Technical Advisory Group Meeting Notes
Aug. 9, 2023

Moderator: Leigh McIntire
Note-taker: Rebecca Stratis

| Attendees | Advisory Group Members: Chuck Ahrens, Steve Wolfe, Ric Wilkerson, Brandon Myers, Kurt Wilson, Jeremiah Gunia, Adam Burris |
| Health Staff: George Waun, Rebecca Stratis, Leigh McIntire, Renee Avelino |

| Covering | 2:00 p.m. |

| Absent | Kathryn Jerkovich, Bill Creveling, Meghan Whidden, Marissa KingTalik, Jessica Gehle, Katie Lott, Michelle Harris, Randall Olsen, Jeremy Bush, Matt Kempf, Mike Jerkovich, Larry Purdum |
| EastWing Conference Room |

### Agenda Item 1
Previous meeting follow-up

#### Discussion
Nothing for discussion

### Agenda Item 2
Shoreline Policy Update

#### Discussion
- Anything in the 200’ jurisdiction needs to submit shoreline exemption to PPW.
  - Repairs- if we can tell all the components are out of the buffer, we will approve and add a condition. If inside the buffer, we will make a comment in PALS+
  - The Health Department has final authority on where components can go. Happy to explain to shoreline reviewers why we need to approve them that way.
  - Our priority is getting sewage off the ground, public health.
- How to deal with Flood review is being discussed.
- How has industry responded to shoreline regulations?
  - Ric- We quit doing designs in shoreline areas.
  - Jeremiah- a large amount of admin time has gone into projects in shoreline jurisdiction.

### Key Points/Decisions

### Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 3</th>
<th>Design Flow for Structures Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADU- Internal staircase= not ADU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Category 1** (definition to be reworded)
  
  o Ric- need to define habitable space.
  o George- agrees. Conditioned space is another term. We will define it better before finalizing this policy.
  o Leigh- habitable space= someone could live there.
  o Jeremaih- washer, dryer, sink in accessory structure, wouldn’t use more water than what you would use if you were in the house.
  o Leigh- we will work with the building department to define. We get a lot of apps where people are right at the edge of an ADU. Bill wanted to bring up ADU’s needing a separate water meter/second connection?
  o George- Yes, they need a separate connection, but we follow the water purveyors lead on these for group A’s and larger systems. Group B’s- Yes, group B’s do need a separate connection.
  o Ric- Fruitland Mutual wants to sell another connection. Most all the others are ok with tying into the existing meter. Would prefer it being up to the water company. Otherwise, it uses up connections and is cost prohibitive.
  o George- Agrees with Ric.
  o Leigh- Remembers a meeting long ago, Fruitland even wanted another meter for a shop with plumbing. Water purveyors know what they want and need. We will look into this issue more and our code.

- **Category 2**
  
  o Ric- need another category with no living quarters (i.e., man cave or she shed.) No additional flows. Attic, crawls space, basement. Shouldn’t need to upgrade septic system and water connection.
  o Kurt- Equivalent residential unit, counting bedrooms and assuming occupancy. We don’t count fixtures, so why are we being punitive here for utility sinks?
  o Leigh- what we are trying to address is people putting upper floors in a garage and they suddenly become ADU’s when it’s time to sell. We are trying to provide a buffer for the septic system. Maybe this section needs to be worked on to define it more. We don’t want to limit the people who are doing the right thing, those who just want an office etc. Maybe put another category. Building Dept.: no range= no ADU, but you could have a guest bedroom without a range that could potentially add 120gpd. What is being permitted vs what can be modified without permits? We will try to schedule a policy group in the next couple weeks to get this finalized.
  o Jeremiah- clarification: existing home, remodel is coming in. Not a living space, bonus area. From an installer perspective, this doesn’t hurt the septic system. What evidence do you have to show that additional space actually increases flows?
o Ric- None of our comments from before have been added?
  o George- We haven’t changed it yet. We wanted everyone to see the original with your comments. One of the common approaches people take when they find out they can’t have ADU because they would have to upgrade their system, they revise their proposal to “craft rooms and workout rooms.” We have an antiquated definition of a bedroom, closet vs. no closet. No closet doesn’t make it not a bedroom in my opinion. We are trying to understand how we can help people who buy these properties, and we have to tell them it was never approved that way. The building department is not interested in defining a bedroom. We don’t want people to have to scramble at the RSS stage. No one is trying to overreach; it is when the building plans line up with living space, often building with the intent to rent and they do not want to add to their septic system. That is the background information on this policy.
  o Leigh- we often find these on waterfront lots with minimum lot size requirements.
  o Ric- Once every 2 weeks we get one of these that didn’t pass the RSS. Virtually none of those remodels were permitted at all. Realtors are starting to become aware of how they need to list these things- check for permits.
  o Leigh- we are working with Pierce County (PC) on unpermitted structures. We will contact PC code enforcement in these situations.
  o Kurt- I like enforcement of those caught in violation. This policy will push people toward not getting permits. Do we have a long-standing septic system issue from 3 bedroom systems with a den that will be used as a bedroom?
  o Jeremiah- This doesn’t change much. Techs check water records, they don’t base it on the number of people they see. With annual water records, does it matter as long as you stay within the water usage?
  o Leigh- We’ve always sized on bedrooms, but a lot of places are not at capacity.
  o Rebecca- May be able to be more lenient with newer systems vs old septic systems?
  o George- Agrees. Lots of old systems on waterfront, some concerns with adding potential additional flow. New WAC- when and where do systems get upgraded?
  o Leigh- newer pressure system with time-dosing is not as big of a deal. 70’s gravity system just disposing is. Can look at likelihood of impact.
  o Ric- we are changing our tactic on repairs. We scope the system to see what is actually happening before replacing. Put a control panel and timer on it! This can add years to a system that may have been teetering.
  o Jeremiah- How can the homeowner demonstrate their water usage? It doesn’t even matter how many people are in the house. It could be one person using a ton of water.
  o Leigh- The system should be able to handle the number of bedrooms because it will sell eventually and needs to support the maximum potential occupancy.
  o George- What do the facilities support? Kitsap County has a policy.
  o Leigh- we will work to refine this and beef up enforcement on non-permitted
structures.

- **Category 3**
  - Separate water connection- leaning towards going with the water purveyor. Group B and A need to be dealt with separately.

- **Definitions**
  - Kurt- anything at the state level to define on the septic side?
    - No
  - Ric- What about Inslee’s announcement on ADU’s? Will we allow them when they don’t meet density?
  - George- we have a policy. Minimum lot size, but if you can fit it in and it’s conforming- we allow it.
  - Leigh- used to have to meet method 1. ADU’s are calculated like multi-family, 3.5 units per acre max. We also include the center line of the road. We are trying to be as accommodating as we can. Looking at the new WAC, method 2 may be gone. It might be only based on soil texture or nitrogen reduction. Modern systems have fail-safes.
  - George- they are going to allow 2 ADU’s
  - Kurt- if we are having issues with alignment on the building side, we can ask for help on the industry side.

**Key Points/Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Agenda Item 4**  **Record Drawing Guidance**

**Discussion**  The record drawing guidance is on our website now

**Key Points/Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Agenda Item 5**  **GovDelivery-How to sign up**

**Discussion**  
- When we need to send out news, we send it out via GovDelivery.
  - Go to our website and sign up.
  - George demonstrated how to sign up and showed everyone where the policies are on our website.

**Key**
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### Agenda Item 6: Staff Updates

**Discussion**
- Kristen and Maggie have gone to King County. We are not planning on backfilling at this point. We think we can keep up with our review timelines with existing staff. Falling back to when we were way behind is not acceptable. Working on efficiency with design reviews. We meet 3 days a week to plan work.
  - George- Marissa will be the point person for the Central area.
  - Leigh- Zach will float and help with RSS’s

### Agenda Item 7: TAG Email inbox

**Discussion**
- Would it be beneficial to have an email for the TAG group?
  - Will be a constantly monitored email inbox, in case anyone is out. Could probably respond more quickly. Limited to TAG related issues.
  - Adam and Jeremiah- Yes.
  - Renee- Might want to make sure you have a primary person and triages the emails.

### Agenda Item 8: Other

**Discussion**
- Renee- Chapter 2 revisions, where are we?
  - Leigh- the WAC has been delayed again. We’re going to start looking at ch.2 early 4th quarter this year. Hasn’t been decided, do we make a whole new reg or adopt the WAC with additions?
- Jeremiah- existing records. Issues: a lot of documents that are not relevant and it is hard to distinguish what is relevant for people without decades of experience. What do we do with inconsistencies?
  - Leigh- old records are often not good. Sometimes they aren’t even as-builts. Improved in the late 80’s.
  - Jeremiah- can they be updated?
  - Leigh- needs to be associated with an application. If it’s an O&M inspection, we
may not get that.
- George- update the components if you find a discrepancy. Somehow upload locates. Other counties do an “existing system record.”
- Leigh- Will need to bring Meghan into this discussion.
- Jeremiah- A Advance just make a note in their own system or something more?
- Renee- we do expect you to tell us what you see if it is different than what is in OnlineRME. 1. RSS- Randall. 2. Regular routine- O&M side of things. Those situations are happening with other firms. Suggests reach out to ehseptic email and they will forward it on.
- Kurt- A Advanced with other agencies for consistency.
- Jeremiah- has a 4 step process for finding documents.
- Kurt- develop a policy for what to do when discrepancies are found.
- Renee- right now it is the O&M program that is responsible for making those updates.
- Rebecca- document search needs to be updated when these are found?
- Renee- can upload through online RME.
- Jeremiah- but what is the action that needs to take place when there are two tanks but one tank on the record.
- Leigh- RSS person would see and ask for a locate. Need to include Meghan on this issue.