

# Technical Guidance Committee Meeting Agenda

Thursday, June 27, 2019

9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Conference Room C  
Department of Environmental Quality  
1410 North Hilton  
Boise, ID 83706

## **TGC ATTENDEES:**

Rachael Smith – REHS, Onsite Wastewater Coordinator, DEQ (TGC Chairman)  
Joe Canning – P.E., B&A Engineers Inc.  
Kellye Eager – REHS, Director of Environmental Health, EIPH  
Jason Peppin – REHS, Senior Environmental Health Specialist, PHD  
Mike Reno – REHS, Environmental Health Supervisor, CDHD  
Kendall Unruh – WEB, Inc. dba Western Septic & Excavation (via telephone)

## **GUESTS:**

Mary Anne Nelson – DEQ, Water Quality Division Administrator  
Lisa O’Hara – DEQ, Office of Attorney General  
Larry Waters – DEQ, Wastewater Engineering Bureau Chief  
Lori Flook – DEQ, Administrative Assistant  
Dave Lowe – Lowridge Onsite Technologies  
PaRee Godsill – Everlasting Concrete Products  
Jason Henderson, - Geomatrix  
Fred Vengrouski - Elgen (via telephone)

## **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:**

Meeting is called to order at 9:33 A.M.  
Committee members and guests introduced themselves

## ***Public Comment Period:***

Rachael Smith opened the meeting for public comments. No comments were presented.

Rachael Smith said that she had intended to add to the agenda a discussion of the frequency of TGC meetings, but forgot to add it to the final version of the agenda. She requested that if the committee was in favor of discussing it at the end of the meeting, they could vote to do so.

**Motion:** Joe Canning motioned to amend the agenda

**Second:** Kellye Eager

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously passed

Rachael Smith asked attendees that in order to maintain a more organized meeting and discussion, if there are public comments during the meeting to please hold them until the

end of the committee discussion for each agenda item.  
If someone wanted to provide public comment, please do so after the committee discussion and before the voting.

## **APPENDIX A:**

**Action Item:** March 7, 2019 Draft TGC Meeting Minutes

Joe Canning mentioned that it would be helpful if the minutes specified what each motion was for, rather than only who made the motion. Rachael said she would take notes to make sure this was on record. Kellye Eager mentioned a spelling error of her name.

**Motion:** Joe moved to approve the minutes with corrections

**Second:** Mike

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously passed. The final minutes will be posted to DEQ's website within 30 days.

## **Old Business**

## **APPENDIX B:**

**Action Item:** TGM Section 4.19.3.2 Pressurization Unit

Rachael summarized public comment and said two comments were provided from engineers who do not want a maximum residual head. She read a comment, "I think an engineer with professional credentials has the ability to make these systems work without limiting the residual head to only 5'. Up until this change, the minimum was 5' or more so there can't be a technical argument to this change. It is still unclear if it is a suggestion or requirement."

Mike said the original minimum in the TGM was 2 ½ feet. Joe said he thought the range may have come from the *Converse and Tyler* study. Joe asked if the use of an orifice shield should be incorporated for residual heads above 5' to prevent scour. A discussion on this followed. Rachael mentioned in her research other states use ranges from 2' – 5' as a minimum with no maximums being listed. Members said a maximum should be listed and Rachael agreed to do more research on the matter.

**Motion:** Joe Canning moved to table the decision until further information is found with a range of residual head being used in other states and what studies show as an effective range.

**Second:** Kellye Eager

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously passed.

## **APPENDIX C:**

**Action Item:** TGM Section 2.2.5 Method of 72 to Determine Effective Soil Depths

Rachael read a public comment that said it may be helpful to include in the TGM that the Method of 72 wasn't applicable to LSAS. The committee agreed that the comment is not applicable because the section already addresses effective soil depths as required by IDAPA 58.01.03.008.02.

Someone mentioned that the reference to “medium sand” needed to be changed in TGM section 3.2.8.1.2 to “manufactured medium sand”. It was decided that this would have to be added to next meeting’s agenda as new business because it was not on the agenda.

**Motion:** Mike Reno motioned for final approval of the edits to TGM Section 2.2.5.

**Second:** Joe Canning

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously passed.

#### **APPENDIX D:**

##### ***Action Item:*** TGM Section 4.23 In-Trench Sand Filter

Rachael said there were no public comments provided for this topic. She said that section 4.23.3.2.3.3.a and b were not consistent with the changes made to figure 4-41. The committee agreed that the section should be changed. She said that figure 4-41 does not make sense as written about soil types instead of manufactured medium sand. The committee agreed to add “manufactured medium sand” before the soil type in this figure. Jason said that the term “native soil” should be added to figures 4-39 and 4-40 as they are shown in figure 4-41.

**Motion:** Mike Reno motioned for preliminary approval of the new edits pending 30 day public comment.

**Second:** Joe Canning

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously passed

#### **APPENDIX E:**

##### ***Action Item:*** TGM Section 4.11.4 Gravelless Trench System Construction

Rachael read the public comment that was received which questioned, “Does this completely remove the requirement for inspection ports? I would support some flexibility in whether they need to be installed on every lateral, especially for bigger systems, but it seems like there is value to having some observation ports, at least to assess the extents of potential drainfield failure? I also don’t think it’s necessary to specify that observation ports be located at the end of the lateral since these systems are installed level and ponded water should be observable throughout the length of chambers.”

Jason said people sometimes cut off the inspection ports and sometimes it was helpful to have the inspection ports at the end of the field to help show where the drainfield ended. The committee decided that as the TGM is currently written, the inspection port is not a requirement and is only a recommendation and decided to leave the wording as it currently reads so no edits were made.

No action taken.

## New Business

### APPENDIX F:

#### *Action Item:* OSCAR-II Treatment System Installer Design Manual

Joe Canning started by saying that he has used Lowridge technology on a couple of systems in the past and if there was any perceived conflict of interest that he would remove himself from the discussion. No one in attendance felt that that would be necessary so discussion on design manual began.

Dave Lowe requested to join the discussion to present the manual. He said the intent was that a complex installer could use the templates for different sites without having to do all the calculations. He said that all sizes were designed based on 1.5x rate. He explained the design process included on page 4 and noted that if TDH is outside of the blue shaded area, the system must be designed by an engineer. The committee requested that a footnote is added at the bottom of Table 1 to explain this.

Jason suggested Table 2 & 3 reference what numbers in the table refers back to and suggested adding a legend. Kendall asked for clarification on page 3 that the installer may design up to 5 bedrooms and more than that requires a PE. to design. Dave said that was true. Jason said he likes having all scenarios laid out for installers. Mike said that on page 14 the coil to edge distance should be 7 feet not inches and that a maximum of 5 bedrooms or 350 gallons should be shown. Design flow should show gpd in these tables. Rachael said the bottom of page 4 should be 15.5 to match Table 1. It was discussed that that anything greater than 350 gallons flow must be designed by a PE and that at the top of page 3 – add or edit (150-350 gallons per day) so as to not limit restrictions to residential applications. It should read 150-350 gpd for non-residential flows with domestic strength.

**Motion:** Mike motioned to a preliminary approval with edits to the manual.

**Second:** Joe

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously approved.

### APPENDIX G:

#### *Action Item:* BioRock Product

Rachael said someone requested to use this as an experimental system for the purpose of a lower impact product (does not use a drainfield). The product would need subsurface disposal after treatment. Jason Peppin stated that product doesn't meet NSF requirements. Rachael said that she looked at the European standard and that it was not a NSF equivalent so it could not receive secondary treatment sizing. Also, the manual requires an Operation and Maintenance plan. The committee said that based on lack of NSF or equivalent certification and the need for an approved drainfield when the manual does not include one, it should be disapproved for use.

**Motion:** Jason motioned to disprove for use.

**Second:** Joe

**Verbal Vote:** Unanimously approved.

## **APPENDIX H:**

### ***Action Item:*** TGM Section 4.5.3 Drip Distribution Design Requirements

Rachael said there was a question about Section 4.5.3.1.4 being unclear about the soil application rate being “the most restrictive” but does not differentiate between pretreated and non-pretreated application rates. Jason said that in the following sections, 4.5.3.2.2 and 4.5.3.3.2 it states which soil application rates shall be used. The committee decided that no action was needed.

### **On-site Wastewater Program Update**

Rachael mentioned Mike Reno’s reappointment for the next 3 years to the committee. Rachael mentioned that some installers have complained about the TGM being updated too frequently and that they cannot stay current on the changes. She asked whether it would be better for the TGC to meet less frequently. The committee said that they thought it was better to keep the frequency of the meetings the same so that products can be reviewed in a timely manner and that the committee can more easily remember the topics that were discussed during the previous meeting. It was decided that it should remain as it has been, every 3 months.

Rachael said that the first negotiated rulemaking meeting is July 10<sup>th</sup>. The rulemaking is for alternative systems including potentially proprietary systems and ETPS.

Rachael stated that the Loweridge OSCAR and Infiltrator ATL products have been approved since the last meeting.

## **NEXT MEETING:**

It was decided that the next meeting would be scheduled for September 26<sup>th</sup> at 9:30AM to be held at the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality state office.

**Motion:** Mike motioned to adjourn the meeting at 11:30.

**Second:** Jason

**Verbal Vote:** Committee unanimously approved.

Meeting was adjourned.