

**Water Quality Division: On-Site Wastewater PPL TWG**  
**Meeting 9: Tuesday, January 11, 2022      10 am - Noon**

(See Link to Google Meets in Calendar Invite)

**Members in Attendance:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ashley Chatfield, Maricopa County Environmental Services | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Stidham, EZ TREAT, INC                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bryan Chiordi, Essential Operations                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Sundberg, MST Manufacturing DBA MicroSepTec |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Todd Christianson, Premier Environmental Products, LLC              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fred Vengrouskie, Eljen Corporation                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Suzanne Ehrlich, Yavapai County                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joelle Wirth, Summit Environmental, LLC             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marc Fleetwood, Fleetwood Engineering                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ray Morgan, ADEQ                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karthik Kumarasamy, ADEQ                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> David Lentz, Infiltrator (non-member)                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Linneth Lopez, ADEQ                                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dick Bachelder (non-member)                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nicholas Noble, Orenco Systems Inc                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heidi Welborn                                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Naveen Savarirayan, ADEQ                                 |   |

Agenda (Est Time)	Lead	Overview	NOTES																										
Additional New Members	Joelle	Poll results re: non-members listing to PPL meetings	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>No Opinion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>✓2</td> <td>✓2</td> <td>✓2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>●</td> <td>●</td> <td>●</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Yes	No	No Opinion	✓2	✓2	✓2	●	●	●			✓		✓		✓			✓				✓		<p>The group discussed how they wanted to operate.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings should be open as part of the sunshine – open meeting laws</li> <li>• OK with listening in but when they interject and slow down the process it becomes a problem</li> <li>• How would it be managed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could be addressed during roll call on why people are attending</li> <li>• Want to understand who we are working with and who is listening in and why</li> <li>• Can members share the invite with anyone?</li> <li>○ If so, this might get out of hand with too many people</li> <li>• Not a committee, we are working group which gives information to a committee</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Yes	No	No Opinion																											
✓2	✓2	✓2																											
●	●	●																											
		✓																											
	✓																												
✓																													
✓																													
	✓																												

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No issue with listening in, non-members could send in issues which the group could address</li> <li>• Interest is not to slow down the process</li> <li>• Like to hear compelling issues, not opposed to non-members to submit inquiries</li> <li>• Need some level of verification that people are coming in with the right intent</li> <li>• NSF reads statement to all committee members at each meeting about collaborating in ways that may lead to anti-trust issues by excluding products from Arizona which is illegal</li> </ul> <p>Decision: Have non-members submit questions/topics/issues to Theresa and she will send to the group for review and determination of what needs to be on the agenda.</p>
Typical Sewage Definition	All	Review draft provided by Mike Sundberg	<p>The group reviewed Mike's proposed definitions of wastewater. Mike stated he reviewed EPA and other state's rules as basis of the definitions. It was requested that citations be added as to where the data was collected from.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the numerical numbers consider low water fixtures which is causing higher concentrations (in pounds)? – Not included because no other state has adjusted for the low water fixtures.</li> <li>• Consider defining in terms of pounds as well as concentrations</li> <li>• New construction (single family home) will have a higher concentration than the influent used for the NSF testing</li> <li>• Does not include nitrogen and there is a gap between FOG gap between 25 and 50? Mike addressed these issues in the second draft of the document.</li> <li>• Low fixture counts should affect the typical residential definition since most systems in the field now do not have the low fixture counts and needs to be more realistic</li> <li>• Concern about the commercial definition using non-toxic, non-hazardous without being defined will need to be aligned with other ADEQ programs</li> <li>• May need to define the home-based business</li> <li>• How do we quantify the non-normal situations such as a day care, beauty salon, etc. as they are not one-time events but ongoing loading</li> <li>• May be a good reason to require testing to catch the specific situations based on the homeowner use of the system</li> <li>• Need to have ongoing training with homeowners under a performance-based system</li> <li>• Need to consider if the 4.02 parameters are appropriate</li> </ul>

# Meeting Agenda/Summary

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential and commercial have the same values for BOD, TSS</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: This paper will be part of the discussion with all TWGs members.</p>
SAR Analysis	Karthik	Review EPA numbers	
Status Report by end of December	Joelle	What should be provided to other TWGs as the status of this group?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>PROBLEM:</u> What is the problem(s) you focused on?</li> <li>2. <u>SOLUTION:</u> How do you propose to fix the problem?</li> <li>3. <u>IMPLEMENTATION:</u> How would you implement this solution?</li> <li>4. <u>OBSTACLES:</u> What are some barriers or challenges that will need to be overcome?</li> <li>5. <u>ALIGNMENT:</u> What information do you need from other work groups? Or, what questions do you have for other groups?</li> </ol> <p>The group reviewed the PPL assumptions and whether they can be forwarded to the TWG members for the Feb 3 meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the PPL also cite an owner's O&amp;M manual as well as the design manual</li> <li>• </li> </ul>
Next Steps	Joelle	Open Discussion Next agenda topics	<p>Linneth provided an update on hiring a contractor to sample existing systems throughout the state of Arizona. Members stated that for the PPL systems need to determine what activities might void the warranty.</p> <p>Next meeting: January 25, 2022</p>

## Action Plan:

Task	Person Responsible	Due Date	Status
ADEQ to answer the industry the question about over reach and going beyond the rule today	ADEQ		Underway