. A new pump tank is proposed. The existing tanks are less than 100' away from the well on the property. The pump tank is 63' away from the well, Readington requires 100', so a waiver is requested. The ground away from the property goes uphill, so the further away from the house, the deeper into the ground the pump tank will be. The pump tank is difficult to service, will be vacuum tested, a single component tank so there are no seams. The soil type is a sandy loam, the sample test was fine, and is a raised system because

of the shallow ground water. There are no wells or septic systems on the adjacent property in the vicinity of any components. According to the DEP website and site inspection, there are no wetlands within 150' of the septic field. The existing 500 gallon pump tank is 50' from the well, the 900 gallon tank is 36' away. The homeowner currently has a treatment system on the well.

Mr. Dandeo, homeowner, stated that an ultraviolet filtration system was put on the well in August, 2014. The complete water softener and filtration was installed as a result of the well test.

Ms. Butula stated that the test had failed with coliform, e-coli, and manganese, so it is important to remedy this prior to a sale. The existing previous field was more than 100' away from the well but the tanks are close at 500' and 900'. The treatment system is now on the well, but there may have been a cause and effect between the septic tank and the existing well.

Ms. Albrecht asked how old the system was. And the description says the system is at the end of its useful life, what are the symptoms?

Mr. Dandeo stated 1977, a new system was installed when he bought the house. The original house was 1950.

Mr. Parker stated the end of the useful life of the system is indicated by the inspection failure and there was effluent in the field.

Mr. Nugent asked the approximate ages of the existing 900 and 500 gallon tanks, and will they be upgraded with an effluent filter?

Mr. Parker stated 1977, when the design was done and they were installed. They are concrete tanks. Neither tank is accessible where an effluent filter would be installed, so no.

There was some discussion of the condition of the existing tanks.

Mr. Parker stated there are no cracks or leaks in the tanks, it is also checked on installation of the system. The tank has to be 1,000 gallons minimum, if either were no good, a replacement tank will be installed. If the replacement tank were placed immediately before the pump tank, the distance to the well would be 58'.

Mr. Nugent stated that this board can only grant a waiver down to 50.0', beyond that it encroaches on the state code and there is not an allowance for a waiver from the state code. In the event of either tank failing inspection, would they both be abandoned and a replacement tank installed?

Mr. Parker stated that it would be indicated on the plan.

Mr. Dandeo stated that he observed the installation of the tanks in 1977. The septic tank is rectangular and the pump tank is round.

The board thanked Mr. Dandeo for his input.

Mr. Kalinich asked for more information on the conversion of the pump tank, will the conversion include installing baffles?

Mr. Parker stated yes, right now there is a pump in there, the same inlet and outlet holes would be used, the pump would be removed and baffles installed.

Ms. Butula asked what the height of the low end of the mound would be.

Mr. Parker stated the low end would be 59" above existing grade on the low side.

Mr. Nugent asked if there was information regarding the well casing depth.

Mr. Parker stated the well company has been contacted but has no record of it.

Ms. Butula asked if the prospective buyers are involved in this? and do they understand all that is involved with the ultraviolet light, placement of prospective septic system, etc.?

Mr. Dandeo stated that the realtors have been contacted, he is not sure if they are aware of all of it.

Chair Colburn stated that they should also be aware of the deed restriction and filing requirements.

Mr. Parker stated that the current homeowner is aware of it.

Mr. Dandeo stated that he would pass on the information to his realtor, and the future homeowner.

There was some discussion of a waiver for utilizing the existing tanks. The following was summarized for resubmission:

- Well casing depth of existing well.
- Improve footnotes regarding the results of inspection of existing tank and pump tank and what must occur if they fail specifically that a replacement tank be placed greater than 50' from the existing well in close proximity to the new pump tank.
- 2 Waivers – 1.) Set back of the new pump tank to the well. 2.) Either the converted pump tank to septic tank set back to well, or 1,000 gal. septic tank replacement.
- Converted pump tank to have baffles installed.

- Communication with the prospective homeowner.

Mr. Dandeo asked if, since it is a step down basement, when measuring the depth of the casing would the step down adversely impact because so much was taken off the casing when put in a new basement?

Mr. Nugent stated that the required 50' of casing is from grade to the bedrock. Grade is considered the grade of the ground outside the house. The fact that something was taken off of it does not matter.

There was some discussion of who may have installed the well in 1977.

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

Mr. Nugent asked regarding the soil permeability class rating test, in what depth and in what type of soils was it performed? The township code restricts that particular test unless the soils are highly permeable because it is not reliable in low permeable soils, K0's, K1's, K2's..

Mr. Parker stated it was in sandy loam soil at 92" from soil log 1.

Chair Colburn asked if Mr. Parker could get all these changes in to the BOH office? and does Mr. Dandeo have any other questions or comments?

Mr. Parker stated yes, he would get them in by 2/23 or 2/24.

Mr. Dandeo stated no.

Mr. Parker thanked the board.

Chair Colburn asked if there were any other questions, or business?

There were no comments or questions from the board members.

F. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Albrecht to adjourn at 9:00 pm, seconded by Ms. Butula with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger