

SKI SEWER: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

QAC Department of Public Works (QAC/DPW) presents only two solutions for SKI failing septic: -- Hooking up to the Kent Narrows/Stevensville/Grasonville waste water treatment plant, or -- Holding tanks.

But citizens should ask – frequently enough to get answers:

- Has QAC/DPW consulted the **National Environmental Services Center** at WVU in Morgantown (<http://www.nesc.wvu.edu/wastewater.cfm>), which in 2012 described four types of onsite systems achieving as high as 75% to 95% nitrogen removal rates? See http://www.nesc.wvu.edu/pdf/ww/publications/pipline/PL_SU12.pdf
- Has QAC/DPW consulted the **New Jersey Pinelands Commission**, which, in its 2013 annual report, described its 14-year old program of testing and approving advanced onsite treatment systems? See http://www.state.nj.us/pinelands/landuse/waste/assp/2013_FINAL_ANNUAL_REPORT.pdf
- Has QAC/DPW considered that the **Bay Restoration Fund** has field verified seven onsite systems achieving anywhere between 55% and 76% reduction of nitrogen? Or that eight more new high-performance systems are currently under field verification? See http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/BayRestorationFund/OnsiteDisposalSystems/Pages/Water/cbwrf/osds/brf_bat.aspx
- Has QAC/DPW accessed the resources of the Barnstable County **Massachusetts Alternative Septic System Test Center** and, in particular, the ongoing work with peat filter septic systems that “are capable of very efficient removal of fecal coliform bacteria” and “can be ideal areas for denitrification”? See <http://www.barnstablecountyhealth.org/massachusetts-alternative-septic-system-test-center>; <http://www.barnstablecountyhealth.org/ia-systems/information-center/compendium-of-information-on-alternative-onsite-septic-system-technology/peat-filter-septic-systems>
- Did QAC/DPW ever go to the website of a company like **New Jersey Septic Management Group** and read about a State-approved onsite system with a peat moss module in which “99.9% of all the harmful bacteria die off” and “the end product is a very pure effluent that is dosed (time released) back into the soil and ultimately back into the water table”? If QAC/DPW did go to that website, and if they were thinking of SKI, weren’t they at least a little interested when the company says: “This new technology gives our engineer the flexibility

to design a system for *a property with a high water table* that will either dramatically reduce or totally eliminate the need for a mound. New Jersey Septic Management is very excited to offer this option to our customers”? (Emphasis added.) See <http://nj-septic.com/new/faq.asp>; <http://www.eco-purewastewatersystems.com/homepage.html>

- Did QAC/DPW ever consider that the famous **Rubin Report** said right up front (p. 2) that “[n]itrogen and pathogen removal technologies are available that may be employed at the individual home level”? Didn’t QAC/DPW think that Rubin’s judgment of 7-8 years ago (p. 21), that these technologies were too “costly to either residents or the county”, might have been overtaken by events? Did QAC/DPW think Rubin might have a different view about the costs of systems “at the individual home level” when MDE/BRF are approving high-performing replacement systems costing \$12,300 (see <http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/BayRestorationFund/OnsiteDisposalSystems/Documents/HB347%20Ranking%20data%20Aug-12.pdf>), while the County proposes to spend \$34,995 per house (= \$53,122,226 ÷ 1,518) on its sewer pipe plan? See <http://www.qactv.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/SKI-Financing-and-Construction-Cost-Estimate1.pdf>
- Why isn’t the QAC Health Department involved with the **Maryland Onsite Wastewater Professionals Association** and their education programs, as the Kent County Health Department is? See <http://www.mowpa.org/MOWPA/who-is-mowpa>
- Has QAC/DPW taken advantage of the enormous resources of the **National Onsite Wastewater Recycling Association** (NOWRA), the largest organization in the U.S. dedicated to educating and representing members in the onsite and decentralized industry? Membership for a regulatory official is only \$60. See <http://www.nowra.org/> and have a look at their Onsite Journal.
- Is QAC/DPW in touch with the **Decentralized Water Resources Collaborative**, a cooperative effort funded by the U.S. EPA to support research and development on decentralized wastewater and stormwater systems? <http://www.decentralizedwater.org/> (Dr. Rubin chairs their advisory committee – did you get him back for an update before you went all in on the pipeline?)
- We could go on . . . there’s a whole new world of alternatives out there . . . why not explore it a bit?