

Approved Minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
August 21, 2012

Attendees: Roger Thompson Claude Chevalier
Peter Boemig Mark Bannon
Anne Whiteley Mary Clark
Spencer Harris John Beauchamp
Bill Zabiloski Jessanne Wyman
Cindy Parks Ernest Christianson
Scott Stewart Justin Willis
Rodney Pingree Craig Heindel

Scheduled meetings:

September 25, 2012 1-4 PM Liquor Control Conference Room-Montpelier
October 23, 2012 1-4 PM Liquor Control Conference Room-Montpelier

Agenda:

The agenda was accepted as proposed.

Minutes:

The draft minutes of the July 17, 2012 meeting were reviewed and accepted. Kim Greenwood had suggested that the minutes state that a VNRC representative was not present and therefore had not offered an opinion on the list of proposed conditional exemptions for the UIC Rules. The committee decided that the list of those attending each meeting was sufficient to make it clear.

Update on UIC Rule Revisions:

Cindy asked the TAC to start with an overview of the proposed categories for conditional exemptions to see if they are appropriate and if there are any others that should be considered. Once the categories are generally agreed upon, each category will be reviewed, and then all of the comments will used to fine tune the wording of each exemption.

Cindy said that she is also looking for input on whether some categories of parking garages should have a registration requirement as one condition for a conditional exemption. Also required is a determination of technical standards, such a separation to SHWT, separation to drinking water wells, and incidental contamination. Cindy said that a draft of the full UIC Rule revision will be available soon.

Mark asked when using an underground injection well would be appropriate. Craig said that a discharge of wastewater that meets groundwater standards would be an example. In response to a question, Anne said that under current regulations, the discharge would need to meet groundwater standards at a point of compliance such as at a property line or at a source of drinking water. Anne noted that there is an ongoing review of compliance points and the current definition could be revised in the future.

Peter said he was concerned about small parking lots with injection wells. There is a current registration process with minimal requirements. Imposing the standards used in the stormwater management program that currently apply to larger parking lots would be a significant burden for small users. Craig suggested some sort of mass balance approach, where the requirements would be proportionate to the amount of area might be a way to smooth the transition from very small parking lots with just a few spaces up to those of more than one acre. Anne noted another area of tension between old and new parking areas/garages. There are choices to be made about an exemption date. Craig suggested it should be the date of the new UIC Rules. Anne said that using the date of the original stormwater rules is under consideration. Roger asked if this could result in requiring the owner of a small system that did not need a stormwater permit or UIC permit at the time to apply for a permit in the future for the existing project. Anne said that it might. Mark asked it would be reasonable to select a date in the future that would take effect after the UIC Rules were adopted. Anne said that this is generally not done because it can cause people to engage in bad development just to beat the clock. Peter asked if the registration process of filing a notice with the state would continue. Anne said that as planned the injection well in most cases would be covered by a conditional exemption and registration would not be required. Some larger projects, maybe certain parking garages, might still need to register. Peter said that Brattleboro is regulating peak stormwater discharges to their municipal system and as a result he is designing more systems where the new or increased discharge is going to a subsurface disposal system. Craig said that the revised UIC Rules should include an exemption for very small increases in flow so that adding a couple of parking spaces would not create a huge burden on a landowner.

Bill asked about floor drains in residential use. Anne said there would be an exemption for certain floor drains. Bill and Jessanne said that there is a need for an exemption for floor drains in residential garages as there are a large number of these that do not seem to be a major threat to groundwater.

John noted that there is a growing awareness and concern about pharmaceuticals that are passing through treatment systems without being treated.

Anne asked for TAC feedback on adding uranium, radium, nitrate, and copper to the water treatment exemption. The TAC supports these additions. Cindy said she was considering if the 2000 GPD exemption limit for water systems should apply to small public systems as well as Potable Water Systems.

Overflowing Wells:

Scott was asked to follow-up from the discussion at the previous TAC meeting. Scott said the issue of how and when to control overflowing wells has resurfaced as a couple of communities are disconnecting large groups of users. These users are now constructing drilled wells and there is at least one area where a group of wells are likely to overflow. A couple of the wells are overflowing in the range of 100 GPM. Scott said that the disposal of this much water can be a problem. Directly discharging this overflow to surface water is subject to the Direct Discharge Rules. The current process is for the well driller to contact the state and they generally receive permission for the discharge. Claude said he has used the process without any problems. Scott said that in the current case 3 wells overflowed when drilled. Two have been closed in and they are working on closing in the third well. Craig asked if there has been any progress on developing a policy on overflowing wells. Scott suggested draft language for the Potable Water Supply Rules to close in any well with a discharge of less than 10 GPM and to work to close in or restrict larger flows. Scott said that Jeff Williams has been working with the original well driller on the process to close in the wells. Claude said that the State of Michigan has a lot of data on overflowing wells that might be a basis for use in Vermont.

Hydro-subcommittee Status:

Ernie said that he has a list of comments that he has received from the Regional Office Staff that he will get organized for discussion at TAC. Craig said it would make sense for Ernie to meet with the subcommittee prior to bringing the discussion to the TAC.

I/A Systems:

Cindy said that there is an approval request for the High Strength FAST System. She hopes to have information to discuss at the next TAC meeting.

The approval for the use of the fabric covered pipe by GeoFlow is moving along and it should be approved soon. The approval will be quite similar to that issued for the Presby Enviro-Septic Pipe.

The approval for the EcoFlo peat filter has expired. The already permitted projects can still use the system. There have been some complaints about cracking tanks. The company has suggested that some of the problems were related to improper installations. The state position is that the installation inspections are done by people approved by the Company and they signed off on the installation as Company representatives. The two most recent service providers have severed their contracts so at this point the Company would need to send someone from Canada, which they have done in the past. The company has made changes in the design to deal with the cracking. It is believed that there are about 60 systems with identified cracks, though some are clearly from being driven over. Spencer asked how many of the systems with cracks are not operating properly. There appears to be about 8 systems that are malfunctioning.

Topic List for URI Training in October:

Craig said that any information about well isolation distances would be welcome. Mary mentioned bottomless sand filters, which are often used in Rhode Island. Jessanne asked for information about hydrogeologic information related to determining site capacity. Craig suggested a discussion of the long term acceptance rate for leachfields. One comment was to cover any information about the physical deterioration of a septic system caused by the discharge from a water treatment system. Mary suggested that they could discuss what is coming for new technology that might be useful in Vermont. Also of interest would be a discussion about recycle and reuse systems, gravelless distribution systems, and filtrate effluent distribution.

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. Water Supply Rule update **high**
6. Seasonal High Water Table determination for performance based systems **high**
7. Wastewater Strength

Executive Committee

Steve Revell, Ernest Christianson, Roger Thompson

Alternates – Chris Thompson, Spencer Harris, Claude Chevalier, Craig Heindel

Subcommittees

Hydrogeology –

Craig Heindel, Bill Zabiloski, Mark Bannon, Scott Stewart, Steve Revell, Mary Clark

Overshadowing of Isolation Distance 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, Cindy Parks

SHWT Monitoring –

Craig Heindel, Steve Revell, Roger Thompson, Ernie Christianson, Bill Zabiloski,
Dan Wilcox, Mary Clark

UIC Rules and Disposal of Wastewater from Water Treatment Systems –

John Beauchamp, Gary Adams, Roger Thompson, Ernie Christianson,
Gail Center, Cindy Parks

Wastewater Strength -

Mary Clark, Cindy Parks, Peter Boemig, Bill Zabiloski, Roger Thompson,
John Akielaszek,

Bottomless Sand Filters-

Peter Boemig, Mark Bannon, Cindy Parks, Mary Clark, Denise Johnson-Terk