

Innovative/Alternative Systems:

Cristin said that there are no systems ready for TAC review.

Instantaneous Peak Demand Rules:

A meeting of the TAC subcommittee that will review the current rules and make recommendations has not been scheduled but Bruce will schedule a meeting for December. Bruce has information from the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (IAPMO) that he will circulate to the TAC.

Diagram for Typical Driven Well:

Figure C-17, in the WW Rules, was discussed at an earlier meeting and found to be confusing. While the text of the WW Rules allows for variations from the details in Figure C-17, it was decided that the diagram should be revised to make it clear that the variations from the diagram are allowed when justified by the site conditions. Claude explained the concerns of the Licensed Well Drillers who need to decide on construction methods as the well is drilled when there is an opportunity to use a less expensive well finished in unconsolidated material rather than in bedrock. Claude will contact the New York well drillers to see if they have any useful material. The group reviewed the diagram and made suggestions that clarify the requirements. The information can be circulated to the Regional Office staff and to Licensed Designers so that it can be used immediately. The changes will be added to proposed updates to the WW Rules.

Training Grant:

Cristin reported that the Lake Champlain Basin Program has authorized a \$200,000 grant to create a training program for service providers. There are groups of providers for water treatment systems as well as for wastewater treatment systems.

Installer Licensing:

Gunner asked if there will be licensing requirements for installers. Bruce said that legislation was passed and signed by the Governor that requires installers to have insurance if they are doing a project that costs \$10,000 or more. Bruce will send a link to the legislation.

Seasonal Use Requirements:

This topic was continued from earlier meetings. Steve asked if there is still any need to keep the language. The existing WW Rules define seasonal use as less than 180 days of occupancy in a calendar year. The WW Rules then define a change in use from less than 180 days in a calendar year to 180 days or more, as a change in operational requirements. This

language is in the WW Rules to ensure that an existing lot with an existing seasonal use, single family residence, that may have limited water and wastewater capacity, is not converted to year-round use without determining that the increased use will not create a health hazard. When the seasonal use requirements were first included in an earlier set of WW Rules, the conversion could not be approved unless fully complying water and wastewater systems could be and were installed. The current version of the WW Rules allows for the use of variances to design replacement water and wastewater systems, except that the replacement wastewater system cannot be a holding tank system.

Steve, and other designers, note that in some cases the building and its water and wastewater systems were suitable for year-round use at the time of construction and would likely function without meeting the definition of a failed system, even though they do not meet current standards. While the use of the variance process allows for the conversion to year-round use for a lot that does not meet current standards, it still requires construction of the most complying systems possible. In some cases, this is an unnecessary expense that does not result in significant health or environmental protection. Cristin noted that, in some cases the permit does not require immediate construction, and perhaps this approach could be applied to seasonal conversions.

While there are situations where the existing water and wastewater systems can support year-round use without alterations, there are also lots with very substandard systems that will not support year-round use. A compromise might be to require a site evaluation and a permit with designed water and wastewater systems but not require the installation of the systems until the systems meet the definition of failed systems. Even if the systems are not built, having a design in place helps protect the areas that will be needed in the future.

Municipal Delegation:

The WW Rules allow a municipality to be delegated to administer the WW Rules. Colchester, which has administered the WW Rules for many years, has asked to end their delegation. Bruce will be working with them on the process of transferring records to ensure continuity. This will result in about 100 additional permit requests per year for the Essex Regional Office. Charlotte will be the only municipality with delegation.

Supplemental Well Requirements:

Gunner noted that §1-1102-(b)(2) states that a building shall be served by no more than one potable water source unless none of the water sources presumptive isolation zones extend onto neighboring properties. Exemption §1-304(16)(D), dealing with supplemental wells, only requires that the isolation zone for the supplemental well not extend onto neighboring properties. The TAC agreed that §1-1102-(b)(2) should be revised to match the exemption.

Site Visits:

Justin noted that Licensed Designers are concerned about lots they have evaluated and found not to comply with the WW Rules that are later permitted for construction. There are situations where the site conditions have been favorably altered, usually by the addition of drainage. In some cases, another area that could not be evaluated during the original visit becomes available. It would, however, be good if there was a system that ensured that the Regional Office staff was aware of the original assessment because some lots have been permitted that do not appear to comply. When a system is seen to have springtime surface water at the toe of the construction compliance is not likely.

In most cases the Regional Office staff is unaware of the earlier testing and if the application did not include a site visit as part of the review process, they can only rely on the information submitted. Even when a site visit was made during the original assessment, if the application is not filed for several years after that, it is difficult to associate the old information with the later application. The TAC believes that a site visit is the best chance at ensuring compliance and supports making site visits a priority. Bruce said he agrees and that he has encouraged the staff to make site visits.