# Meeting Agenda/Summary

**Meeting**  
Water Quality Division: Onsite Wastewater Advisory Committee (OWAC)

**Date**  
July 6, 2021

**Start / End Time**  
10 am – 12 pm

**Virtual Meeting**  
Zoom link in calendar invite

**Documents**  
Located in ShareFile - https://azdeq.sharefile.com/

## MEMBERS
- ☒ David Bartholomew, Bartholomew WW Services, Inc.
- ☐ Mark Basic, Basic Drilling Company
- ☒ Colin Bishop, Anua
- ☒ Suzanne Ehrlich, Yavapai County
- ☐ Craig Rasmussen, University of Arizona
- ☒ Joelle Wirth, Summit Environmental LLC
- ☒ Jake Garrett, Gila County
- ☒ Thomas Hanson, Maricopa County
- ☒ Maher Hazine, PE, REI Development Services, LLC
- ☒ Dawn Long, First American Septic Service LLC
- ☒ Michael Stidham, EZ Treat, Inc
- ☐ Kathy Mills, Mills Engineering, LLC
- ☒ David Monihan, PE, RLS, Coconino County
- ☐ Cullin Pattillo, Mohave County (Board Meeting)
- ☐ Kitt Farrell-Poe, University of Arizona (vacation)
- ☐ Craig Rasmussen, University of Arizona
- ☒ Maher Hazine, PE, REI Development Services, LLC
- ☒ David Monihan, PE, RLS, Coconino County
- ☐ Cullin Pattillo, Mohave County (Board Meeting)
- ☐ Kitt Farrell-Poe, University of Arizona (vacation)
- ☒ Jenny Vitale, PE, Civil Engineer

## ADEQ STAFF
- ☐ Trevor Baggiore, ADEQ, Water Quality Division Director
- ☒ Naveen Savarirayan, Manager, Groundwater Protection Value Stream
- ☒ Matt Ivers, Groundwater General Permits and Reuse
- ☒ Theresa Gunn, Project Manager
- ☐ Jon Rezabek, Legal Specialist
- ☒ Karthik Kumarasamy, PhD, Engineer III
- ☒ Linneth Lopez, Environmental Engineering Specialist III
- ☒ Raymond Morgan, Trainer, Groundwater Protection, Groundwater Permits & Reuse Unit
- ☒ Luke Peterson, Environmental Engineer Specialist 3, Groundwater Protection
- ☒ Heidi Welborn, Legal Support
- ☐ Morgan O’Connor, Community Liaison

## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Topic</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Welcome (10 mins) | Jake Garrett, Chair | Roll Call Meeting Notes  
Review Agenda  
Review Ground Rules | June 2021 Notes*  
July 2021 Agenda*  
Ground Rules* | Approval of Notes | Maher moved to approve the June meeting notes and Colin seconded the motion. Notes were approved unanimously. |
| Action Items | Theresa | Review completed and Action Plan* | For | Theresa reviewed the open action items. |

---
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### 4.01 Meeting

**Chair:** Jake Garrett
**Summary:** Report on the meeting with ADEQ and OWAC members to discuss inclusion of 4.01 in the current rulemaking.

- Jake provided an update of the meeting held with Trevor to discuss whether 4.01 should be included in the onsite rulemaking. The group discussed delegation of 1.11 permit to the counties. ADEQ current rulemaking authorization does not include anything beyond onsite wastewater treatment facilities. Discussion was had about adding low pressure sewers to onsite rules. It isn’t clear about the use of 4.01 permits and how they are regulated. Dave will provide some stick drawings to ADEQ where there are issues. Also, need to address orphan systems. Increased O&M enforcement and tracking is needed. Discussed the need to have annual permit renewals. Follow-up meeting will be held on how the rules apply to the different systems currently in the fields.

### Technical Work Groups Reports

#### TWG Chairs
- **1.09: Maher**
- **Design/Permitting:** David M/Ashley
- **Future State:** Colin
- **O&M:** Dave B
- **PPL:** Suzanne
- **Training/Certification:** Cullin

**Status Reports**

- **1.09 – Maher** reported the group will meet twice monthly (first and third Wednesday afternoon.) At the first meeting, members discussed issues and problems from each perspective including regulatory, ADEQ, customer, RV park, and designer and engineers. Communal systems are often unfunded because the community does not have a reserve or the repairs are expensive. Lots of repairs occur without permitting. Other issues include setbacks, salesmen offering quick solutions, and building code requirements for upgrades which impact the septic system. Next step is to complete the list of issues and schedule each for discussion. Dave B stated the O&M and 1.09 TWGs will have crossover issues for which they will need to communicate.

- **Design/Permitting – David M** reported the group had their first meeting. They will meet twice monthly while they are categorizing issues into small groups. The group set up a whiteboard and started categorizing issues. In the next meeting, the team will finalize the issues, categorize and set up small groups to define the problem and collect the information to discuss and move recommendations forward.

- **Future State – Colin** reported the group had a kick-off meeting and determined they will meet twice a month. The group brainstormed the high-level issues of a future state. The group will meet 2nd/4th Tuesdays at 1 pm. Need to start with the question of what is the role of the regulators; which will be the topic of the next meeting. The meeting was very productive. Each person indicated what they felt were the most important topics to discuss.

- **Operations and Maintenance – Dave B** stated the group will kick-off tomorrow at 10 am. The group will begin with a whiteboard exercise to get topics on the board and organize...
them.

PPL – Suzanne stated the group’s kick-off meeting is on July 27 at 9:30 am. In advance of the meeting, Suzanne will send a draft charter and process for organizing thoughts.

Training and Certification – The group is meeting tomorrow to kick-off their efforts. Dave B stated he had a paper for three grades of operator and will send to Theresa before the meeting. US EPA has been working on workforce issues and has issued a draft report. Colin will share the link.

Policy Updates (20 mins)

| Policy Updates | Matt Ivers, ADEQ Groundwater Permits Unit Manager | Matt will review the status of the issues for which ADEQ has been asked to provide guidance and or clarification. Theresa will share the revised flow charts. | SPS Flow Chart* For Information Only | Theresa reviewed the updated flow chart for development of a substantive policy statement. Matt stated the technical briefing papers are the why behind the SPS. Baseline dates in the flow chart will be monitored to determine if they are realistic. For the papers which ACDEHS has already seen, we are bypassing the SPS review and going straight to submittal of the final SPS. Thirteen policies are on the flow board of which 2 are on hold. Seepage pits is being sent to Secretary of State for publication. Certification of Completion has been split into two policies. July 27 Board of Technical Registration meeting to discuss clarification on registrant or non-registrant. ASTM is being reviewed by OAC. Composting toilets, stacking, RV waste and odor inhibitors are with the legal specialist for drafting. Site definition is on hold for more research into legal issues. Math equations and rounding is in management review. Presoaking is in draft and use of a pump for a 4.02 permit is on hold.

Question – What is the discussion on the registrant/non-registrant and composting toilets. D701 and composting toilets have been combined to provide answers on if a soil test is required and accounting for graywater in sizing the system. The registrant question is who can design and sign the certificate of competition (COC). |

Rulemaking Phase 1 (30 mins)

| Rulemaking Phase 1 | Heidi Welborn, Legal Specialist | Phase 1 Rulemaking components | Phase 1 Matrix* For Discussion | Heidi stated the phase 1 rulemaking is a small part of the ongoing rulemaking process. ADEQ has approval for critical technical fixes. Received over 200 substantive comments on the rule. Staff reviewed all comments and determined if the comment met the phase 1 criteria. The more complicated issues which need more data were moved to phase 2. The comments broke down into 94 overarching topics with 46 recommended for phase 1 changes most of which are clarifications and corrections.

Theresa reviewed the rulemaking schedule which proposed having TWG recommendations by the end of 2021. The following are comments made by OWAC members on the draft rule schedule. |

For Discussion |
• Future state would potentially have an interim report but may not be final by the end of the year.
• We could be having rule updates within a few years, is this what we want to do to the industry?
• If phase one corrects the rule language which conflicts with other sections of the rule it will be helpful.
• The phase 1 changes are going to be minimal and will not hugely affect the customers.
• It is going to be the phase 2 changes which may stress the industry.
• A design needs to be made on future state before making significant changes in phase 2.
• Stakeholders need to be a part of the process and need to be involved in a meaningful way to know the changes are coming. It will be critical to success to build consensus.
• ADEQ should have meetings to solicit input and get comments from the broader stakeholder community.
• The schedule is aggressive and will be difficult to have meaningful input from the stakeholders.
• Design will have several white papers some coming out quickly and others will take more time. The TWG will send to OWAC as they are prepared.
• The schedule gives us a target but it may get pretty tight especially adding public meetings.
• Training may be one of the most challenging groups to create a program that doesn’t exist and will be the biggest bite and affects everyone.
• It is too early to make the decision on when the recommendations for phase 2 should be due. TWGs need more time to work on them.
• Readdress the schedule in August.
• Like the suggestion of April since November and December are difficult to get work done.
• Heidi stated it is important for the TWG to have data to back up the recommendations not just antidotal information.
• It will helpful to know what the bar is for documentation of recommendations. Sources could include peer reviewed literature, government websites, documents with some level of rigor, documented industry standard.
• Phase 1 A303 and A 305 language is contradictory and should be a phase 1 correction because they are woven through the rule. The languages prohibit in one area and allows in another area.
Arizona is one of the few states that allows deep injection for septic dispersal. Consensus around the country is not to do seepage pits but there is no study in Arizona which shows it is a problem. There may be some studies in other states which could be used to justify a change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review New Action Items (5 mins)</th>
<th>Theresa Gunn, Project Manager</th>
<th>Theresa will review the new action items assigned during the meeting.</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>For Information Only</th>
<th>Theresa reviewed the action items taken during the meeting. New ROI form is posted on the website.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>Jake Garrett, Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colin moved to adjourn the meeting and Joelle seconded. Passed unanimously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>