



ONSITE SEWAGE FACILITY SOURCES WORK GROUP MEETING

Meeting Notes
March 4, 2009

- **Individuals Present**

Alisa Max (HC), Mark Lowry (AECOM), Bryan Eastham (TCEQ), Philip Moore (Montgomery County), Frank Green (Montgomery County), Scott Nichols (Montgomery County)

- **H-GAC Staff Present**

Erin Anderson, Rachel Powers

- **Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions**

Erin welcomed attendees, initiated self-introductions, and reviewed the agenda.

Philip Moore was chosen to give the workgroup report to the BIG.

- **Discussion**

Develop/review the workgroup's list of top sources:

- **Primary**
 - Older, unpermitted systems
 - Lack of maintenance of systems (both aerobic and conventional)
- **Secondary**
 - Testing for BOD and TSS of effluent in aerobic systems

Develop/review the workgroup's list of top implementation activities:

- **Address older unpermitted systems**
 - Inventory ALL septic systems/(inventory sewerer systems then process of elimination) (Mont. County has over 26,000 aerobic systems)
 - Identify OSSF that are failing
 - Develop plan of attack/prioritize areas that need to be addressed
 - Find funding (EDAP, SEP, CDGB, public utility funds, etc.)



- Implement
- Acquire clear-cut legislative rights that allow counties to adopt rules that are more strict than TCEQ rules (285) that relate to OSSF OR make TCEQ rules more stringent
- Address lack of maintenance
 - Repeal 2510 so that OSSF must be maintained by a registered maintenance company or a trained homeowner
 - Homeowner education

Introduction to the Coordination & Policy prioritization tool:

The group chose the first item: address aging systems

Criteria	Evaluation factor	Score	Comments
1	Source Bacteria Load	2	
2	Engineering or scientific feasibility	5	
3	Pathogenicity of Source	5	
4	Precursor activity	1	
5	Capital Costs		
6	Operational Costs		
7	Unit cost for bacteria removed		
8	Land needs		
9	Anticipated effectiveness		
10	Size of load reduction		
11	Additional benefits		
12	Geographic area		

Based on the brief discussion of the tool, it seems like there a lot of blanks and it is too subjective, especially because there is so little data to answer the questions—although it is a start.

- Wrap-up

Next meeting date: Tuesday, May 12, 2009, 1:00 pm to 2:00 pm, H-GAC Conference Room C

Tasks: Respond to forthcoming e-mail



Next meeting topics: review sources and IAs of interest, continue using prioritization tool

DRAFT