

# **Legislative Council Committee**

## **Septage Management**

**September 16, 2004**

**Greg Kester - WDNR**

**608-267-7611**

# Septage Management

- ~ 500 Licensed Businesses
- ~ 1200 Certified Septage Operators
- ~ 725,000 On-Site Systems
- Serve ~ 1/3 of State Population

# Septage Jurisdiction

- **Dept. of Commerce**
  - Controls everything but disposal
  - Delegates to Counties under Wisconsin Fund
- **Dept. of Natural Resources**
  - Controls only disposition of waste
  - Could delegate to Counties (None have sought it)
- **Creates a Disconnected Circle**
  - Systems could be approved without disposal options

# NR 113 Overview

- Revised to reflect 40 CFR 503 - Jan 1997
- Options include:
- Land application (many requirements)
  - Becoming more challenging
- Haul to Wastewater Treatment Plant (Catch 22)

# Limitations on froz/snow (1999)

- Septic restrictions
- Non routine!
- $\leq 2\%$  slope
- Less than 10,000 gal/acre
- 750 feet to surface water
- Not in floodplain
- No reasonable alternative

# Limitations on frozen/snow

- Holding tanks
- If not required to go to WWTF (NR 113.07(1)(f))
- Same as septic tank except
- May use  $\leq 6\%$  slope if approved

# Septage Disposition

- Septage receiving at WWTF
- 281.49 Stats., Require from 11/15 - 4/15
- But broad exemptions
- No cost limit
- Reluctant -no assurance that any will be received

# St Croix County

- Growing at very fast rate
- Significant shortage of POTWs acceptance
- Combined with losing land application sites
- Disposition options are limited and in question
- Brings issue into sharp focus



# Elcho Sanitary District

- Significant treatment plant upgrade late 1990's
- Provided capacity for private systems in lake area
- No formal contract was signed and waste was not received
- Created tremendous hardship - economic and treatment

# Village of Ephraim

- Town of Gibraltar entered into 15 yr contract
- All holding tank waste generated in Town would be hauled to WWTF
- Issue when Sister Bay received for lower cost
- Nearing its end and unsure whether it will be renewed

# Septage receiving

- **Advantages**

- **Revenue source**
- **Good public relations**
- **Environmental protection**

# Issues for Consideration

- **Need to consider disposal options when approve on-site systems**
- **Need to require POTWs to provide capacity - if necessary**
- **Need to provide such treatment within reasonable cost parameters**
- **Need to guarantee septage receipt at POTW**

# Issues for Consideration

- DOJ enforcement authority rather than County
- Require septage capacity during facility planning
- Retain requirements for County delegation (no more stringent than 113)
- Limitations posed by Interstate Commerce laws

# One Option

- **Carve state into sewer use areas**
- **Require capacity at a given POTW**
- **Assess impact fees and use CWF monies**
- **Require all septage generated in that area to be hauled to POTW, except**
- **Allow land application until distance is < 40 miles**