







































**SPS 383 PRIVATE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS**

NO.	SPS SECTION	ISSUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS	CLASSIFICATION
26	383.22(2)(c) <i>Council Addition</i>	Are changes to signature requirements needed to accommodate electronic submittal of plans?			Low <i>See draft language</i>
27	383.44 Combine these concepts.	Short of a petition for variance, many commercial facilities have been pushed towards unreliable pretreatment devices which fail to perform.	Allow 3rd soil column or alternative sizing method for High Strength Wastewater which would allow the same loading rate of BOD, FOG and TSS per square foot as system receiving "normal" strength effluent. An alternative is to entirely eliminate the limitation in SPS 383.44(2)(a) and size based upon effluent loading.	No change in costs.  This revision would allow another simple low-technology option for owners and installers.	High <i>This will be combined into one topic regarding high strength waste. Begin discussion on 3/16/2016 meeting.</i>
28	383.44-1 Maximum Soil Application Rates Based Upon Percolation Rates (Table)	The rule references out of date percolation rates.	Remove all references to percolation rates.	Costs are expected to be minimal.  New morphological soil tests would be needed to replace old soil tests showing percolation rates which are no longer used.	Low <i>See draft language</i>
29	383.44-2 Maximum Soil Application Rates Based Upon Morphological Soil Evaluation (Table)	High strength waste (>220 BOD and >150 TSS) have limited treatment options.	Additional loading rate column for moderately high strength wastes.	No costs increases are expected from this proposal.  This proposal would provide more flexibility for dealing with high strength wastes.	High <i>This will be combined into one topic regarding high strength waste. Begin discussion on 3/16/2016 meeting.</i>
30	383.44(2) Influent quality.	Various commercial buildings produce influent quality greater than those listed, but still may be best served by a POWTS.	Add (d), "New facilities potentially generating waste greater than the parameters listed in (a) may be designated as 'At-Risk'. At-Risk facilities shall submit testing data, according to section (b), within one year of installation. Those facilities shown to produce parameters above the limits in (a) shall make the necessary changes to reduce wastewater strength according to the management plan."	The cost of this proposal expected to be minimal.  This proposal is expected to provide better management of 'at-risk' systems and reduce violation of the code.	High <i>This will be combined into one topic regarding high strength waste. Begin discussion on 3/16/2016 meeting.</i>

**SPS 383 PRIVATE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS**

NO.	SPS SECTION	ISSUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS	CLASSIFICATION
31	383.44(2)(a)	<p>Currently, the department exclusively allows some form of aerobic treatment component to meet the parameters specified in 383.44(2)(a) in situations where those parameters would be exceeded without the aerobic treatment. Often, the aerobic components are incorporated into a POWTS design without consideration of relevant hydraulic flow and organic loading data. The hydraulic flow and organic loading must be within the performance limits of the proposed aerobic component model in order for it to operate properly. Furthermore, once these components are in operation, many are not maintained in a timely manner resulting in pre-maturely failing drain fields. Other design techniques are available that would eliminate these inherent problems with aerobic components. These techniques were effectively applied in Wisconsin for "high-strength" wastewater application to soil dispersal areas prior to the pervasive use of aerobic components which did not begin until the mid- to late 1990's.</p>	<p>Revise s. SPS 383.44(2)(a) to read: "Unless otherwise permitted under s. SPS 383.46," (remainder as currently worded). Then add a new code section, s. SPS 383.46, which would read: "Design techniques for in situ soil dispersal components receiving high-strength wastewater. (1) Definition. Influent to an in situ soil dispersal component shall be considered high-strength if it exceeds the parameters specified under s. SPS 383.44 (2)(a)&amp;(b). (2) Permitted design techniques. Permitted techniques for designing in situ soil dispersal components receiving high strength wastewater include one or a combination of the following: (a) Determine the minimum required dispersal area based on organic loading rates. (b) Provide three separate dispersal components each having fifty percent of the minimum required area based on hydraulic loading rates. In an annual rotation scheme employing a diverter valve, two units would be on-line while one unit would be off-line." (These alternatives are suggestions open to discussion.)</p>	<p>The cost of this proposal is unknown.</p> <p>The proposed language would provide alternatives to the use of aerobic components to reduce organic load concentrations and to the inherent and intensive ATU maintenance requirements.</p>	<p>High</p> <p><b><i>This will be combined into one topic regarding high strength waste. Begin discussion on 3/16/2016 meeting.</i></b></p>

**SPS 383 PRIVATE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS**

NO.	SPS SECTION	ISSUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS	CLASSIFICATION
32	383.44(6)(a)2 ORIENTATION	Some component manuals allow systems to be constructed <1% off contour.	Codify component manual language by striking “along” and replacing it with “within 1% of”.	This proposal is not expected to increase costs. This proposal is expected to clarify rule requirements and provide a basis for more consistent interpretation of the rule.	Low <i>See draft language</i>
33	383.45 <i>Council Addition</i>	Specify cover/backfill depth for effluent lines and forcemains.	No specifications for the cover over forcemains. No minimum depth. If picking number, it would be one foot.  Effluent lines and forcemains need to have 12 inches of cover.	Physical protection for issue. Hit with lawn mower and breaks. When it gets hit by a lawn mower or something then there could be a discharge. Common practice for other types of systems to provide frost proofing.	Medium
34	383.45(2) <i>Council Addition</i>	Change language to say “...frozen at <u>or below</u> the infiltrative surface...”			Low <i>See draft language</i>
35	383.45(6) <i>Council Addition</i>	Can we clarify requirements for POWTS in a floodplain?  Should 383.45(6) allow Observation pipes <2’ above RFE, if they have watertight caps.	First, NR 116. This group can’t fix that.  Question is why do they have to go that high if they are watertight caps? Strike “and observation pipes”. Observation pipes.		Medium
36	383.52(1) & 384.27(7)(h)	Clarify the concept of “locked or secured”	How do you secure objects (like ejector pits) that don’t have weight. Can we learn something from city manhole covers? Maintenance is big issue. Safety is a concern. Children falling in and dying-usually because the pit is open, not that they are lifting the cover off. Other states use safety nets. Fall protection for over 12 inches. Take a look at safety netting. Possible secondary net? Would that replace the primary security. ASTM C 1227.7.13 indicates minimum weight of manhole cover should be 59 pounds.		Low <i>Discussed at 2-10-2016 meeting</i>

**SPS 383 PRIVATE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS**

NO.	SPS SECTION	ISSUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS	CLASSIFICATION
			<p>Possibly say that all covers less than 59 pounds should be locked and secured.                      Change the wording from unauthorized (maybe accidental) access.                      National Precas Concrete Association best practices covers. Maybe leave 8 inches.                      Safety net. Make sure to use phrase locked and secured.                      382.34 (5) (c) h.requires grease interceptors to have a manhole covers and shall have an approved locking device.                      Manhole risers for interceptor tanks shall be provided with a substantial, fitted watertight cover of concrete...                      Safety nets-systems permitted by the PCA, safety net. Subservice discharge code that not all have safety net.                      Anything over 59 pounds &gt; 8 inches &lt; 8 inches locked and secured                      Possible secondary (safety net)-homework on that.</p>		
37	383.54(2)(b) or fund department monitoring 383.70	Many pretreatment devices are not tested to the environmental conditions present in Wisconsin. Too many pretreatment devices appear not to perform as advertised causing POWTS failures and owners/installers upset with the department for approving these devices. Product approval has become more of a "buyer beware" environment than a real review of pertinent performance testing.	Require annual effluent testing for all devices that install pretreatment devices	<p>The potential cost would need to be determined.</p> <p>It would provide better data on the performance of devices approved for use in this state. Better data will result in ability to make informed decisions on the performance of devices.</p>	High
37	OTHER <i>Council Addition</i>	Inventory/maintenance of state owned POWTS			
38	OTHER	Wisconsin Fund Grant			

**SPS 383 PRIVATE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS**

NO.	SPS SECTION	ISSUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS	CLASSIFICATION
	<i>Council Addition</i>	program			
39					

**SPS 384 PLUMBING PRODUCTS**

NO.	SPS SECTION	ISSUE	POTENTIAL CHANGES	POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS	CLASSIFICATION
50	384.25 <i>Council Addition</i>	Clarify requirements for repair of POWTS tanks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When can a tank be repaired vs replaced?</li> <li>• When is DSPS or manufacturer’s approval required for a repair?</li> <li>• Sanitary permit?</li> </ul>	Leave it the way it is now.		Medium <i>Discussed at 2-10-2016 meeting</i>
51	384.30(6)(j)	Various natural materials non-conductive to filtering in a POWTS have been proposed.	Additional language stating: “Also, sand used as a filtering medium in a treatment or dispersal component of a POWTS shall meet all of the following requirements: be comprised of outwash parent material and have a hardness value of at least 3 on Moh's Scale of Hardness.”	No expected cost increase.  This proposal would clarify the type of material allowed for use in a POWTS.	Low <i>See draft language</i>
52	384.10 (3)	Review makeup committee and how referenced in code.  Responsibilities of that committee.	Committee should be improved –important.  Helping with the product approval. Minnesota, Washington, might be examples. It is cumbersome, but legitimate. Standards are spread over several codes so that could take some time. Discussion though concludes that the standards in the code don’t need to be changed for this purpose. Protocol out there for the advisory. Are we satisfied with the scope, and the makeup of that committee? Should it be the first step in approval process rather than the voluntary approval. Tony will review other states.	DIS finds more value in more input in product review. Information varies.	<i>Discuss at 3-16-2016 meeting.</i>

<b>SPS 385 SOIL AND SITE EVALUATIONS</b>					
<b>NO</b>	<b>SPS SECTION</b>	<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>POTENTIAL CHANGES</b>	<b>POTENTIAL COSTS/BENEFITS</b>	<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>
60	385.60(2)(a)	Wording does not adequately reflect the current use of Interpretative Determination Reports (IDR).	Revise second sentence. The written report shall conclusively determine current conditions of periodic soil saturation and assess their effect upon the operation of a POWTS.	No expected costs. Clarifies the use and intent of IDRs.	Low <i>See draft language</i>
61	385.60(2)(b)	Delays in approval of Interpretative Determinations (IDR) due to scheduling onsite with Wastewater Specialists.	Revise to exempt IDRs written by licensed Professional Soil Scientists from Departmental review.	May reduce review fees. Reduce delay in time to receive plan approval, especially during peak submittal times.	Low <i>See draft language</i>
62					