

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH
March 18, 2015

Chair Robert Colburn called the meeting to order at 7:05 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 @7:45	Wendy Sheay	absent
Robert Colburn	present	William C. Nugent	present		

Also in attendance: Division of Public Health - Deb Vaccarella.
Board of Health Engineer, Ferriero Engineering representative Joe Kosinski

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. Minutes of 2/18/15. (-Rohrbach, Sheay vote).

A motion was made by Mr. Nugent for approval of the 2/18/15 minutes.

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

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

B. CORRESPONDENCE

- 1. Suspected Hazardous Discharge Notification** letter dated 2/6/15 regarding oil heating 2.
- 2. HCHD – Annual Municipal Board of Health Member Meeting.** March 24, 2015, 6:00 p.m.,
Route 12 County Complex, Flemington, 08822 Building 1, 1st Floor Meeting Room.
(emailed to board members 2/26/15).

Ms. Butula stated that she and Mr. Colburn will be attending.

- 3. NJDEP – application for multi-permits** dated 1/30/15. (application on file at the BOH office).
- 4. HCDPS – Pesticide Control Regulations** dated 3/1/15.

Ms. Butula asked that this is forwarded to the Environmental Commission and Twp. Administrator.

- 5. New Pet Store Licensing Law for Municipalities** - effective 6/1/15.

Mr. Nugent stated that this law is at the State level and may impact municipalities regarding pet shops but may impact people selling pets as well. Certain processes, responsibilities or requirements for the township may be involved as well. The board may want to request township counsel to review and access this law and the changes thereof and exactly how it is going to impact the township, most specifically regarding any activities that this Board of Health is responsible for either directly or indirectly. The phrase on the cover letter ‘please be guided accordingly’ seems insufficient as to what this Board should be guided by.

A MOTION was made by Mr. Nugent to direct this back to Township Counsel for review and specific assessment on the exact impacts to this Board of Health, its agencies and organizations that it interfaces with.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Butula.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that a LINC message was sent out regarding this, so the board may not have all the information that is available on this. The State Dept. of Health was very clear that this is a consumer protection law. It has nothing to do with the kennel and pet shop inspections. The County of Hunterdon does, for all of the facilities. Locally, the issue is the fact that pet stores, kennels, shelters are licensed locally but inspected by the County, not the Township.

Ms. Albrecht stated that on page 7, C.56:8-95.1 (2) c. “Every pet shop shall submit, annually and no later than May 1 of each year, a report to the municipality in which it is located and licensed, providing.....” and all the details of the background indicating what would be posted on the cage. This is perhaps what would apply to this board and what the follow up would be.

Mr. Nugent stated that the reason for the motion was for clarity on guidance for the process and procedure regarding this board’s responsibility. Also, what seems confusing is that in the definitions it defines ‘pet dealer’ yet throughout the document there isn’t a reference to ‘pet dealer’, but a reference to ‘pet shop owner’ which could be interpreted to be the same. How is the County interpreting that?

Ms. Vaccarella stated that she agrees with the motion because it is unclear if they are advising the municipalities to hold licenses until this information has been submitted. This is a consumer protection law so that the consumer knows exactly what the background is on a particular pet. The definition of ‘pet dealer’ is for something that doesn’t exist in the pet shop/kennel/shelter regulations, this law is entirely a consumer protection law for the

The MOTION was amended to include the information from the HC LINCS from the County, specifically that the distinction and definition of 'pet shop' vs 'pet shop owner' vs 'pet dealer' be more clearly defined by counsel.

The amended motion was seconded by Ms. Butula.

Chair Colburn asked if there were any further discussion?

There were no further comments from the board.

On roll call vote the following was recorded for the motion amended as stated:

<i>Ms. Albrecht</i>	<i>Aye</i>	<i>Mr. Kalinich</i>	<i>Aye</i>	<i>Chair Colburn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Ms. Butula</i>	<i>Aye</i>	<i>Mr. Nugent</i>	<i>Aye</i>		

Ms. Vaccarella stated that she would forward the HC LINCS document and also the link to the current requirements in the code so that counsel may reference it.

6. Block 36/Lot 17 – Letter dated 3/5/15 application to NJDEP regarding flood hazard area/riparian zone in Raritan Township.

7. Pit Bail Calculator.

Mr. Nugent stated that the board members may find this valuable.

C. OLD BUSINESS

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Partnership for Health Meeting Agenda – 3/13/15.

Ms. Butula stated that the quarterly meeting was held on March 13, 2015.

2. Safe Communities Coalition.

Ms. Butula stated that the DEA has stopped picking up the medications from the drop boxes. It is now being covered by various agencies and will continue without disruption. Also, the Chamber is having a Community Day at the county fairgrounds on June 13, 2015, 12:30 – 6:30 p.m.

E. APPROVALS

Chair Colburn recused himself at 7:30 p.m. from hearing the following application due to the fact that the applicant is an adjoining property owner. Mr. Colburn joined the audience as a resident.

Mr. Nugent assumed the role of Chair for hearing Block 56/Lot 9 stating that the application is presented by Parker Engineering for 11 Thor Solberg Road.

Time heard 7:35 pm

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

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

Previously heard 2/18/15.

Acting Chair Nugent confirmed that the paperwork was a map dated 12/31/14, revised 2/23/15 per Board of Health, sheets 1 and 2. The latest County review letter is dated 3/6/15.

Mr. Stephen Parker, Parker Engineering, and a NJ licensed engineer stated that this application is carried from last month requesting waivers from the setback distance from the well to the septic tank and pump tank. The well on the adjoining property, Lot 10 and the well on the subject property are impacted. The changes submitted were relocating the septic tank and the pump tank to be greater than 100' away from the well on Lot 10. A waiver is still requested from the well on subject property to the septic tank and pump tank. As a result of the well test for a home sale, it did not pass so the homeowner had an ultraviolet light put on the well to provide treatment. Test results were supplied to the board.

Ms. Vaccarella clarified that under the private well testing act regulations, any wells are tested prior to any treatment. If this house were sold in 2 years, it would still come up as failing with those parameters before the treatment system. The information the buyer needs is whether the treatment system is functioning. At that point in time, they need to pay for the extra test after the UV light

Ms. Butula asked, referring to the variance for the proposed septic tank distance from the well on the existing property, the revised County letter indicated 78' for both the septic and the pump tank, is that correct?

Mr. Parker stated yes.

Acting Chair Nugent noted that there was substantial correspondence regarding the well casing depth and was that pursued ?

Mr. Parker stated that he does not have that information, it has been presented to the homeowner.

Ms. Butula asked if the future homeowner has been involved in any plans?

Mr. Parker stated that the realtor indicated that the home would not be expanded, and that they do want to keep the trees in the back yard.

Ms. Butula asked for testimony on any wetlands, and the distance information and notification was given ?

Mr. Parker stated that the disposal field is 50' minimum from any adjoining septic systems and is 100' from any wells and water courses. There are no wetlands within 150' of the proposed area of disturbance based on a site inspection by Parker Engineering walking the property and also the DEP website. Yes, notification was given for the 2/18/15 meeting and carried.

Acting Chair Nugent stated that additional communications regarding well casing information was requested from the County regarding the casing vs a UV system.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that the County was reminded of the need for review. In the past this board has not asked for County advice, but has asked a hydrogeologist, the County would provide advice only if the system were closer to State regulations. In light of the new technology regarding tank manufacturing, it is possible that the board may want to review their distance ordinance to mirror the State regulations.

Acting Chair Nugent stated that the board had a specific request, being whether or not a UV system would afford the same protection as a 50' casing would afford. It would be appreciated if that clarity is understood and responded to. This request was forwarded to the board's engineering firm as well.

Mr. Kosinski stated that there are no safeguards afforded by having a 50' minimum casing in the ground. By law the casing has to be set into competent bedrock, which may be encountered at 10' or 20'. Some neighboring states have an 18' or 20' minimum well casing requirement. If contaminants are going to get into the well, they are likely going to come from surface water or a shallow groundwater source, that is really the purpose of the casing. There is no special significance to the 50' other than it is a NJ State regulation. From a scientific standpoint, there is no special significance to the 50', the important thing is to have the well casing seal off any surface water contamination or shallow ground water.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that the regulation is 50' of casing and 20' into competent bedrock.

Acting Chair Nugent asked if there were any opinion as to whether a UV system would actually protect in the same way that a well casing would protect, specific to contaminants that would come out of a septic tank? The waiver is for the set back distance between the septic tank and the well.

Mr. Kosinski stated it is a condition of approval that the BOH could put on the application, in the absence of conforming set back and casing depth. The board has implemented that condition in the past.

Acting Chair Nugent confirmed with Mr. Parker that he agreed that the UV system could provide the protection of the 50' of casing.

Mr. Parker stated that combined with the other items discussed at the last meeting, that the new tanks will be located further away than the existing tank, the fact that all new tanks are vacuum tested, a note on the plan indicates that these tanks will be 1 piece tanks below the outlet of the tank itself, there are no seams in the tank. Those things coupled with the UV light will afford protection for the well for the residents of the house. It has since been discovered that the existing tank is cracked, which could be a contributing factor to the original well results.

Ms. Vaccarella stated that the new standards in existence and the fact that they are providing a UV light indicates that they are doing the best they can for this property.

Mr. Kalinich stated that there has not been a determination if the contamination reported in the initial private well testing was a result of the septic tank or ground seepage, is that correct?

Mr. Parker stated that they didn't know the source.

Mr. Kalinich stated that it is fair to say that without knowing the parameters regarding the casing if it were coming from ground seepage you would simply be remediating with the UV light a problem that would be ongoing, is that correct?

There was some discussion of the types of contaminants that the UV light would remediate and whether or not to include the UV details in the motion for approval as far as including it in the deed restriction for the pump system. Acting Chair Nugent recapped the details, the application initially proposed needing waivers from setbacks to 2 wells one on an adjoining property, one on the subject property for the new to be constructed septic and pump tanks. The engineer and applicant have reacted to prior discussions with this board by relocating the septic and pump tanks in excess of 100' from the adjoining well. Only achieving 78' from the property's well. It has been presented by the engineer that the installation of a UV system on subject property's well coupled with the design characteristics of the new septic tanks and his proposal of monolithic below grade tanks which are pressure tested, afford protections against the well casing that may not be to the required depth. The applicant has noticed adjoining property owners. Is there anyone in the audience wishing to speak to this application?

There was no response.

Acting Chair Nugent asked if there were any further comments from the board ?

Ms. Butula asked if the board members had any criteria in mind for the depth of the well casing for this one application ?

Ms. Albrecht stated that she would have concern if the casing were only 10 or 12'. The UV would take care of the bacteria from the septic tank.

Acting Chair Nugent stated the well and well casing albeit important to the health of the property is less the subject of what the board is acting on, what they have to act on is the setback from the septic tank to the well. One thing Ms. Vaccarella pointed out was that the failed test was only failing in things that the UV could address. Testimony from subject engineer is that the tank is cracked. The tank is presently closer than the proposed. The increased distance as well as the newer design may likely equate to what the well casing would afford for protection against septic system contaminants.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval as follows:

Block: 56 Lot: 9

Street location: 11 Thor Solberg Road # of Bedrooms: 3 Name of owner: Ms. Gaynell Rayburn

Map Title: Septic System Design for Lot 9, Block 56, Township of Readington, Hunterdon County, NJ

Pages(map): 1 – 2 Map Date: 12/31/14; Map Revisions: 2/23/15

Prepared By: Stephen E. Parker, P.E.

Survey(s): Boundary survey: Andrew Drysdale 1/27/1993

Topo Survey: Daniel Parker, 12/31/14

Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 1/7/15, 2/9/15, 3/6/15;

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, soil replacement, fill enclosed, single compartment 1,000 gallon tank replacement with effluent filter.

Soil testing results: 12/30/14, Soil log 1, @ 124", no mottling , no seepage, no ground water. Soil log 2 @ , 120", no mottling , no seepage, no ground water. Permeability is basin flood 1, 12/30/14, @ 91" in soil log 2, passing. There is no regional water, the design is based on the soil testing and basin flood. Testimony from the engineer indicates the absence of any wetlands within 150' of the system or anywhere on the property.

There are no wetlands, wetland transition areas, or watercourses within 100' of the system, no neighboring disposal systems within 50' or wells within 100'. A deed restricted pump system is granted by this board, to be given to present and future homeowners and that they are aware of the filing and maintenance requirements. Two variances are granted 1) proposed tank to be installed 78' from the well on Lot 9 2) proposed pump tank within 78' of the well on Lot 9. Also the ultraviolet light for this well must be maintained and correctly at all times until circumstances are changed and the contamination is proved not to be present in the well water.

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

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

Chair Colburn returned to the dais at 8:18 p.m.

Time heard 8:20 pm

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

Mr. Stephen Parker, Parker Engineering, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is a continuation from last month's hearing. This application is requesting a waiver from the setback distance for a proposed pump tank to a well. 63' is proposed, 100' is required. The existing tank and pump tank are to remain and are also less than 100' away from the well. Notes have been added to the plan since last month's meeting. If the existing tanks are determined to need replacement they will be at least 50' away from the well and upgraded with effluent filters and baffles. The well casing information has been obtained and provided to the board.

There was some discussion of the revisions submitted by Mr. Parker.

Mr. Parker confirmed that the proposed 1250 gallon pump pit is not able to be moved in excess of 100' from the well. The property slopes upwards away from the house to the backyard where the septic system is going. The further away from the well, the deeper into the ground it goes with a greater amount of cover on top of the pump tank making it difficult for maintenance and servicing and is not a good design idea. Notes 27 and 38, the existing system is 50' from all septic systems and 100' from all wells and watercourses. Mr. Parker walked the property and there are no wetlands within 150' of the proposed area of disturbance, this is based on that inspection and the DEP website.

Chair Colburn asked if there were any other questions or comments?

There were no comments or questions from the board members.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval as follows:

Block: 63 Lot: 47

Street location: 154 Stanton Road # of Bedrooms: 3 Name of owner: Mr. George Dandeo

Map Title: Septic System Design for Lot 47, Block 63, Township of Readington, Hunterdon County, NJ

Pages(map): 1 – 2 Map Date: 12/16/14; Map Revisions: 2/23/15

Prepared By: Stephen E. Parker, P.E.

Survey(s): Boundary survey: Theodore Hallard, 8/25/2977

Topo Survey: Daniel Parker, 12/3/14

Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 1/6/15, 2/9/15

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, mounded soil replacement, fill enclosed, existing 500 gallon pump tank, 900 gallon septic tank, effluent filter will be installed if possible, 1,250 gallon pump tank.

Soil testing results: 12/3/14, Soil log 1, @ 132", mottling 27" – 65", no seepage, no ground water. Soil log 2 @ , 132", mottling 30 – 65", no seepage, no ground water. Permeability was soil permeability class rating test @92" in soil log 1. Test 1a, 1b presented, 12/3/14, result K2, regional water determined by soil log 1, mottling @ 27". Testimony from the engineer indicates the absence of any wetlands or wetland transition areas within 150' of the system. A deed restricted pump system is granted by this board, to be given to present and future homeowners and that they are aware of the filing and maintenance requirements. A copy of the deed restriction will be provided to the BOH office within 90 days. A variance is granted for a 1250 gallon pump tank to be installed 63' from the existing well, the BOH ordinance requires 100'. Also the existing septic tank may remain where it is, a 900 gallon tank 36' from the well, again the BOH ordinance requires 100'. The remaining 500 gallon pump tank will be adapted with the effluent filter to remain 50' from the present well BOH ordinance requires 100'. Note 37 from the revised plans states "The existing septic tank shall be pumped by a licensed waste hauler and inspected to insure the baffles are in place, the tank is structurally sound and that it has 900 gallons minimum capacity. The tank shall be repaired or replaced at the discretion of the county health dept. If the tank remains it shall be upgraded with a locking manhole lid that is extended to grade, in addition, the existing pump tank shall be pumped by a licensed waste hauler and inspected to insure the tank is structurally sound. If the pump tank is to remain it must have both inlet and outlet baffles installed and a locking man hole lid that is extended to grade. If the existing access configuration allows, the converted pump tank shall have an effluent filter installed on the outlet baffle, if either the existing tank or pump tank are in need of replacement, both of the tanks shall be crushed, backfilled, abandoned and a new 1,000 gallon septic tank must be installed. The new septic tank must be located 50' minimum from the existing well on the property." There is a UV light presently installed on this well, it is required that it remain in place until the situation has changed and the testing of the raw water sample contains no contamination, and is presented to the Board of Health.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Kalinich. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

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

The board thanked Mr. Dandeo for attending the meeting.

The following application will be heard last:

Time heard 8:45 pm

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

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

Data mailed previously with February application packet.

Time heard 8:50 pm

4. Block 71/Lot 8 – Douglas Fine, P.E., Woolf, 1 Deerpath Road.

Escrow fees paid 2/17/15, ck.#95, \$750.00

Mr. Doug Fine, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is for an existing 4 bedroom house, the property is at the corner of West Woodschurch and Deerpath Road that is currently served by a cesspool and is the subject of a real estate transaction. In accordance with regulations, a cesspool must be remediated and replaced with a septic system. There were two soil logs performed and one basin flooding test. Permeability proved to be acceptable and exceptional, a basin flooding test at 80” immediately drained out. Both soil logs were taken down to 120”, the substratum is a fine gravely shale, very permeable. The use of a pump will be required because the house sits downhill from the location of the proposed system.

Ms. Butula noted that on the HCHD application, Mr. Fine indicated under #8., “contamination...”, was there any definitive proof of that? and were any of the neighboring wells tested?

Mr. Fine stated yes, the existing cesspool was functioning at a very full capacity and overflowing. There are no neighboring wells anywhere near here. There is an existing storm drain ditch, there is no runoff water there other than the small discharge point of cesspool effluent.

Ms. Butula asked for wetlands testimony, and a description of the ditch.

Mr. Fine stated that the DEP wetlands are shaded in grey on the property, actually mostly off the property. The existing storm drain ditch is nothing more than channeled road runoff, there is no running water there, it comes from Deer Path Road from the intersection of West Woodschurch and Deer Path, there is a small culvert under the road and this is just a discharge point. The only water noted was from the existing septic system discharge, and will be alleviated by the proposed system, it did not reach the wetlands area. There are no flooding possibilities. The house is currently occupied by two people, the cesspool was recommended to be pumped out, and was done at least once. The property was walked for wetlands inspection, the wetlands are probably lesser than what is shown on the map. The low areas are much further from the property line than what is shown here. This does not appear to be a wetland area, the bed is 127’ from what is mapped. There was no standing water or vegetation indicating a wetland area. There are currently no off-site wells located within 100’ and no off-site disposal fields within 50’ of the proposed disposal field.

Chair Colburn asked if there were any other questions or comments?

There were no comments or questions from the board members.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval as follows:

Block: 71 Lot: 8

Street location: 1Deerpath Road # of Bedrooms: 4 Name of owner: Richard Woolf

Map Title: Septic System Alteration Design Block 71/Lot 8, Township of Readington, Hunterdon County, NJ for Richard & Linda Woolf, 1 Derpath Road, Flemington, NJ 08822

Pages(map): 1 – 12 Map Date: 2/2/15 Map Revisions: none

Prepared By: Douglas E. Fine, P.E.

Survey(s): Boundary survey: William Bohren, 12/2/1975 Topo Survey: David M. Newton, 2/2/15

Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 2/25/15

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, soil replacement, fill enclosed, 2 compartment tank and effluent filter with a pump. A deed restricted pump system is granted by this board, to be given to present and future homeowners and that they are aware of the filing and maintenance requirements. The

homeowners and future homeowners are to be made aware that a copy of the deed restriction will be provided to the BOH office within 90 days. The engineer has testified that there are no wetlands or wetland transition areas near the proposed system.

Soil testing results: 1/22/15, Soil log 1, @ 120", no mottling, no seepage, no flooding. Soil log 2 @ , 120", no mottling, no seepage, no flooding. Permeability, 1/22/15, was basin flood 1 @ 80" soil log 2, passing. Installation of the system is determined by the depth of the logs in basin flood 1.

Testimony was given by the engineer that there are no neighboring wells within 150' of the proposed system.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Nugent. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

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

Ms. Albrecht left at 9:03 p.m.

Time heard 9:05 pm

5. Block 68/Lot 5.08 – Douglas Fine, P.E., Desai, 139 Readington Road.

Escrow fees paid 2/17/15, ck.#3374, \$750.00

Mr. Doug Fine, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is for Block 68/Lot 5.08, 139 Readington Road.

The board received a revised sheet 6 of 11, with a revised per HCHD review note of 2/1715, replacing the page 6 that the board had received. Sheet 6 had a basin flood.

Mr. Fine stated that this is an existing 4 bedroom house, part of a real estate transaction where the existing septic system was deemed to be unsatisfactory. There is an existing run off ditch located within a conservation easement on the property, taking up the eastern portion of the property, coming down the property towards the rear. It is served by an existing well and septic system. Two logs and the permeability test were performed, soil log 1 excavated at 115", gravely shale encountered at 50", seepage 94" and below with a 24 hour static water table at 94". Soil log 2 excavated to machine refusal at 129", gravely shale started at 37", seepage 90" and below. A pit bail test was performed at 115" bottom depth in soil log 1 with a permeability rate, final K rate of 3,113"/hour.

Ms. Butula asked for a detailed description of the conservation easement and drainage ditch and the distances from the proposed bed to the beginning of the 100' easement.

Mr. Fine stated that there is a very low lying area behind the house, there is a headwall along Readington Road at the northeast property corner. There is a lot of drainage coming through here, it was probably established when the property was originally constructed. It leaves the property and continues towards Van Pelt Drive. It seems that all the properties generally drain in that rear direction. The distance of the septic bed to the conservation easement is about 77'.

Mr. Nugent asked how wide the water flow is that as mentioned is usually flowing, is it literally covering the 100' easement? and what is the distance between the septic bed and that approximate 3' wide runoff ditch?

Mr. Fine stated it is about 3' wide, you could easily jump across it. The distance between the septic bed and the 3' wide ditch is about 130'.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Fine to describe any of the area from the ditch back toward the bed that would appear to be affected by the ever present water that would become a transition area?

Mr. Fine stated the area looks like a run of water, as you get further south off the property it flattens out and gets into some standing water areas that may be considered wetland. If you look towards the bottom of the sheet, the DEP mapping shows the wetlands which is off the southwest corner of the property. That is the wetlands mapping from the state maps, the dimension up to the bed is 183'. There are two springs that channel downhill in a trickle of water into the ditch.

Mr. Nugent asked what is the distance between the septic bed and the springs?

Mr. Fine stated it is 75' from the north most spring to the southeasterly corner, and 95' to the other spring.

Ms. Butula stated that there are 3 classifications to getting a wetland investigation. This may fall into that category because it is a bit of an involved piece of property. This would have been an ideal candidate for having a wetland investigator come in and give a report.

Mr. Nugent stated that he would concur with that.

Mr. Nugent stated that the bed seems to be positioned a bit southerly of where it could be positioned relative to the soil logs testing, is there a reason for not moving it further north?
Mr. Fine stated it is because of the malfunctioning field, it is completely saturated. It likely was not deep enough when installed.
Ms. Vaccarella stated that applying for a GP25 would be an alternative to a wetlands investigation.
Mr. Kosinski confirmed that by assuming they are wetlands an alternative to obtaining a wetlands investigation would be to apply for a GP25.
Mr. Fine stated that that is a good suggestion and would put everyone at ease because it would be permitted and accepted that there may be wetlands here.
There was some discussion of the labeling as depicted on the plan.
Mr. Fine stated that a 1250 gallon 2 compartment tank is proposed.
Chair Colburn asked if there were any other questions or comments?
There were no comments or questions from the board members.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval as follows:

Block: 68 Lot: 5.08
Street location: 139 Readington Road # of Bedrooms: 4 Name of owner: Ramila Desai
Map Title: Septic System Alteration Design Block 68/Lot 5.08, Township of Readington, Hunterdon County, NJ, for Ramila Desai, 139 Readington Road, Whitehouse Station, NJ 08889
Pages(map): 1 – 11 Map Date: 2/5/15 Map Revisions: Pg. 6 of 11 dated 2/5/15, all details on page revised.
Prepared By: Douglas E. Fine, P.E.
Survey(s): Topo Survey: David M. Newton, 2/5/15
Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 2/19/15

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, fill enclosed, gravity, 2 compartment 1250 gallon septic tank and effluent filter. The engineer has testified that there are no wetlands or wetland transition areas near the proposed system. This motion acknowledges that the engineer will apply to NJDEP for a GP25 permit and that this is an obligation for approval for this property because of the springs on the property and the conservation easement with a drainage runoff ditch and the wetlands per NJDEP mapping close to the border of this property.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Nugent. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

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

Time heard 9:35 pm

6. Block 45.03/Lot 28.01 – Kearney, Santoro, 34 Dreahook Road.

Escrow fees paid 2/18/15, ck.#3772, \$750.00

Mr. John Kearney, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This application is for a septic system alteration at Block 45.03/Lot 28.01, 34 Dreahook Road. This is a 4 bedroom home and is not involved in a real estate transaction. The proposed system is a mounded fill enclosed pump system. Soil tests were conducted in June 2014. Two soil logs were dug, #1 to 45", #2. to 88". Pit bail was conducted in #1., 151", passing with 0.48" per hour. A permeability class rating test was sampled in soil log 1, K3 value in the horizon from 66" to 188". The water table after 24 hours was at 5', 60" with mottling in both soil logs at about 1' which was the governing factor in the design of the systems.

There was some discussion of a discrepancy between the soil witness' information and that presented by the engineer. The board determined that the information was recorded in a different format than the usual presentation. Mr. Nugent asked for soil log 2, the witness reported mottling at 12 – 134", the submitted Form 2b indicates that it was 12 – 151", what would explain the discrepancy?

Mr. Kearney stated that they went down to equivalent depths on both of them, they chose the one with faster water. Mr. Nugent asked if the mottling were down to 134" or down to 151", would either cause a difference in the design? Mr. Kearney stated no, the governing factor is the mottling at 12" because that sets the threshold of the entire design. Mr. Nugent asked what the reason is for the existing bed being abandoned? Why is the placement of the new bed where it is in lieu of to the south of the dwelling to possibly give greater depth to regional zone?

Mr. Kearney stated it is not failing now, but it is was built in 1966. They didn't want to dig in that area and encounter part of the field. The grade is a little higher in the proposed area. The testing was performed in

There was some discussion of the location of the proposed system with regard to the location and size of the existing system and setback distances.

Mr. Santoro offered testimony regarding the history of the existing system.

There was some discussion of the calculation of the K rate.

Ms. Butula asked that Mr. Kearney read note #5. and the wetland description also.

Mr. Kearney read "Septic disposal field is to be a minimum of 100' from all wells. Septic tank to be 50' minimum from wells. These minimum distances apply not only to the lot in question, but also all adjacent lots, unless increased by local code." "There are no wetlands or transition areas within 150' of the proposed disposal bed."

Chair Colburn stated in note #5. it should state the septic tank should be 100' from wells.

Mr. Kearney stated that the distance of the proposed septic system to the well is 117'.

Chair Colburn asked if there were any other questions or comments?

There were no comments or questions from the board members.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval as follows:

Block: 45.03 Lot: 28.01

Street location: 34 Dreahook Road # of Bedrooms: 3 Name of owner: John T. Santoro

Map Title: Septic System Design for John Santoro in Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ.

Pages(map): 1 – 4 Map Date: 7/21/14 Map Revisions: 8/1/14

Prepared By: John H. Kearney, P.E.

Survey(s): Topo Survey: Ryan G. Warford, PLS, 7/7/14

Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 8/4/14

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, mounded soil replacement, single compartment 1,000 gallon tank, fill enclosed, pump tank with effluent filter.

Soils testing, 6/24/14, soil log 1 @ 188", mottling 12 – 145", seepage 65 and below, pit flooded @ 60". Soil log 2 @ 151", mottling 12 – 151", seepage 90" and below, permeability is pit bail 1, @ 12.63' in soil log 1, results K=0.48"/hour. Permeability class rating done, samples A and B, resulting in K 3. Regional ground water is determined by the mottling @ 12" in soil logs 1 and 2. A deed restricted pump system is granted by this board, the homeowner is aware of the filing at the County Clerk's office and a copy returned to the BOH office within 90 days. The maintenance requirements will also be given to the homeowner. The engineer has testified that the installation is 100' from existing well and that there are no wetlands or wetland transition areas or neighboring wells or septic near the proposed system. A waiver is granted for the proposed installation @ 12", understanding that the State is 24" but this is a definite improvement to the system that exists on this property and the improvement will insure the health and safety of the homeowner and neighboring homes, per NJDEP Code 7:9A 3.3e 2 II.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Nugent. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

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

Mr. Kearney thanked the board.

Time heard 10:15 pm

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

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

Data mailed previously with February application packet.

Mr. Kurt Hoffman, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. This is a preemptive septic alteration due to the fact that the home is for sale, the current system is a cesspool, and per code the title cannot be transferred as such. The first attempt at soil testing on site were soil logs 1, 2 and 3, basin flood 1 and 2 in soil log 2 which came up with non-passing, or failing, results in soil log 2. They returned to the site on a later date, soil logs 4 and 5 with a basin flood, and soil log 4 with favorable results. They dug 5 additional test pits on site to verify high water table on site. One of the waivers is for the water table @ 12" verified by the 5 test pits outside of the 100' well circle around the perimeter of the property to the north and west of where the other testing was done. This is an existing 4 bedroom house, a new 1300 gallon 2 compartment tank is proposed with a 1300 gallon pump tank going up to the disposal field located soil logs 4, 5 and basin flood 3. Tanks are outside the 100' well circle. Notes on the plan, #7., pg. 1. "use of the pump for the septic will need to be approved by RTBOH and added to the property deed once approved." This was explained to Mr. Attanasia and will be done. A

freshwater wetlands or freshwater wetland transition areas or state open waters are present on or within 150' of the proposed replacement septic system on Block 62/Lot 3. There are no septic, no wells, there is a designation of 150' around the proposed disposal field. For the record, there are 3 errors on the plan, 1) an indication for another soil log near soil log 3 on the map, there was no soil log there. 2) 150' circle around the disposal field is labeled 4" schedule 40 PVC, is incorrect. 3) chart on pg. 2 of 6, existing ground elevation high side 296, existing low side 298, the numbers should be reversed. 4) pg. 1, 4" schedule 40 PVC pipe should be 3" schedule PVC pipe. The proposed system location was chosen because they were trying to find an area with the mottling 24" or lower. The next best location, soil logs 4 and 5 were dug and basin flood 3 were all good. The revised plans will be submitted to the BOH office and the County tomorrow. Noticing has been done for this application to 4 property owners, 2 of which called back and were reassured of their concerns.

Chair Colburn asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak to this application?

There was no response.

Chair Colburn asked if there were any other questions or comments?

There were no comments or questions from the board members.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula for approval as follows:

Block: 62 Lot: 3

Street location: 75 Woodschurch Road # of Bedrooms: 4 Name of owner: Ralph Attanasia

Map Title: Septic Design for Ralph Attanasia Block 62/Lot 3 Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ.

Pages(map): 1 - 6 Map Date: 11/26/14 Map Revisions: 12/22/14, 3/19/15

Prepared By: Kurt Hoffman, P.E.

Survey(s): Boundary survey:

Topo Survey: David M. Newton, 1/24/14

Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 1/6/15

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, mounded soil replacement, pump, two compartment 1300 gallon tank with effluent filter.

Soils testing, 10/7/14, soil log 4 @ 110", mottling 12 – 110", no ground water, no seepage; soil log 5 @ 128", mottling 12 – 128", no ground water, no seepage. Permeability 10/7/14 – 10/8/14 was basin flood 3 @ 5.5' in soil log 4, passing. Regional ground water is determined by soil logs 4 and 5, mottling @ 12". A wetland investigation by Jeff Tariela dated 9/18/14 states "in conclusion it is our determination that no freshwater wetlands or wetland transition areas or state open waters were present on or within 150' of the proposed system to be located on Block 62/Lot 3." A deed restricted pump system is granted by this board, the current homeowner should be informed of the filing at the County Clerk's office and a copy returned to the BOH office within 90 days. The maintenance requirements should also be given to the homeowner and any future homeowners. The mottling at 12" vs the State at 24" variance is granted per NJDEP Code 7:9A 3.3e 2 II. The design shows a minimum of 48" of separation from the water table and the proposed level of infiltration. Corrections on sheets 1 and 2 will be submitted to Ms. Petzinger and the County within 2 business days.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Nugent. On roll call vote, the following was recorded:

Ms. Butula Aye Ms. Muir Aye Chair Colburn Aye

Mr. Kalinich Aye Mr. Nugent Aye

Mr. Hoffman thanked the board.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Butula to adjourn at 10:35 pm, seconded by Mr. Nugent with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger