

**Water Quality Division: On-Site Wastewater PPL TWG**  
**Meeting 8: Tuesday, December 21, 2021**      **10 am - Noon**  
*(See Link to Google Meets in Calendar Invite)*

**Members in Attendance:**

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

Agenda (Est Time)	Lead	Overview	NOTES
<b>Additional New Members</b>	Joelle	Request for new members to PPL	Joelle sent out a poll and 5 members responded that no new members should be added at this time. The group discussed whether or not people should be allowed to listen in to the conversation. Consider scheduling a public meeting after February to review the status of the work group recommendations.
<b>Field Testing</b>	All	Review draft field-testing document	<p>Nick reviewed a proposal for in-field testing for group discussion.</p> <p>Member comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which technologies will be required to do the in-field testing?</li> <li>• Intent is to get a really good in-field testing program. Arizona is a good place because of elevation and climate variations.</li> <li>• NSF 360 in-field testing program has never been implemented as it was costly</li> <li>• Orenco will share the Pennsylvania field testing done by a third party (NSF)</li> <li>• Could there be standardized field testing instead of each state doing their own</li> </ul>

<p><b>SAR Analysis</b></p>	<p>Karthik</p>	<p>Review of current analysis</p>	<p>Karthik shared his analysis of the existing SAR formula in rule and how it isn't a mathematical issue but need to discuss the biochemical.</p> <p>Member comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider the longevity of the disposal field</li> <li>• If the drain field is shrunk and they mess up the dirt – there is nothing to do when the dirt fails</li> <li>• It is more of an operations and maintenance issue</li> <li>• The Tyler, 2001 data doesn't tell the whole story</li> <li>• What is the root problem and what assumptions are we making?</li> <li>• Trying to craft something without known enforcement</li> <li>• SAR should be in the realm of biology not mathematics</li> <li>• Check when the EPA recommendations were published</li> <li>• Loading rates have built in conservatism because of the variability between testing and in-field data</li> <li>• Are the values in the formula real values</li> <li>• Should not also stack values</li> <li>• Are we looking at a tiered approach or specific numbers?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Status Report by end of December</b></p>	<p>Joelle</p>	<p>What should be provided to other TWGs as the status of this group?</p>	<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>AZ PPL Phase 2 Approach Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with the first assumption</li> <li>• Why should there be NSF testing and then in-field as part of the state program</li> <li>• Disagreement on viability of NSF testing and need for in-field testing</li> <li>• See notes on the approval</li> </ul>
<p><b>Next Steps</b></p>	<p>Joelle</p>	<p>Open Discussion Next agenda topics</p>	<p>January 9, 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

## Future State PPL Certification Process

