



file drawer. The staff will be relocated into other spaces at the VSAC building in Winooski as well as space in Waitsfield and Barre. The regional offices are in good shape except that the computer systems, which all depend on the central office network as a time and money saving approach, are currently not functioning. This should be fixed quickly. It is unknown how quickly the folks from the Waterbury Office will have new office space with phones and computers. Many of the staff are working from home or various temporary spots they can find.

There was only a small impact on the Wastewater Management operations from the storm, though people are slowly coming forward to deal with wastewater systems that were washed away or have had their isolation to surface waters greatly reduced by the storm actions.

Justin asked if phone numbers are the same. Chris said yes for the moment with the staff checking their voicemail frequently.

Wastewater treatment facilities were mostly OK with most of the damage being to pump stations and collection lines. Most plants realized the magnitude of the flooding and bypassed the treatment systems. The plants operated with primary separation chlorination to reduce the contamination to the extent possible. Considering the amount of water flowing and the contamination from all of the other sources, the chlorinated effluent posed only a small risk.

It is not clear if the state employees will move back to the Waterbury Complex. The ranges of options include moving back but also selling the property for other development and looking for space closer to Montpelier.

### **WWMD Reorganization:**

The WWMD division staff will move to the VSAC building in Winooski and this relocation will speed the physical reorganization by co-locating the staff in accord with the reorganization plan. The change in supervisors has not yet happened but is on track to happen when things are better organized.

### **Design Flows:**

Ernie, as requested by the TAC at the last meeting has updated the design flow list putting the categories in alphabetical order and making all of the changes that had been accepted by the TAC. Ernie circulated the most recent draft and Jessanne Wyman, Dan Wilcox, and Steve Rebillard submitted comments.

Ernie started to review the revised document and Anne asked if we could start with the sections not recently reviewed beginning with the section on laundry design flows. Craig asked if “per manufacturer’s specifications” is a dangerous approach. Anne said this approach was included to deal with extra-large machines. Mark asked if the Agency had collected any metered flow data. Ernie said that he did not have much data but agreed it

could be collected by talking to municipalities. It is important to consider the location of the operation as two businesses with a similar amount of washer/dryer capacity can vary a great deal in the amount of water they use depending on the number of customers. It was decided to go with a minimum flow of 450 GPD and to deal with unusually large machines on a case by case basis.

Ernie reviewed the design flows for marinas, noting that most of the waste from onboard holding tanks is pumped to onshore holding tanks rather than being discharged to a leachfield. The TAC accepted the flows as proposed.

Massage office flows were considered and there was discussion about the portion of flow for the patrons. It was decided to set a minimum flow that would allow for toilet flows for patrons which would not be reduced even if the applicant proposed to not provide toilets for the patrons, which might not be acceptable under other applicable regulations such as the Vermont Plumbing Rules.

Hotels, motels, bed and breakfast operations were considered to be one group and a design flow of 50 GPD per bed space was assigned. This allows for convenience kitchens in the individual rooms. If the laundry is washed onsite additional flows are assigned using the design flows for laundries. An operation serving breakfast to overnight guests is also allowed without requiring an increase in design flow. Mark said this was another category where it would be possible to collect information from municipal treatment plants that would help understand the flows actually being generated.

Items prioritized for discussion with high, low, and medium ranking

1. Soil identification vs. perc test **medium**
2. Curtain drain with presumption of effectiveness **high**
3. Revisions to desktop hydro chart **medium**
4. Minimum amount of sand under a mound **high**
5. Grandfathered design flow and conversion of use policy **high**
6. Updating of design flow chart **high**
7. Water Supply Rule update **high**
8. Seasonal High Water Table determination for performance based systems **high**

### **Executive Committee**

Steve Revell, Ernest Christianson, Bruce Douglas, Roger Thompson  
Alternates – Chris Thompson, Spencer Harris, Claude Chevalier, Craig Heindel

### **Subcommittees**

Hydrogeology - Craig Heindel, Dave Cotton and Steve Revell.

S.77 Issues – Anne Whiteley, Ernie Christianson, Roger Thompson, John Beauchamp,  
Gail Center, Chris Thompson

UIC Rules and Geothermal Wells - Craig Heindel, Steve Revell, Roger Thompson, Ernie  
Christianson, Scott Stewart, Rodney Pingree, Kim Greenwood

SHWT Monitoring - Craig Heindel, Steve Revell, Roger Thompson, Ernie Christianson,  
Bill Zabiloski, Dan Wilcox

UIC Rules and Disposal of Wastewater from Water Treatment Systems –  
John Beauchamp, Gary Adams, Roger Thompson, Ernie Christianson,  
Gail Center, Jeff Fehrs