

Approved Minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
February 9, 2010

Attendees: Roger Thompson Rodney Pingree
 Scott Stewart Jeff Fehrs
 Spencer Harris Dave Cotton
 Craig Heindel Claude Chevalier
 Gerry Kittle

Scheduled meetings:

March 16, 2010	1-4 PM	Room 107 Stanley Hall
April 13, 2010	1-4 PM	Room 107 Stanley Hall
May 4, 2010	1-4 PM	Room 107 Stanley Hall

Minutes:

Scott asked if the draft changes to the Water Supply Rules had been circulated to the Regional Office Staff. Roger said that he did not remember for certain and that he would check and would circulate any drafts that had not been circulated. Craig suggested changing the word backflow to backwash in the minutes which was agreed to.

H.593:

Roger reviewed the draft legislation which deals with two items. The first is the impact on neighboring properties of isolation zones for water and wastewater systems. The bill requires the developer to keep the isolation zones on their property to the “extent technically feasible.” The Department agrees with the concept but the language is unworkably vague and the Department will ask for clear guidance as the bill is considered. The second issue is that the bill also proposes to allow municipalities to not issue a local permit until a State Wastewater and Water Supply Permit was issued. This issue was considered by the Legislature in 2007 and the current language that allows a local permit to be conditioned such that construction may not start until the state permit was adopted in statute. The Agency will work towards a process that will continue to allow a person to apply for the most limiting or difficult to obtain permit first whether that be the state permit or the local permit.

Roger will keep the TAC informed and they can follow the legislative website as well.

Water Treatment Systems:

Roger reviewed the status of water treatment systems. Roger and Anne Whiteley met with a subcommittee of ACEC (American Council of Engineering Companies) to review the rule language that would deregulate a large portion of water treatment systems for non-public water systems. Craig asked about the sense of the ACEC folks and Roger replied that there did not seem to strong opposition though there are some concerns about

systems larger than one single family residence. Their plan was to take the issue to their larger group. There may be an attempt to add the exemptions statutorily which would make the changes effective sooner than would happen with a revision to the Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Rules could be done.

Draft Revisions to the Water Supply Rules:

Scott reviewed the draft revisions of the Water Supply Rules that are related to isolation distances and to the section on variances. Roger noted that variance is used differently in the Wastewater System and Potable Water Supply Rules and its use in the Water Supply Rules is limited for use with small scale water systems. Scott said that it is important to the Water Supply Division to have a process in the rules that allows for alternate methods of construction such as running a well vent over to and up the side of a building.

Spencer asked how the isolation distances apply when someone adds a bedroom to an existing single family residence that was approved when the well isolation distance was 100' but which under the current rules needs an isolation distance of 200'. If there is an increase in design flow the rules would require use of the 200' isolation distance. Craig noted that in some cases the 200' distance could be reduced using a hydrogeologic evaluation of the site conditions.

Scott reviewed Table A and noted that there are several categories that have been added. Many of these came from a review of the Wisconsin water supply rules which has a much more extensive list of items that have a protective isolation distance. All new water sources serving a new or expanded use would need to comply with the isolation distances. Replacements for existing systems without any increase in design flow qualify for reductions in isolation distance if required. Scott said that he had included a section that provides guidance on how to respond to lesser isolation distances with additional well casing.

Table A has a ranking number as the left most column. The intent is to provide guidance on which of the isolation distances are most important so that when choices must be made between two or more items the one with the lower ranking is the one where the isolation distance is reduced the most. The question of shallow wells was raised and Scott said that this first attempt was based on drilled wells. There was discussion about the use of the term shallow well as opposed to unconsolidated versus consolidated and pumped versus gravity sources. It was agreed that the terms should be clarified.

It was decided that line #8 related to discharges from water treatment systems could be removed.

It was also decided that the isolation distances related to ROW herbicide application should be reviewed. The types and uses of herbicides have changed significantly over the recent years and it may be appropriate to reduce these isolation distances.

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**

Executive Committee

Steve Revell, Lance Phelps, and Roger Thompson
Alternates – Chris Thompson, Spencer Harris, Jeff Williams

Subcommittees

Hydrogeology - Craig Heindel, Dave Cotton and Steve Revell.

Training subcommittee - Roger Thompson, Dave Cotton, and Barbara Willis.

Drip Disposal – Roger Thompson, Dave Cotton, Steve Revell, Alan Huizenga

Water treatment systems – Gail Center, Jeff Williams, Rodney Pingree, Dave Cotton, Lance Phelps, and Roger Thompson.