

# On-Site Wastewater Technical Advisory Group

April 3, 2013  
Kittitas County Courthouse  
County Commissioners Chambers  
Ellensburg, WA

## Meeting Summary

### MEETING ATTENDEES

#### Core Group Members Present

Peter Lombardi, L.D., Orenco  
David Jensen, P.E., Jensen Engineering  
Cindy Waite, Mason Co. Health  
Brent Stenson, Adams County Health  
Department  
Keith Grellner, Kitsap Co. Health District  
Robert Monetta, Windermere Real  
Estate-Methow Valley

#### Group Core Not Present

Bill Christman, P.E., Chelan Co. PUD  
Eric Knoff, Indigo Design

#### Guests

Stephen Wecker, Onsite Consulting  
Services  
John Thomas, WOSSA  
Joe Gilbert, Kittitas County Public Health  
Paul Vandervelde, Glendon  
Mike Moren, PE  
Dave Lowe, Lowridgetech

#### DOH Staff

Leslie Turner  
John Eliasson  
Lynn Schneider  
Nancy Darling

### INTRODUCTION:

The meeting began at 9:45 AM on April 3, 2013

### SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL DISCUSSIONS

#### UV Field Issues

There are problems that have been identified with UV units in various areas of the state. Kitsap has had several sites where the UV has caught on fire. There have been reports of a trampoline and other items catching on fire from the UV unit. Not all UV units that are not working catch on fire.

Some of the O&M providers have reported to their LHJs that the light may be on and functioning but because the bulb is so sludged up, there is likely no disinfection.

Currently no monitoring is conducted to determine whether the UV unit is working and/or emitting the proper wavelength and intensity. The equipment for this level of monitoring is apparently very costly.

The cost to the homeowner to replace the bulb is approximately \$300.00. If the entire unit must be replaced, the cost is approximately \$1000.00. There is a concern that some problems may not be reported due to these costs and the belief that UVs are ineffective.

Kitsap estimates a 45% failure with UV in their jurisdiction.

Several questions/issues were brought up:

1. DOH should do some field investigations.
2. Installation inconsistencies and what is the best method? Some areas install them in the pump tank, others in an external basin following the pump tank, and some are installed in the ground. Should there be a standardized installation procedure?
3. A troubleshooting manual from the manufacturer should be provided. This appears to be a manufacturer issue. Modifications to the unit have been made throughout the past years.
4. The question of whether UV is actually effective was discussed.
5. Why are there no problems during a 6 month NSF test? NSF is required to inform us if maintenance is performed during a test. Should this be addressed in rule?
6. Does NSF testing serve the necessary purpose? The rule does not consider the testing results to be applied as field compliance standards.
7. A risk based design and a tiered process with mitigation was considered, however the general consensus was that it would be difficult to standardize it.
8. \*\* Perhaps the rule change creating Treatment Levels A, B, C, D, and E are too conservative and should be revisited.

General consensus: All of the above should be revisited.

## Technical Issue Topics Regarding the Effectiveness of the Rule Revision

### Background

WAC 246-272A requires rule review every 4 years to evaluate its effectiveness and determine if revisions are needed. The resulting report is presented to the State Board of Health. The first review was in 2009. A survey was sent to the LHJs and other stakeholders. The summary result was to not reopen the rule for revision at that time.

It is now 4 years later. The first step for the 2013 rule review is discussion with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

### **Item#1:**

#### Table III – “Treatment System Performance Testing Levels”

#### Table VI – “Treatment Component Performance Levels and Method of Distribution”

These were developed because the general thought at the time was that parameters of Treatment Standards 1 & 2 were too close and there should be more categories.

#### Table IX “Treatment Component Performance Levels for Repair of OSS Not Meeting Vertical and Horizontal Separations”

The item in question here was that add-on disinfection cannot be used to meet some treatment levels in certain conditions. The reason for this was that strong O&M programs are not common throughout the state and better control over the success of the only replacement drainfield area is needed.

Question: Would it be possible to assess site risk? This would not be something that could be standardized in the rule?

General consensus: These tables should all be revisited. The Treatment Levels may be too conservative. Are proprietary product requirements too stringent? Is disinfection necessary to meet Table VI performance levels?

### **Item#2:**

#### Table V “Soil Type Descriptions”

General consensus: This does not need to be changed

#### Table VIII “Maximum Hydraulic Loading Rate”

General consensus: This does not need to be changed

**Item #3:**

Organic Loading Rate Design Standards

General consensus: This may be a good topic to discuss if the rule is reopened.

**Item #4:**

Disposal component reductions

General consensus: the majority did not think this needed to be changed.

**Item #5:**

Wastewater Quality/Strength/Content

General consensus: no change needed

**Item # 6:**

Type 1-A Soil Issues

General consensus: no change needed

**Item #7:**

Minimum lot size

General consensus: if the rule is reopened, this section should be clearer, and provide better consistency with GMA – currently there are conflicts.

Daily Design Flows

General consensus: no change needed

**Item #9 (there is no 8):**

Table IV soil depth issues

The concept of a risk based approach was again brought up. This would include horizontal separations as well as soil type and vertical separation.

General consensus: this may be a topic for further discussion.

**Item #10:**

Sand/Media specifications

General consensus: no change needed

Performance based criteria

General consensus: Composting toilets that meet NSF 41 should not need to be registered. If the rule is reopened then this should be revised.

The following are the volunteers from the TAG and WOSSA who will serve on a panel to work on developing a survey for the 2013 rule review:

John Thomas, WOSSA

Peter Lombardi, TAG

Bob Monetta, TAG

David Jensen, TAG

Keith Grellner, TAG

## **WRAP UP:**

The next meeting will be in fall, 2013 or as announced