

**SEWAGE, WASTEWATER, AND SANITATION HEARING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT**

Members

Ronald J. Anderson, P.E., Chair
Matthew Buehler
Vonnie Fundin
Nick Vestbie, P.E.
Matt Smith – Alternate
Ray Pezonella, P.E. - Alternate

Tuesday, November 20, 2018

6:00 p.m.

**Washoe County Administration Complex
Health District South Conference Room
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV**

6:00 p.m.

1. *Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Chair Anderson called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. once a quorum was present.

The following members and staff were present:

Members present: Ronald J. Anderson, P.E., Chair
Matthew Buehler
Vonnie Fundin

Staff present: Leslie Admirand, DA
Jim English
Dave Kelly
Latricia Lord

Members absent: Nick Vestbie, P.E.

Ms. Valentin verified a quorum was present.

2. *Pledge of Allegiance

Those present pledged allegiance to the flag. ***Public Comment**

3. *Public Comment

As there was no one wishing to speak, Chair Anderson closed the public comment period.

4. Approval of Agenda

November 20, 2018

Chair Anderson stated Mr. Fundin requested to abstain on agenda item number 6 and that he also requested to abstain on agenda item number 8, both due to a conflict of interest. Due to these requests on item 6 and item 8, no quorum would be available. Mr. Buehler moved to accept the agenda of the November 20, 2018 Sewage, Wastewater, & Sanitation Board (SWS Board) regular meeting as written with removing agenda number 6 and 8 public hearings until another meeting can be scheduled. Mr. Fundin seconded the motion which was approved three in favor and none against.

5. Approval of Draft Minutes

October 10, 2018

Chair Anderson commented he did not have the draft minutes in his hard copy agenda packet.

Mr. Kelly apologized for the oversight and relayed Laura sent the draft minutes with the electronic packet they received. Chair Anderson requested highlights.

DDA Admirand stated the minutes needed to be approved at this meeting.

Chair Anderson requested highlights. DDA Admirand provided a verbal summary review of the minutes for the board members.

Mr. Fundin moved to accept the minutes of the October 10, 2018 Sewage, Wastewater, & Sanitation Board (SWS Board) regular meeting as written. Mr. Buehler seconded the motion which was approved three in favor and none against.

Mr. Kelly stated he will be contacting the Board to determine the next available date for a quorum to hear item 6.

7. **Public Hearing** to determine whether or not to recommend approval to the District Board of Health for a variance for APN 084-200-80 of Sections 040.007 regarding the minimum setback to a domestic well from a residential onsite sewage disposal system as required in Section 040.007 of the Regulations of the Washoe County District Board of Health Governing Well Construction.

Staff Representative: David Kelly

Jerry Turley
240 School Street
Wadsworth, Nevada 89442
Assessor's Parcel Number 084-200-80

Mr. Dave Kelly, Senior Environmental Health Specialist for septics and wells thanked the board for meeting tonight as he realizes this is a tough month to make time available. This is the item he really wanted to see go before the District Board of Health at their next agenda. This is a bit of a time crunch as they have an out of water situation. He spoke briefly with Chair Anderson before the meeting who stated the plan was a bit inadequate for his standards for the items that need to be addressed in placing the well. Mr. Kelly feels he will be able to answer any questions to the satisfaction of the Board regarding that. This is one of the properties he spoke to the board about last month. He mentioned both Verdi and Wadsworth properties. This is one of the Wadsworth properties.

About three months ago the property owner came to us and began discussing the need to place a well on his property. Previously they had been feeding off a well of a neighboring property. Mr. Kelly didn't know exactly what occurred, but his understanding was that the quality and flow went down and in the end they did not have access to a satisfactory source therefore needed to drill a well on his property.

EHS staff went out and looked at the property and where the septic system is there was really no place to place a well on that property that would meet the requirement of 100 foot setback. One location that would meet the requirements sits directly on power lines so that was not an option. Mr. Kelly's understanding is that when speaking with the power company and the

drillers to see if there was a work around there wasn't. Where the drilling company could get their rig in and the farthest they could get from the septic system was located 95 feet from the septic tank. Mr. Kelly referred the Board to review the parcel map/plot map as the drawing would relay more information.

While the depiction of the septic system is not clear, the septic tank is verified of the location and that it is 95 feet from the tank. We are comfortable that a new well could be placed 95 feet away. We actually know more activity than is depicted here and where the leach field is. The leach field goes straight out, not three wavy lines. A single line goes straight out as it was located about a year and a half ago. Basically there are two issues on this property.

1. The well would only be 95 feet from the septic tank. They could not meet the 100.
2. There is also a repair issue that at some point the septic field may fail. By our estimates we had some ideas on how to fit the repair to bring it down to the bottom of the property. We don't believe this will place it closer than 80 feet. In order to help against the review of the fact, we kind of made some recommendations based on previous variances we looked over. We have seen a variety, the main constant is deeper still. It also came from Vonnie at the last meeting it was mentioned that the setback could not only be horizontal but diagonal. I don't know that we want to agree to that on all properties but in this situation. What we suggest is conditions of approval that the Board could consider is that the well will be placed as far as the current septic system and somewhat based on and that is why we gave a specific seal. The well already requires a minimum of 100 foot seal because of the proximity of the Truckee River (1/4 mile) and seal depth shall be increased by one foot for each foot of setback that cannot be met. For example, for an 80 foot setback, the minimum seal is 100, the seal would be 120 feet. Those are our recommendations.

Findings of Fact

1. Will the proposed variance result in contamination of water to the extent it cannot be used for its existing or expected use?
Reply: No, there are no effects on groundwater quality by the drilling of a new domestic well.
2. Will the proposed variance pose a threat to public health?
Reply: Septic systems located within close proximity to domestic wells can be considered a risk to contamination of groundwater, however, there are precautions that can be taken to minimize that risk. The recommended conditions of approval will create greater than the required 100' of separation by utilizing a deeper sanitary seal. Section 010.235 of the regulations defines a seal as "the watertight seal established in a well bore or the annular space between the well casings or a well casing and the well bore to prevent the inflow or vertical movement of surface water or shallow groundwater..." Staff feels that the deeper sanitary seal will protect from the public health threat of locating a septic system too close to a well. A review of the surrounding parcels and onsite evaluation does not indicate the presence of any other septic systems within 100 feet of the proposed well location.
3. Are there other reasonable alternatives?
Reply: Staff was unable to locate any place on the property that met the required setback and was feasible for the driller to place their rig. Without allowing for this variance, the property will likely have to haul water in to provide for water needs.

Conditions of Approval

- The well will be placed as far as possible from the current septic system and future

repair area.

- The well will already require a minimum of a 100 foot seal due to the proximity of a watercourse within ¼ of a mile. The seal depth shall be increased by 1 foot for each foot of setback that cannot be met from either the current or future repair area; for example, if the well is located 95 feet from the existing septic system and 80 feet from the repair area, the seal shall be increased to 120 feet.

Mr. Fundin thinks the additional foot of seal for every foot they are in violation is probably very minimum because for the horizontal distance is not equal to a foot of vertical distance. It is not an expensive situation to put a seal in if you wanted to go even further than that instead of an additional 20 feet. You could even double it, say for every foot in violation of the distance add 2 feet to the seal. A 100 foot seal because they are close to a stream or water source is fine but if they were to only require a 50 foot seal then I think the 1 foot violation an additional 1 foot of seal is very minimal. He would like to see 100 foot seals on everything.

Mr. Kelly stated certainly they made the recommendation and if they want to change the requirement and he knows there are other considerations where the water lines are but am only discussing the setback issue. So a portion of it is because of the 100 foot seal and proximity I realize we may have a of groundwater and showers that was my thought but you have a lot more experience.

Mr. Fundin stated because of the 100 foot seal requirements on that piece of property, I think the 20 foot is going to be fine. I don't know whether I would agree on another piece of property or not.

Mr. Buehler asked about the soil logs out there. I know it is very loose sandy soil. Does that go down quite a depth or it's hard to say?

Mr. Kelly responded it is hard to say.

Chair Anderson asked does the seal ever go down to groundwater?

Mr. Fundin stated it is with contamination zones or something like that. If I was next to a sewage plant I would definitely want to go as deep as I could get. But seals are a pretty good seal. You are more worried about input along the casing where groundwater or contaminants could find its path down. We are more in the drilling industry more worried about sealing the void we would put in there, not something of the subject system of the sand in the ground. We just want to protect what we've done by placing the seal. Don't want it to find a path down with what we have disturbed.

Chair Anderson stated the conditions of approval I am deferring to your expertise. Is there anything you would want to add or change to these conditions that have been recommended?

Mr. Fundin thinks it is okay on this one but a 20 foot additional per foot is good. If it was only a 50 foot seal requirements, I would say let's double it.

Chair Anderson stated there is nothing I have to add to this. I guess just complain a little bit. It would be better to have a more accurate map for a lot of reasons but there is a time issue on this that makes it maybe not so important to have the best map.

Mr. Kelly stated this is what we briefly touched on this part before of why I brought to the Board last time a thought that maybe do some sort of variance where we could move without having Board approval because these properties in Verdi often times just are crossed a sinking well in property's ability for those things. It becomes difficult to get luxuries to do a septic system through very technical reports and details, logs, testing, so I agree with you on that but that is one of the concerns I have and why I would like to continue that conversation to see if we can build a structure in the future.

Mr. Buehler made a motion to “Move to support staff to present to the District Board of Health for approval Variance Case #1-18W (Jerry Turley) to allow the approval of the well permit H18-0228WELL with less than the required 100 foot setback to proposed well location, subject to the conditions of approval indicated in the staff report.

Chair Anderson seconded the motion which passed three in favor and none against.

9. *Public Comment

As there was no one wishing to speak, Chair Anderson closed the public comment period.

10. Adjournment

At 6:40 p.m., Chair Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Buehler seconded the motion which was approved three in favor and none against.

Respectfully submitted,

James English, Environmental Health Specialist Supervisor
Secretary to the Sewage, Wastewater and Sanitation Board

Paula Valentin, Administrative Assistant I
Recording