Minutes of the Meeting of the Lakelse Lake/Jackpine Flats Septic System Management Working Group held Wednesday, October 24, 2012, in the Regional District of Kitimat-Stikine Board Room, 300 - 4545 Lazelle Avenue, Terrace, BC, commencing at 9:00 am

In Attendance
Working Group members:
Dave Materi
Ken Kolterman
Terry Brown

Members Absent
John Jensen
Gordon Gillam
Azreer Gill

Regional District Representatives in Attendance
Ted Pellegrino, Planner
Roger Tooms – Manager, Works and Services
Margaret Kujat – Environmental Services Coordinator
Dianna Penner – Alternate Director, Electoral Area ‘C’

Others in attendance
Linda Zurkirchen, Project Consultant.

Introduction
This is the 8th meeting of the Working Group (WG)
The meeting commenced at 9:07 a.m. when Chair Linda Zurkirchen
Terry Brown mentioned that he would prefer to get the minutes in a more timely manner as they were only sent out late yesterday. Roger Tooms addressed this directly and he committed that he would make sure the group will receive the minutes and at least a draft agenda be delivered electronically to all at least one week prior to the meeting. Ken Kolterman also indicated he fully supported this concept and the group concurred.

Some notes and observations:
Area ‘C’ alternate Dianna Penner had some notes and observations to share with the group: Doug McLeod recently had his system pumped out which cost $220 for a double sided tank and had approached this task with additional interest in what services he could obtain through the pumping service company. The operator briefly inspected scum layers but did not appear to be qualified or have enough experience beyond pumping services. This appears to align with what the group had thought might be the case under current circumstances.

In doing research, Cambria Gordon Ltd provided the group with a copy of a document from Penn State which focuses on septic services which is quite informative and easy to read.
Roger noted that he found this to be quite a good document.

Roger pointed out a tool he had acquired called the “Sludge Judge” which has been brought in to show the group and something he has described in the past. This cylindrical device goes into the tank and the tube provides a reading on the amount of fluid, sludge and scum related to the health of a septic system. This will be ground-truthed with field staff when they have some available time.

**Agenda:**
Outstanding Items and Action Items
Note change of date for next meeting in November as the 20th from 10 am – 2 p.m.
Date and time change for December.

**Action Items for last meeting:**
1) **Survey Monkey** questionnaire – this is required for grant applications and general information
   What is the plan for follow up on this survey?
   Ted informed the group that the Update # 3 had been mailed out on October 5th and October 8th to the community as a program update.
   Ken Kolterman noted that he has never received correspondence of any kind regarding this program. There may be varying reason why these are coming back and Roger has indicated RDKS will look into this immediately. RDKS will also follow up with different groups to try and get further information on mailing addresses.
   Roger indicated we will be pursuing the survey information with some diligence.
   Ken noted that the timing of this survey was perhaps less effective than in the spring when most people are going to their cottages rather than winterizing them.
   Roger noted that the purpose was also to determine a willingness of property owners to work with RDKS to audit properties and systems.

2) **Flow chart of program development to date**
   Linda discussed the updates on the program development - she reviewed the flow chart which was an item from the last working group meeting. She described how it currently looks and the related time lines. Some of the flow chart information was identified to be further reviewed and refined by the group at this meeting.

3) **Summary of progress**
   The WG discussed the inspection forms, and interpretation of the form.
   The flow chart and the table are related documents.
   RDKS will revise cost estimate based on home owner looks after the pumping rather than RDKS within the maximum of 5 year cycles.
   Dianna Penner requested clarification of the determination of a 5 year objective. Linda reviewed the sources which were previously reviewed by the WG on healthy septic systems to decide a maximum of 5 years as a reasonable objective.
Roger differentiated between long term use vs. seasonal intensive use and the general indications of properly working systems. The WG has concurred that the maximum of 5 years was a decision made from this group which will be taken to the Board for their review and decision as part of the overall system plan and program per standard industry standard.

Dianna Penner indicated people should be given an opportunity to not pump out their tanks. Linda noted that this input is appreciable but explained that the group has moved through these questions via past meetings and a report will be compiled into a conceptual draft to be fully reviewed and captured.

As an alternate just joining the group it was appreciated that Diana would not be necessary current to the group's past discussions. Roger noted that industry standards and system, input and facts from qualified professionals have been used by the group to build their program to date. Tanks are a part of the overall system and the field must also be considered in the function.

Roger noted the group has worked through a large amount of information and discussion very well to get to this point to date.

General discussions took place with respect to the identification for the need of this management program, in part because of flood plain at the Lake. Year round and seasonal properties also have issues to consider. Jackpine Flats is also a source of drinking water so public health is also a critical aspect of septic systems management. Consensus is that owners have responsibility to ensure that their systems are properly functioning. Dave Materi also indicated that many of the details have been discussed at length and that the group needed a number of years to use and therefore agreed to 'use' 5 years as a maximum time period for servicing.

3) Inspection Form

The group had general discussion on the differences of a Preliminary Inspection and Follow-up Maintenance Inspection, and what would the information be used for in terms of 'compliance'.

a) Preliminary inspection and follow up maintenance form.

Linda reviewed the inspection form with the group and its content as circulated. Roger Tooms noted that the survey could be used to help homeowners fill in the possible information not known about a system. This information could be reviewed and updated by owners over time.

Questionnaire seems to have captured what the working group thought was important and this was discussed at length to develop improvements.

Dave Materi asked for clarification of what are some of the terms used on the form. He noted that these should be clear to the public who may not be familiar with them such as UTM, NHA. Dianna Penner questioned whether the second part of the form was also in line with the objective of the form. Roger indicated the top part related to the inventory to be acquired...the second part of the survey aligns with indicators coming forth that would help RDKS assist homeowners determine frequency of future pumping and inspection for environment and public health.

Dave Materi noted that #13 and #19 need to be adjusted to have more significant meaning.
The WG had general review of the document for wording and improvements on all questions presented in the inventory. It was also concluded by the group that the forms should be created as two separate parts/forms.

Dave Materi asked when would the home owner get this – whether at inspection or when the 5 years is up.

Linda Zurkirchen indicated that in her discussions with service providers, one they indicated that the inspection service could be integrated with the service they provide while others said they were too busy to undertake additional work.

Roger Tooms reviewed questions for clarity and accuracy and the WG provided feedback. There was a suggestion that diagrams with standardized ‘labels’ or standardized terms should also be included.

4) Qualification and Risk Assessment

Linda briefly reviewed the history of the group’s work to date in terms of private vs. public as it relates to this risk assessment form.

Information available identified key items that have to do with the function of the system. Ranking will help to determine low risk or high risk. Numeric ranking allows more objective view.

Feedback was provided by the WG regarding the appearance of the form and the rating criteria. General discussion by the group took place on very refined information gathering and how to best word the documents to obtain that. Overall the concept is well accepted but the forms have been identified as requiring editing to make them simple, concise and more intuitive.

Linda will revise forms for review and update to be included to the group in next agenda package.

Low risk or high risk rating would result in direction taken to determine the program cycle for individual properties.

Outcomes would be as described on the form.

Roger indicated that this will become challenging to defend as it may be viewed as subjective. Ideally it would be possible for a property owner to have a 2nd tank installed in the system and if a person could adapt their current systems to make it work/functional/compliant, RDKS should work with NHA to allow these alternatives. He indicated a preference to find some common sense solutions for the public to adapt and work towards compliance and possible future connection to the community sewer.

Roger also again indicated a concern for cumulative impacts to the lake and to groundwater quality. This also speaks to public health and safety.

Diana Penner asked Roger for indication of the schedule of funding a community sewer project.

Roger indicated that funding maybe never come to be. An application for funding through the “gas tax” program has been submitted and with senior level funding, a 2/3 grant would cost each property roughly $1500 per year.

Linda indicated that the discussed changes to forms will be completed and circulated to the working group.
5) On Agenda – Items not addressed yet:
1) How to deal with homeowners who choose not to comply.
2) Educational component.
4) Communication plan.

Linda requested feedback from WG with a brief outline of report of progress to date.
Roger will re-cost the program – based on conceptual programs.

The WG also discussed meeting more frequently to accommodate the materials which need to be covered.

Ted Pellegrino and Linda Zurkirchen advised the group that they had responded to a request by the Jackpine Flats Community Association to attend their annual general meeting to speak about the Septic System Management Program. The proposed program concept was well received and about 30 people attended. People were concerned with sustainable potable water supply and the need for protection of water and ensuring septic systems were compliant. Feedback from attendees at this meeting indicated people tend to pump more frequently than 5 years. Show of hands indicated support for concept of the system management program. They are generally in favor of ensuring everyone takes responsibility for their systems.

Revised meeting dates: Tuesday November 20 – 11 - 2
December 16th – draft to the board 9 – NOON
January 9 – 16th - 9: - Noon

Meeting adjourned 12:40 p.m.

Action Item – get Educational material on water softeners, conditioners, and water purification systems for group.