

READINGTON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF HEALTH

August 17, 2016 7:00 p.m.

Readington Township Municipal Building

Municipal Courtroom - Room # 100

509 County Road 523, Whitehouse Station, NJ 08889

Chair Robert Colburn called the meeting to order at 7:06 and announced that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting has been duly advertised.

Attendance Roll Call:

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

Also in attendance: Board of Health Engineer representative, Joe Kosinski, Ferriero Engineering.

Not in attendance: Hunterdon County Division of Public Health.

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

1. Minutes of 7/20/16. (- Kalinich, Muir, Sheay vote).

A motion was made by Mr. Nugent, seconded by Ms. Butula for approval of the 7/20/16 minutes.

On roll call vote the following was recorded:

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

B. CORRESPONDENCE

1. NALBOH – Newsletter.

2. Block 12/Lots 16 & 16.01 – PK Environmental letter dated 7/27/16.

3. Block 4/Lots as listed on letter – Merck, Sharpe and Dohme Corp. - LOI.

4. Block 73/Lot 44 – NJDEP – no further action letter.

5. HC LINCS – Update: dated 7/30/16 – August is National Immunization Awareness Month.

6. Block 65/Lot 6 - HCHD notice of violation.

Ms. Butula noted the contact person at the County, and asked that Ms. Petzinger follow up on this.

7. Block 14/Lot 49 – Walmart – well water test results.

8. Block 58/Lot 28.02 - EcolSciences, Inc. LOI application notice dated 7/18/16.

9. HC LINCS – Update: dated 7/28/16 – BOH registry announcement.

Chair Colburn stated that the Administrator should address this.

10. HC LINCS – Update: dated 8/2/16 – Summary of Rabies post exposure prophylaxis.

11. HC LINCS – Update: dated 8/2/16 – Zika virus updates. (*email available*).

12. HC LINCS – Update: dated 8/2/16 – Discontinuation of Routine WNV Bird Testing.

13. NJDEP Release – dated 8/3/16 – Watershed Ambassadors for 2107 annual program.

www.nj.gov/dep/wms/bears/americornps.htm

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. Free Roaming Cat Ordinance BH:02-2016.

There was some discussion on the wording of the Ordinance. The suggestion was made to revise the ordinance and include the statutes for codification in preparation for First Reading at the September 21, 2016 BOH meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Price addressed the board, stating they both believed that all cats should be vaccinated for rabies.

D. NEW BUSINESS

E. APPROVALS

Alteration/No Expansion:

Time heard 7:45 p.m

1. Block 53/Lot 6 – Kurt Hoffman Engineering, Price, Holland Brook Road.

Escrow fees paid 8/3/16, ck.#1017, \$750.00

Mr. Kurt Hoffman, NJ licensed engineer appeared before the board. Mr. and Mrs. Price were also in attendance.

This is an existing 3 bedroom dwelling that they have purchased, and want to upgrade the septic system. Soil logs 1 and 2 and pitbails were done in both holes. This is a very narrow, deep lot, existing septic is behind the house and the existing well is behind the house in very close proximity to one another. The 100' well circle pushes the useable area to the front of the lot. A drainage feature crosses the property in the front which creates another hazard. They tried to get a gravity system, but with the setbacks and grade, they had to go with a pump. The proposed is a new

1300 gallon septic tank, 2 compartment, with effluent filter in compartment 2, with a 1000 gallon pump tank to the disposal area utilizing the afore said soil log results,

Mr. Nugent asked if the homeowner were aware of the effluent filter and pump maintenance, deed restriction, and filing requirements associated with the pump.

Mr. Hoffman stated yes, they are aware of it, every 3 years during the pumping.

There was some discussion of the distance of neighboring septic system being 70' away.

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

There was no response.

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

Block: 53 Lot: 6 Street location: 24 Holland Brook Road # of Bedrooms: 3

Name of owner: Jennifer Mary Price

Map Title: Septic Design for James Price, Block 53/Lot 66, Readington Township Hunterdon County, NJ.

Pages(map): 1 – 6 Map Date: 4/26/16 Map Revisions: 6/10/16 Prepared By: Kurt Hoffman, P.E.

Survey(s): Topographical: David M. Newton, 4/2016

Report(s): Hunterdon County Dept. of Public Safety Div. of Public Health Svcs., 8/4/16

Proposed System Specifications: Proposed alteration with no expansion, mounded soil replacement, 1300 gallon 2 compartment septic tank. with effluent filter and 1,000 gallon pump tank. A waiver is granted for the use of a pump in this system, the maintenance and deed filing instructions have been provided to the homeowner.

Soil testing results: 1/15/16, Soil log 1, @ 98", mottling 40 - 98", seepage @ 86", 80" after 24 hours. Soil log 2, @ 95", mottling 42 – 95", seepage @ 66" , 66.5" after 24 hours.. Permeability was pitbail 1 @ 98", K=0.57"/hour 2 @ 95", K=0.35"/hour, regional in soil log 1 with mottling @ 40".

The current homeowners are in attendance and understand the maintenance of the effluent filter and the pump system deed restriction requirements.

A GP25 from NJDEP was applied for by Jeff Tariela, permit # 1022-16-0002.1, page 4 of 4, the board certifies that the proposed activities are authorized under and comply with the departments standards for Individual Subsurface Sewage Disposal Systems at NJAC 7:9 and the proposed activities are not directly or indirectly caused by an expansion of the facility. The Individual Subsurface Sewage Disposal System serves as, or there was no change in use and there is no alternative location on the site that has a seasonal high water table deeper than the 1 ½' below the existing ground surface and it can be used as an Individual Subsurface Sewage Disposal System.

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 Ms. Rohrbach Aye Chair Colburn Aye

New Construction:

Time Heard: 8:00 p.m.

2. Block 53/Lot 5 – Engineering & Land Planning, Fernandes, Holland Brook Road.

Escrow fees paid 6/15/16, ck.#1734, \$750.00

Previously approved 1/20/16.

Mr. Wayne Ingram, New Jersey licensed engineer, Engineering & Land Planning appeared before the board representing Mr. Fernandes. This application was heard previously, approval was given, and since that time a new location closer to the home was tested and avoided the need for pumps, etc., it is the area that was the reserve area. New soil testing shows a very favorable infiltration rate of 5.37"/hour, which is better than the tests performed the first time.

Ms. Butula stated that previously this property was used for sanitation and solid waste, is there any knowledge of any soil contamination, or anything the NJDEP is investigating or holding records on?

Mr. Ingram stated he was not aware of anything. The excavations gave no indication of any land fill or any concerns with the soil logs. That was a well known fact by the buyers, so due diligence would have been done by the buyers. The primary tests will be used for the new reserve area. All of the soil logs for the existing reserve were passing without issue.

There was some discussion of the soil logs to be used.

Mr. Ingram confirmed that the distances between the primary and reserve area soil logs is at least 15'.

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

There was no response.

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

Block: 53 Lot: 5 Street location: 14 Holland Brook Road # of Bedrooms: 4
Name of owner: Rob Fernandes
Map Title: 14 Holland Brook Road Residence Individual Subsurface Sewage Disposal System
Readington Township, Hunterdon County, NJ.
Pages(map): 1 – 6 Map Date: 9/21/15 Revisions: 1/21/16, 5/31/16 Prepared By: Wayne J. Ingram, P.E.
Survey(s): Sheet 6, Boundary and Topo by Wayne J. Ingram, LS # 43353, 5/31/16
A passing well water test was done for the previous submission.

Report(s): Ferriero Engineering, 7/6/16

This is new construction, gravity, subsurface disposal system, 1300 gallon 2 compartment septic tank with effluent filter. The property owners are aware of the maintenance of the effluent filter.

The application has been resubmitted asking that the new testing be used for the primary system and the previously approved primary will now act as the reserve system.

Soils testing: 3/2/16;

Soil log 9 @ 122", mottling 40 – 122"; seepage @ 70". Soil log 1 @ 94", mottling 40 – 94", seepage @ 72".

Pit bail 3 in soil log 1, K=5.37"/hour. In season ground water monitoring 3/7/16 – 4/25/16, results soil log 9 @ 44"; on 4/4/16; soil log 1, test hole 2, 38" on 3/7/16 establishing the regional water determined by the monitoring @ 38" in soil log 1. This is the new primary area.

The applicant's engineer stated that the previously approved primary system designated at the 1/20/16 Board of Health meeting will now be used as the reserve area, soil logs 2 and 4, testing done on 2/1/12.

Soil log 2, @ 114", mottling 36" in soil log 4, depth 110", permeability was pit bail 1, K=2.66"/hour. Ground water monitoring was performed in soil log 4 from 2/4/12 – 3/25/12, highest reading @ 32", zone of saturation was 32". This will now function as the reserve area.

The previous approval for the pump system and associated deed restriction is rescinded.

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	Ms. Rohrbach	Aye	Chair Colburn	Aye

Time Heard: 8:22 p.m.

3. Block 4/Lot 13 – Engineering & Land Planning, Sherry, Potterstown Road.

Escrow fees paid 2/22/16, ck.#1968, \$750.00

Mr. Wayne Ingram, New Jersey licensed engineer, Engineering & Land Planning appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant Todd Sherry. This property is at 281 Potterstown Road, it is an extremely small triangular lot with 2 buildings, a 3 bedroom residence, and a 1500 sq. ft. commercial building. Considering the various buffers on the lot, and a piece of the lot actually falls within a right-of-way, there is only one spot on the property where the septic system can be located. The systems in this area of town are very old, and the wells are very shallow. The proposed system is an advanced treatment system, a HOOT unit, which this board has seen before. This will connect to a pump tank, connected to a disposal bed which has been reduced in size and height, and will be located between the 2 buildings. They were only able to perform 2 soil logs on the property, the perc rate was 8"/hour, no elevated ground water. In accordance with the State regulations, this system is fully sized, actually a little oversized. One neighboring well will be within 100', but will be further away with this system than with the current system. With the HOOT unit, the water entering the ground will be vastly cleaner than what is there. Their septic is less than 50' from the well, the well having 17' of casing. Any contaminants to the neighbors' well is likely to come from their own septic. The proposed system is clearly within their own well buffer, the well having 23' of casing which is very deficient, but the proposed system will be much further away from the well with the new system than the existing, and again, much cleaner.

Ms. Butula asked how the existing system was failing? And is the commercial building occupied right now? And do they store any chemicals in the building?

Mr. Ingram stated they were contacted by the owners, it is a tenant occupied residence. The commercial building is a fire and security company, the building is occupied by a single tenant. There are no chemicals stored in the building, they do mainly fire inspections, extinguisher maintenance and security systems. The 300 gallons/day which was calculated for them is based on the size of the building, but they probably don't even approach that, there are just a few people in the office, and people that are out on service calls. Realistically, it is probably 45 gallons/day.

Mr. Nugent asked what type of maintenance is included in the fire extinguisher maintenance? It could easily

include water.

Mr. Ingram stated it basically comes down to recharging them, nothing is discharged into a sanitary sewer.

Ms. Muir stated that it may be a good idea to get a letter from their company stating what chemicals are on the property.

Mr. Ingram stated that would be no problem.

Ms. Albrecht stated that they also have to consider any future occupants/owners of the property. Also, if extinguishers are regulated by the State, it would be the States responsibility.

Mr. Nugent stated this could dovetail into the State code which prohibits anything other than standard effluent to be introduced into the septic system.

Ms. Butula stated that she felt a responsibility to the property owners whose well is under 100'.

Ms. Muir stated that on the map there is a proposed 'spoils hole', would Mr. Ingram explain what that is?

Mr. Ingram stated that it is a very small system to begin with, part of it being in the new field. It is the old lateral that is going to be excavated and disposed of on site. The area is 100' from the well, so it made the most sense to bury it on site. It would have been extremely cost prohibitive to take it off site.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Kosinski if this is an acceptable way to dispose of it?

Mr. Kosinski stated there is a residence on the property, so there is no objection to burying it on site.

Chair Colburn asked about the line running out of the residence, is it 62 or 82', and there is only a cleanout outside of the building? And there was a membrane mentioned in Ferriero's letter, where is that?

Mr. Ingram stated it is 82', there will be 2 cleanouts on that whole length of pipe. The membrane is on Page 2, above the title block "20 ml plastic liner to be installed, extending below topsoil to the bottom of the zone of treatment along the edges within 15' of the building slab and 25' of the basement."

Ms. Butula asked what the well distance on this site is from the disposal area? Have they obtained anything regarding the neighbors casing? And was there any feedback to the noticing?

Ms. Ingram stated it is 38.6' from the proposed septic to the existing well on this property, and 77.1' to the neighbors well. The applicant paid for the neighbor to have their well opened and the casing is 17', they were willing to cooperate, they understand that the new system will be further away from the well than the existing. The board agreed that it may be a good idea to advise the neighbor in writing of the proposed system, distances and well information.

Ms. Butula pointed out that there were about 8 deviations from standard practice noted in the County's letter.

Ms. Butula asked if the tank is a 3 compartment tank?

Mr. Ingram stated it is a HOOT treatment unit with multiple chambers, the first functions as a reduced size septic tank, the second chamber has the aeration unit. There is then a pump tank. There is no 3rd chamber.

Ms. Butula referred to and reviewed the items in E&LP letter dated 6/20/16 in response to Ferriero Engr. letter dated 3/4/16. Regarding #4., what is the issue of the effluent filter?

Mr. Ingram stated that you don't put an effluent filter in an aerobic treatment system because you need that material to make the system function effectively. The aeration system needs a certain amount of biomass to create the bugs to breakdown everything that is in that wastewater and clean it out. If you remove too much in advance, you're not going to keep everything alive to make the blower unit function. The first chamber is the septic tank, so that is where you're not putting an effluent filter. Either way you are taking out the solids, it is just the finer material that you want to pass to the second chamber. There is no effluent filter, but none of that is actually leaving the tank because the aeration is sending the clean water to the top and pushing all the dirty stuff to the bottom. In essence the blower is serving as your effluent filter to make sure only the clean water is what exits the tank.

Ms. Butula summarized questions and responses #1. – 18. of E&LP letter dated 6/20/16, in response to Ferriero Engr. letter dated 3/4/16. Ms. Butula asked Mr. Ingram for testimony regarding #15.

Mr. Ingram stated that he is aware of Readington Townships requirement of 100' buffer from the "watercourse". This is a solid sealed pipe, the setback of 28.7' is the maximum they could provide.

Mr. Kosinski stated the engineer is correct, this is a solid pipe, there is no chance of groundwater entering the pipe and no chance of stormwater exiting the pipe. In that case it is not considered a watercourse unless it is defined as such in the code.

Mr. Ingram stated that the existing seepage pit is 18' from that pipe, so with the removal of that they will be 50% further away than they currently are.

Ms. Butula asked Mr. Ingram for testimony regarding #17.

Mr. Ingram stated they looked at this property and the neighboring properties, it is a very dense community, there are no watercourses, no low lying areas, the property drops of substantially, so there are no areas that would even remotely be considered wetlands. The lot is 60% impervious and for the most part very steeply sloping. The other properties are fully developed lawn areas and residences, garages and driveways. There is no evidence of any wetlands.

Mr. Nugent asked 1.)what would happen to the existing walkways? 2.)What is the proposed elevation of grade? 3.)From a design prospective, why is the pump tank to the left of the HOOT 900 forcing the line to come out and go around the HOOT 900 on the way to the bed? 4.) What is the distance between soil log 2 and the proposed disposal area?

Mr. Ingram stated they would 1.) Probably reconstruct the walkways on top. 2.) They will match the existing grade because of the proximity of the buildings they'll be within 6" of existing. 3.) It would be the exact same scenario, you would just be running the long line to the HOOT tank before you went to the pump tank. Either way, one pipe has to come from the other building and come around. There is no advantage to either scenario. 4.) 15', they went as far as they could away from it and still be within the limit.

There was some discussion of the proposed system being more in conformance than the existing system.

Mr. Nugent read into the record the section of Code that allows the administrative authority the right to make that determination:

N.J.A.C. 7:9A 3.3(e) 2 ii If it is not possible to bring the system in conformance with this Chapter, the system shall be brought as close to conformance with the requirements of this Chapter as the Administrative Authority determines is possible provided the system as improved results in a discharge that is protective of the human health and environment.

Ms. Butula reviewed the necessary variances/waivers as documented in HCHD letter dated 8/2/16 and Ferriero Engr. letter dated 7/6/16:

Variance:

1. Disposal area to existing well – 38.6' away from disposal area, 23' of casing. Neighbors is 77', 17' casing.
2. Separation distance from disposal bed to water service line. – 4.3 in 7:9A; 5'; Township requires 10'.
3. Septic tank to water service line 7.3; Township requires 10'.

Waiver:

4. Separation between building sewer and water service line. – 5'; Township requires 10'.
5. Separation from tank to right-of-way. – 1.9'; State requires 5'; Township requires 15'.
Waiver from BOH; Variance from State.
6. Disposal field bottom does not conform.
7. Pump.
8. HOOT treatment system.
9. Separation from disposal area to right-of-way. – 12.3'; State requires 10'; Township requires 15'.
Waiver from BOH; Variance from State.

There was some discussion of requiring the property owner to do a potable well test post construction, and to send an educational letter to the neighboring property advising to test their well.

Mr. Ingram stated that he would provide a letter from the property owner confirming that there are no chemicals stored on the property.

F. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Nugent to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m., seconded by Ms. Muir with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted:

Lorraine Petzinger