

POWTS Teleconference Minutes
August 15, 2006

1. Comm 83 Revision Process - Roman Kaminski prepared a Comm 83 scoping statement. It allows us to begin the process to make revisions to chs. 81, 84, 85 and 87. Letters will go out to various groups inviting them to participate in the advisory code council. The first meeting will be after Labor Day with about 6 meetings anticipated in total. Staff with code revision suggestions should let Harold Stanlick or Brad Johnson know what they are so they can tally them and review when they meet with Roman in September. It is expected that the code revisions will be minor in scope. Roman estimated that the revisions from this process will become effective the first part of the year 2008. Act 347 directs Commerce to ramp up the maintenance requirements in Comm 83. Roman described a meeting that was held in Clark County to discuss the removal in Act 347 of an exemption for farmers that spread their own holding tank waste. A number of counties would like to see the farmer exemption reinstated for what the DNR is calling "true farmers".
2. There will be a POWTS program meeting on November 14-15 immediately following the Red Tag training for field staff. Arrangements in Stevens Point are being made. More details to follow.
3. Gravity At-Grade Designs - a discussion took place about the use of distribution boxes in gravity at-grade designs. The discussion focused on whether or not elbows or some other type of flow equalization measure should be installed. Due to the depth that many d-boxes are installed, many staff felt that they are seldom checked again afterwards. Others reported that there are few problems with at-grade designs compared to mounds. Roman reminded everyone that it is important to obtain factual information about POWTS component performance before making statements about potential wide-ranging problems. Jerry Swim will develop a draft policy on what details should be submitted with gravity at-grade designs. Input from field and county staff will be obtained. Ross Fugil suggested

that we should visit other Individual Site Designs in the field to see how they are functioning.

4. Soil Application Rates - Roman indicated how to consider soil application rates other than those reported on the soil test for POWTS designs. This applies to soil structure that can be modified during the installation process like moderate or strong platy structures that can be altered to blocky or subangular blocky. In these cases, the CST needs to report the actual soil conditions, but should make a note on the report that a modified rate may be used in the design. It is the person with the expertise in the field (CST) that makes the call that the soil structure can be modified and what the "new" soil application rate from Table 83.44-2 can be. If the CST does not make a reference on the soils report about modifying the structure of the soil, then it will not be acceptable for the designer to modify the soil application rates reported by the CST if they are different people. In cases where a CST or designer chooses to assign a soil application rate other than that listed in Table 83.44-1 & 2, this would trigger an ISD submittal that would include justification for the selected application rate.
5. Mounds with auto-shut off switch. It was reported that two such designs were approved over the last year under very tight monitoring conditions and that no more designs would be approved until sufficient monitoring was conducted and a final report prepared. If any additional proposals are made, reviewers are asked to indicate that they will not be approved for now and to report those cases to Brad.
6. Individual Site Designs and Regulated Object Line Descriptions - Brad suggested differences in how regulated object description lines should be filled in by plan review staff that would make it easier to research previously reviewed projects. When the design submittal consists of a typical system design (mound, at-grade, in-ground, etc.) with a deviation from a component manual, list the system type first, then a brief description on the unique aspect that makes it an individual site design. Examples include:

Holding Tank - Site Constructed

At-Grade - Gravity

In Ground - Sand Blanket
System in fill

If the description line is not large enough to briefly describe the uniqueness of the design, place a short description in a few sentences or paragraph in the final action letter of transaction.

Charlie Bratz suggested including the number of bedrooms in the description line as a good reminder to a home owner of the capacity of the POWTS. This is ok to do as long as there is sufficient room, but the above mentioned information should be listed first prior to placing additional information.