

Pennsylvania Septage Management Association

July 2021

СОΝТЕΝТЅ
President's Message page 1
Legislative Update page 3
PSMA Testifies Before page 4 PA State Legislature
Wolf Proposing Phase page 6 Out of PA Gas Tax
Landscaping Over page 7 Septic Drain Fields
CDL Updates page 8
Biosolids GP Revisions page 8

PSMA's mission is to protect Pennsylvania's citizens and our industry through sound management, proper maintenance and environmentally conscious disposal of wastewater.

SAVE THE DATE!

Aug 3-4, 2021 - Installation of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Training Course, Scranton, PA

Sep 28-29, 2021 - PSMA 101 Basic & 102 Advanced Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Inspector Certification Courses, Williamsport, PA

Sep 28-29, 2021 - Installation of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Training Course, Lansdale, PA

President's Message

Teamwork. It's an important component of any successful undertaking. For professional organizations like PSMA, it's critical.

PSMA's growth as an association and its impact on the wastewater

industry as a whole is the direct result of the countless hours of service donated by our members.

Our volunteer board of directors sets the direction for PSMA. I want to thank those longtime directors who have participated as a leader for several years as well as welcome new board directors Adam Browning (Region 1), Chuck Starr (Region 7), and John Williams (Region 5/6). Your commitment to your industry is admirable and appreciated.



Ned Lang PSMA President

We also have numerous volunteers who serve on a variety of committees. Sometimes meeting several times in a month, the committees are where the real work of PMSA is performed. We have members offering their time & expertise on our Education Committee, Conference Committee, Government Affairs Committee, Sewage Advisory Committee, Scholarship Committee, Ethics Committee, and Financial Committee. If you would like to get involved, contact the PSMA office for details. It's a great way to give back to your industry.

Finally, one of the "jewels" in PSMA's "crown" is its highly-respected inspector training certification program. We have a cadre of PSMA instructors who not only teach the certification courses, but also spend many extra hours ensuring that students receive a valuable education that enhances their professional development in the wastewater industry.

> I want each volunteer of the "PSMA Team" to know that PSMA's success is a direct product of your time & your effort. Thank you!

Ned Lang, PSMA President



WE ARE IMPERIAL.

At IMPERIAL INDUSTRIES, we have been going the extra mile designing and manufacturing specialized commercial sanitation tanks for more than 39 years - constantly evolving to meet the changing needs of your industry. It is our mission to provide you, our valued customers, with dependability for the road ahead.

- Quality
- Durability
- Customer Support
- Truck Dealer Partners

Better efficiency means bigger profits...let us help you get the results you want!

OFFERING A WIDE RANGE OF SEPTIC & PORTABLE PUMPING EQUIPMENT:

- Septic Trucks
- Portable Restroom Service Units
- Grease Units
- Vacuum Trailers
- Hydraulic Hoist Tanks
- 407/412 DOT Tanks
- Parts

Tanks available in your choice of metal - steel, aluminum or stainless steel.

We've built over 150,000 tanks and counting.







PAGE 2

1-800-558-2945 | SEPTICTRUCKCENTER.COM | IMPERIALIND.COM

Imperial Industries, proudly family-owned and operated in central Wisconsin for more than 39 years, is the trusted choice for specialized septic solutions and expert service.

Subscribe to our YouTube channel

Imperial Industries Inc.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

It is one thing to pass a law but implementation through formal regulation and agency "guidance" is where the rubber meets the road. Act 537 creates a legal framework but actual implementation of the law means regulations. As a regulated industry, septage management depends on regulations in order to function as businesses in the Commonwealth. This article will explain the current legislative effort to reform the regulatory process.

Why Is the General Assembly Interested Now?

The second quarter of 2021 saw considerable interest on the part of the Republican-led PA House and Senate on the issue of regulatory impact on the private sector.

This has been driven by three major factors, reaction to COVID controls, an apparent desire by the Governor to do as he pleased without regard to what the General Assembly might think, and a regulatory atmosphere where the regulating body interpreted a law differently from its text or intent.

Reason I: Reaction to Governor's COVID Authority

First, strong public and business reaction surfaced because of what was felt by many to be the heavy hand of government in addressing the COVID-19 Crisis. Governor Tom Wolf and his Administration placed controls on individuals (self-quarantine, distancing, closed schools, etc.) and businesses deemed by the State to be 'non-life-sustaining' and so forced to close commerce having face-to-face contact. The list of industries affected brought legislative reaction against what Republicans believed to be arbitrary abuses of power.

Reason II: Conflicts with Law/Constitution

The second reason for this interest in regulatory reform is perceived abuse of power by the executive branch. One attracting great public attention was Governor Wolf's unilateral decision to have PA join the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), a regional multi-state entity with the power to impose fines on coal-generated facilities. Environmentalists and Democrats applauded RGGI as providing a needed tool to curb man-made pollutants contributing to climate change. Republicans countered by complaining that the General Assembly was totally bypassed by this executive decision.

Reason III: Regulatory Misinterpretation of Statute

This reason hits closest to home for PSMA. Act 26 of 2017 (Senate Bill 144) was intended to simply allow a property owner to use alternate system technologies during the planning process. A House amendment convinced the Department of

Environmental Protection that it had the authority to develop new onerous verification protocols for already approved technologies. The big battle for PSMA in 2020 was passage of Senate Bill 1030 sponsored by Senate **Environmental Resources** & Energy Committee Majority Chair Gene Yaw (R-Lycoming). It explicitly restated the original intent of the law and was designed to undo DEP's application of the Governor Wolf signed SB 1030 into law as Act 34 of



DEP's application of the original piece of legislation. Governor Wolf signed SB 1020 into here a Act 24 of PSMA Lobbyist

2020 on June 5, 2020. Since the Administration actively opposed this legislation, it is reasonable that Governor Wolf knew that a veto could be overridden. After all, there was strong bipartisan support in both chambers for the bill.

However, Governor Wolf's statement on signing the bill into law was not supportive. In it, the Governor reserved the right for DEP to implement Act 34 how it saw fit in pursuing the Department's mandate to protect the environment.

In response, Senator Yaw and House Environmental Resources & Energy Committee Majority Chair Daryl Metcalfe (R-Butler) held a joint hearing April 27, 2021, of both Senate and House committees on Act 34 to review DEP's implementation. DEP's testimony held that alternate systems had a place in "limited, urgent circumstances" but questioned use in new development pending adoption of formal regulations. The Department said that "establishment of new lots requires a more robust set of criteria than use of alternate onlot systems to address an existing threat to public health..." It went on to say that use of alternate systems without strict criteria (promulgated by formal regulation) could pollute wells and create sewage wetlands and potentially leave owners of these homes with devalued properties.

Needless to say, PSMA's testimony at the hearing vigorously disagreed with the Department's interpretation.

PSMA TESTIFIES BEFORE PA LEGISLATURE

On April 27, 2021, Pennsylvania's Joint Environmental Resources and Energy Committee held a public hearing on the PA Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) implementation of Act 34 of 2020 and alternate technologies.

PSMA Secretary and PA Sewage Advisory Committee representative Joe Valentine delivered testimony to the legislative committee on behalf of our organization. You can watch a recording of the full public hearing via links posted on the PSMA website (www.psma.net).

Alternate systems have been listed by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) first in ALL SEO LETTERS and then in a document called the Alternate System Guidance (ASG) used in Pennsylvania since about 1998 in one form or another. A number of these alternate systems have become to be known as Shallow Limiting Zone Alternate Systems (SLZAS). These systems are used on soils which are not suitable for an elevated sand mound which requires a 20 inch or greater soil limiting zone. SLZAS require a minimum of 10 inches to a seasonal high

water table and 16 inches to a rock limiting zone. This is the same requirement for a system identified in the regulations (Chapter 73 section 73.161 through section 73.167) known as an individual residential spray irrigation system (IRSIS). This is an important fact as it is the basis for the DEP argument that SLZAS cannot be used for new land development under the regulations prior to Act 26 and cannot be used under Act 34 when considering the signing statement by the Governor.

• The DEP has approved the use of alternate systems in PA since 1996. DEP has had a listing of approved alternate systems since 1998. The first SLZAS listed as an alternate system was called the AB system. It was developed and tested by DEP in the NW Regional office

• The current listing of alternate systems on the DEP website lists five SLZAS. These systems were placed on the list by DEP after reviewing data submitted by the

manufacture and in most cases a period of monitoring and sampling of the system before assigning alternate system status.

• There was a short period from about 2003 to 2005 that a SLZAS was being used for new land planning. That system was the AB system develop and tested by DEP in the NW regional office. That practice ceased on 6/9/05 when an email from DEP-Central office outlined a restatement of existing regulations which was not new policy. That email became to be known as the Flag Day



Email which guided the use of SLZAS in PA up to the passage of Act 26 on 7/20/2017. From 2005 until 2016 the SAC asked the DEP to allow for SLZAS use in new land development but the DEP maintained the position that the current regulations do not permit for the use of SLZAS for new land development. The justification for that position is outlined in the Flag Day Email which basically says the regulations (71.62, 73.14 and 73.15) require that for general site suitability a site meeting the regulations for a system identified within the regulations must be use for at least the primary site. Those systems include spray irrigation(IRSIS) as the only system permitted for planning approval on soils with a limiting zone less than 20 inches. A secondary or replacement site could use a SLZAS. Once the subdivision has received Act 537 planning approval, the use of a SLZAS could be considered since the lot now exists and has Act 537 planning approval.

PSMATESTIMONY (cont.)

Continued from page 4

• In 2005 DEP was revising the regulations in consultation with SAC to allow for the use of SLZAS for new land planning. Those proposed regulations were known as Chapter 71a, 72a and 73a. During that regulation review process DEP did not oppose the use of SLAS for new construction and new land planning. DEP has not provided any data to support a change in their 2005 position.

• The DEP position as outlined in the Flag Day Email and the decision by DEP not to continue with the approval of the proposed regulation (Chapters 71a, 72a,73a) left no other choice but to change the regulations by proposing Act 26 to revise Act 537 and allow for the use of SLAS for new land development. Act 26 was signed into law on 7/20/2017. The original language of Act 26 was revised to include language that allowed DEP to develop standards for the use of SLZAS for new land planning and to develop technical standards and performance monitoring of SLZAS which became the new Testing Verification Protocol (TVP). It should be noted that neither the original TVP nor the recent TVP received endorsement by the SAC.

• Act 34 (SB1030) was proposed to reinstate the original intent and language of Act 26. Act 34 was signed into law on 6/5/20 with a governor signing statement. This signing statement is at the core of the DEP position on implementing Act 34. Act 34 simply states: When proposing a new land development, the applicant may submit and the department shall accept, for the purpose of satisfying general site suitability requirements, any conventional sewage system or alternate sewage system that meets site conditions present at the proposed new land development.

• DEP has not provided any documentation or data that the currently listed SLZAS are adversely affecting the waters of the Commonwealth and creating a public health hazard.

• The DEP implementation of Act 34 as presented at the 2/23/21 SAC meeting and the restrictions listed in the 3/2/21 ALL SEO LETTER to eliminate the use of SLZAS for new land development with certain time rest restrictions is arbitrary, without proper vetting by the SAC, is inconsistent with prior DEP actions regarding SLZAS and places an undue hardship on the residents of the Commonwealth. Furthermore, the SE Regional office of DEP has indicated that the use of SLZAS may also be restricted form use on existing lots of record for new construction. The DEP action will affect the rights and property values of the Commonwealth citizens and will adversely affect the business that supports the on lot sewage industry.

In conclusion, PSMA and the residents of the Commonwealth have relied on previous documents prepared by DEP in considering SLZAS for new land planning along with prior direction provided by the DEP staff to the SAC members. Subdivisions plans have been prepared in accordance with the DEP document developed under Act26 using SLZAS for new land development and expenses incurred which now do not meet the arbitrary dates set by DEP in the 3/2/21 ALL SEO LETTER. There was no discussion at any SAC meeting before 2/23/21 that the DEP was interpreting Act 34 to eliminate the use of all SLZAS except for repairs. There was amble opportunity for a SAC meeting in 2020 to meet the 60 day requirement (due by 8/5/20) of Act 34 placed on DEP to present this information. The mere fact of missing the 60 day deadline maybe interpreted as DEP forfeiting their opportunity to develop any policy document other than what is clearly stated in Act 34. The DEP decision to present their interpretation of Act 34 with the elimination of all SLZAS for all uses except for repairs is arbitrary, without supporting data, proper vetting by the SAC and places an undue hardship on the residents of the Commonwealth that will affect their property values. The DEP decision will adversely affect the businesses which support the on lot sewage industry in PA. PSMA recommends that the 3/2/21 ALL SEO letter be rescinded. Any future notifications regarding the DEP implementation of Act 34 must be first vetted with the SAC and be consistent with the plain and simple language of Act 34.

(The extended copy of PSMA's testimony can be found via the website www.psma.net)

GOV WOLF COMMITS TO PHASING OUT GAS TAX

Where do we get our current bridge and highway funding?

74%

Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf reiterated his commitment to phase out Pennsylvania's gas tax, which is becoming an unreliable source for funding Pennsylvania's vast transportation network. To make this possible and to further address the state's transportation funding needs, the governor has also signed an Executive Order establishing the Transportation Revenue Options Commission, which will develop comprehensive funding recommendations for Pennsylvania's large and aging infrastructure. are created, reliance on the gas tax for state revenue is less and less dependable. Any phase out of the gas tax will need to be coupled with new or replacement revenue.

Since Wolf committed to phasing out the tax, the Commission has to ensure that the alternative does not incentivize more gas consumption. Additionally, the alternative funding can't be regressive, must raise more money than the gas tax, and not disincentivize a move to electric cars.

9%

Ceneral Fund

17%

/ehicle Fee

"Our economy, our communities, and our future rely on a strong transportation system that supports our safety and growth. We have more than

\$9 billion in annual unmet needs across our statemaintained transportation system alone. At the same time, Pennsylvania is relying too much on outdated, unreliable funding methods, and the federal government hasn't taken meaningful action in decades," Gov. Wolf said. "Phasing out the burdensome gas tax, coupled with seeking long-term reliable funding solutions that will keep pace with our infrastructure needs, deserves a close examination. Forming this bipartisan commission will bring multiple, bipartisan voices to the table to ensure that we can examine reliable, sustainable revenue solutions to address both near-term and long-term funding needs."

Pennsylvania's gasoline tax is the second-highest in the nation only behind California. Currently, Pennsylvania charges a tax of 58 cents per gallon of gasoline. That tax generated an estimated \$1.69 billion last year and is expected to generate \$1.86 billion next year, according to Wolf's budget proposal. Revenues not only fund transportation projects, but a portion of the \$1.4 billion state police budget.

PennDOT's latest assessment places the annual gap of its needs in all modes and facilities at \$9.3 billion, growing to an annual \$14.5 billion gap by 2030. Further, as more fuel-efficient cars and technologies If Pennsylvania moves ahead with the governor's plan, it will become the first state to phase out motor fuel taxes as the main funding mechanism for infrastructure costs. Motor fuel taxes function as a user fee system by relying on motor fuel consumption as a proxy for road use. These taxes, which have a centurylong history in this country, have worked very well but are challenged by technological developments. Vehicles drive more miles on a gallon of gas and there is growth in sales of electric vehicles, which do not consume gasoline or diesel.

The options for replacing motor fuel taxes are limited.

Some states have implemented fees on fuel-efficient cars and electric vehicles to supplement motor fuel tax revenue, but this only captures in-state vehicles, and fees would have to be quite high to be an alternative to motor fuel taxes.

Another option would be more tolling, which has its place, but an expansion of the toll system to cover most roads seems untenable.

The best option is likely a tax on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). These taxes have the benefit of taxing road use directly rather than using a proxy. VMT also captures

Continued on page 9

LANDSCAPING OVER SEPTIC DRAIN FIELDS

Many homeowners want to know what can be grown, if anything, over their septic drain field. As an increasing number of people move into rural areas throughout the state, this issue becomes more common. A septic system represents a significant investment, so some understanding of its workings will allow a homeowner to protect and care for his investment properly. Proper care and maintenance of the septic system will save time and money while protecting the environment.

There are several reasons for planting over a drain field. Perhaps the most compelling argument for planting into the drain field would be to mitigate any erosion of the soil over the drain field. Another reason would be that plants help the system to function more effectively by optimizing oxygen exchange and promoting necessary soil moisture removal through transpiration. Therefore, a cover of lawn turf would be the best plant cover to establish and maintain over the drain field.

On the other hand, a homeowner's reason for wanting to landscape the drain field may also be that it is the only sunny location on their property. This is often the case with new developments carved out of woodland areas. It may also be that the drain field is in the front yard, and the homeowner wants to plant a landscape to accentuate the front of their house. While these are certainly valid considerations, it should be noted that planting certain types of vegetation on or near a drain field is not recommended because of the threat that their associated root systems pose to the longterm functionality of the drain field. No one wants septic effluent surfacing in their yard, not to mention the cost of repairs and the associated inconveniences.

According to many of the articles written on this subject, shallow-rooted herbaceous plants that are well adapted to normal rainfall amounts for the area are best suited for use in a drain field planting. Plants that have aggressive, woody, water-loving, deep roots can potentially clog or disrupt the pipes in the system, causing serious damage that can be very expensive, very messy and threaten the environment. The key is to select plants that will satisfy landscaping needs while posing as minimal a threat to the drain field as possible.

Shallow-rooted herbaceous plants refer to flowering annuals and perennials (including bulbs), turfgrass, weeds and many groundcovers. These plants are unlikely to clog and damage drain lines. Many grasses are well suited for use in a drain field planting. Just remember that larger plants typically have larger root systems, so tall grasses are definitely not recommended for use in this instance. Mixes of wildflowers, bulbs and grasses



provide a suitable, attractive vegetative cover.

However, even when planting shallow-rooted plants there are some general guidelines to consider:

Never add additional soil over the drain field unless it is a minimal amount used to restore an area that may have been eroded or pulled up by removing another plant.

Try not to be overly zealous when tilling the soil for planting.

Continued on page 10

CDL LICENSE UPDATES

The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) announced updates to the commercial driver's license (CDL) holders program as a result of recently enacted state law, Act 131 of 2020.



Act 131 of 2020 extends the validity period of a commercial learner's permit from 180 days to one year. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration recently changed regulations to allow a jurisdiction the choice of the 180-day commercial learner's permit with an additional 180-day extension or a one-year commercial learner's permit.

According to PennDOT, "a one-year permit is more convenient for customers, giving them more time to prepare for their skills test. Additionally, a longer validity period means that fewer customers will need to extend their permit, which will help decrease customer traffic in driver license centers." This section of the law became effective May 23.

Additionally, Act 131 provides for a safe program that will allow eligible individuals to use bioptic telescope lenses to help them to qualify for and obtain a driver's license. Bioptic telescope lenses are authorized for use in at least 28 other states and are designed to help individuals meet visual acuity standards who otherwise wouldn't be able to obtain a license. PennDOT is currently developing the program's training and licensure process and will implement the program on the effective date of this section of the legislation, which is September 27, 2021.

Act 131 will also update requirements and restrictions for commercial driver's license (CDL) holders, including reporting requirements for convictions and violations. In addition, this law will also bring Pennsylvania into compliance with upcoming federal CDL regulations, which will include a lifetime disqualification from operating a commercial motor vehicle for human trafficking convictions. These sections of the law will become effective on various dates starting in early 2021.

BIOSOLIDS GENERAL PERMITS

Changes are coming to Pennsylvania's General Permits (GPs) that govern the land application of biosolids and residential septage (PAG-07 Exceptional Quality, PAG-08 Non-Exceptional Quality, and PAG-09 Residential Septage).

The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is reviewing the terms and conditions of the GPs as part of their routine permit renewal process. However, some of the draft proposed revisions have caused concern in the septage management industry.

In a March 18, 2021 presentation before Pennsylvania's Agricultural Advisory Board, DEP laid out some of the potential changes, including:

- Term of permit extended from 5 to 10 years
- Prohibition of mixing wastes with sewage sludge
 - Hauled-in waste acceptance & treatment facility
 - If not incorporated into head of plant, the biosolids are not sewage sludge
- PAG-07 & PAG-08 adding PFOA and PFOS monitoring requirements
- Addition of P-Index based land application rates requirements
 - Treatment facilities nutrient reduction requirement
 - 2 year phase for exiting land application sites
 - New land application sites would be immediately subject to requirement
- Storage amounts limited to next growing cycle to address issues during especially wet years



DEP has formed work groups with various stakeholder groups to provide input on the GP revision particulars. PSMA has been invited to participate. Ned Lang and Bruce Fox have volunteered to represent our industry.

The Department is targeting the end of 2021 to have published the final General Permits.

.

GAS TAX (cont.)

Continued from page 6

road use independent of a vehicle's fuel economy, which is appropriate if the tax is imposed to recover costs associated with wear-and-tear and congestion. However, the Commission will need to contend with the fact that such a funding scheme won't bring in out of state dollars like the pumps in Pennsylvania's gas stations do. Also, it will need to differentiate between heavy vehicles that are more responsible for road damage versus lighter vehicles that do not place the same degree of wear and tear on the road system.

Pennsylvania has one of the largest state-owned transportation networks in the country, with nearly 40,000 miles of roads and over 25,400 bridges under its direct purview. The Keystone State's road system is comparable in size to New York, New Jersey, and all of the New England states combined.

In 2019, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) produced a report that identified six major risks to our funding. The largest two, at the time, were federal funding and gas tax. And now, after a global pandemic, we have new challenges that change the way people use our transportation system.

The bottom line is that our current and future funding is at risk for three reasons:

Reason #1: Lower Revenue From Gas Tax. People are using less gas. Fuel efficiency is great for the environment and our pockets. But this means the state

environment and our pockets. But this n is collecting less gas-tax revenue.

Reason #2: Unpredictable Federal Funding. The Federal gas tax hasn't been raised since 1993 — 27 years ago. The cost of construction materials has gone up 140% over the past 30 years. As a result, the Federal Highway Trust Fund does not provide the funding that is needed for national infrastructure.

Reason #3: Changes in Travel Patterns Due to COVID-19. Vehicle miles traveled dropped 40% in the spring and have recovered somewhat but still remain down 15%. This may have a lasting impact on our economy, where and how we work, and where and how we go to school. PennDOT estimates that gas tax revenue is down nearly \$500 million since last year, with losses still occurring.

State Rep. Mike Carroll (D-Luzerne), the ranking Democrat on the House Transportation Committee, told a House hearing last month that the sprawling expanse of Pennsylvania's highways and state roads has not kept lawmakers from peeling off almost half of the gas tax revenue for other purposes.

That includes 12 cents a gallon to the state police budget, 8 cents a gallon to local governments, 3 cents a gallon to the Mon-Fayette Expressway's Southern Beltway in southwestern Pennsylvania and 3 cents a gallon to the Department of Agriculture and other state agencies.

"Nearly half of the gasoline tax that we collect does not go to PennDOT's responsibility with respect to roads and bridges," Carroll said.

Sources: https://taxfoundation.org/ https://www.ttnews.com/ https://www.penndot.gov/



LANDSCAPING OVER DRAIN FIELDS (cont.)

Continued from page 7

Remember that the drain lines may be as close to the soil surface. Double-digging is certainly not recommended!

Always wear gloves when working with the soil in the drain field area to minimize your exposure to the soil and any harmful organisms in it. This applies to many gardening activities such as digging, planting and weeding.

When planting directly over a line trench, avoid using plant species that require frequent dividing.

If a groundcover is chosen, do not use species that create a thick, dense canopy that would shade the ground beneath and collect organic debris. This situation can create an environment of cool, moist soil that does not allow enough evaporation and soil oxygen exchange from the soil surface for optimal functionality of the system.

Choose species that are well adapted to the soils and average rainfall in the area. This may reduce the need for supplemental fertilizers and water, which can compromise the functionality of the system.

Minimize traffic over the drain field. Select low maintenance species and try to plan for a minimum of foot traffic and activity over the area.

Keep the mulch layer to a minimum so as to not restrict evaporation of soil moisture.

Woody plants are mostly larger shrubs and trees that have woody stems and other woody plant parts that do not die back to the ground in winter. These plants are much more likely to cause serious damage to drain fields with their root systems.

Trees with very aggressive root systems that should be avoided include willows, red and silver maples, beeches, birches, elms and poplars. Some trees with less aggressive root systems include cherries, crabapples, dogwoods, hemlock and oaks.

To reduce the associated financial risk and emotional stress of a failed system, plant trees at least as far away as their estimated root spread at maturity. There are two methods used to estimate tree root spread. One rule of thumb is that roots extend out from the tree two to four times the diameter of the canopy. Another is



that tree roots spread out one to three times the height of the tree. These estimates should be considered a bare minimum, and to reduce the risk, the trees should be planted even further away from the drain field.

Shrubs with less aggressive root systems should never be planted any closer than 10 feet and small less aggressive trees no closer than 20 feet from the drain field. Planting these less-aggressive species, such as boxwoods, hollies or arborvitae towards the drier ends of the drain lines may also reduce the risk for problems down the road.

An important point to remember is that the drain field needs sun to perform optimally, so do not shade the area heavily with trees and shrubs. If the homeowner decides that it is worth the risk to plant less aggressive, fibrous-rooted shrubs or small trees in the drain field, at least plant them between the drain lines. Refer to your layout chart or diagram that should provide the locations and dimensions of your system's components. Please be aware that planting trees and shrubs near the drain field is inherently risky, but if you are willing to take the risk of potentially damaging the drain lines in order to enjoy the landscape, then keep these guidelines in mind when planning.

Source:

Clemson Univ Factsheet | HGIC 1726 | Mar 7, 2010

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT

Ned Lang Lang Industries, Inc. Narrowsburg, NY 12764 Email: ned.enviroventure@gmail.com Phone: 845-252-3000

VICE-PRESIDENT

Frank Parker, Jr. Parker Wastewater Consulting West Chester, PA 19380 Email: fpark17553@aol.com Phone: 610-408-8110

<u>Secretary</u>

Joseph Valentine

Quality Septic Inspections, LLC Wind Gap, PA 18091 Email: valsoils@verizon.net Phone: 484-764-7862

TREASURER

Jeffrey Rachlin

OnSite Management, Inc. West Chester, PA 19380 Email: JR@onsitemgt.com Phone: 610-430-3100

Past President

Kyle Rigby

Young's Sanitary Septic Service Dillsburg, PA 17019 Email: youngseptik@hotmail.com Phone: 717-432-3514

EDUCATION CHAIR

Ray Erb

Thomas H. Erb & Sons, Inc. Lititz, PA 17543 Email: erbs@ptd.net Phone: 717-626-5591

Staff

Mark Mitman, Admin Director PSMA Bethlehem, PA 18016 Email: director@psma.net Phone: 717-763-7762

Angela Leopold, Lobbyist

Novak Strategic Advisors, LLC Harrisburg, PA 17101 Email: angela@nsallc.com Phone: 717-234-9909

DIRECTORS

REGION 1

Barry Helverson Helverson Homes Lenhartsville, PA 19534 Email: helversonhomes@gmail.com Phone: 484-764-7191

Charlie Gutridge

Gutridge Inspections Pottstown, PA 19465 Email: charlie.inspector@gmail.com Phone: 484-318-1415

Adam Browning

Penn's Trail Environmental LLC Hatfield, PA 19440 Email: abrowning@pennstrail.com Phone: 215-362-4610

REGION 2

Alan Caldwell Biros Septic & Drain Cleaning Zion Grove, PA 17985 Email: alan@birosseptic.com Phone: 570-889-3738

Bruce Fox

Allstate Septic Systems Bangor, PA 18013 Email: bfox@allstateseptic.com Phone: 800-858-3111

Larry Spaciano

Dallas Area Municipal Authority Harveys Lake, PA 18618 Email: lspots@epix.net Phone: 570-639-1424

REGION 3

Tom Trimmer Trimmer Home Inspections Middletown, PA 17057 Email: ttrimmer01@comcast.net Phone: 717-944-4663

Rachel Wick Evangelista

Greenwick Septic Parkesburg, PA 19365 Email: greenwickseptic@gmail.com Phone: 610-857-3548

Susan Glackin Miller

Dale B. Miller & Son, Inc. Fawn Grove, PA 17321 Email: millersons@aol.com Phone: 717-382-4811

REGION 4

Lewis Crawford, Jr. Crawford's Septic Tank Cleaning Sugar Run, PA 18846 Email: lpcrawford@frontier.com Phone: 570-746-3234

Laurel Mueller

Soil Services Company, Inc. Forksville, PA 18616 Email: laurel@soilservicescompany.com Phone: 570-924-3694

<u>Region 5/6</u>

David Hapchuk

Hapchuk, Inc. Washington, PA 15301 Email: hapchuk@hapchukinc.com Phone: 724-222-6080

Charles Heffern, Jr.

Heffern Septic Tank Service Franklin, PA 16323 Email: heffern12@csonline.net Phone: 814-432-3072

John Williams

Williams & Sons Services, Inc. Reynoldsville, PA 15851 E: johnw@williamsandsonsservices.com Phone: 814-328-9918

Mark Patterson

Patterson Septic Service Jackson Center, PA 16133 Email: markrp1@verizon.net Phone: 724-662-3996

REGION 7

Chuck Starr Starr General Contracting Franklinville, NJ 08322 Email: info@starrgeneral.com Phone: 856-875-5020





Pennsylvania Septage Management Association P.O. Box 144 Bethlehem, PA 18016

UPCOMING TRAINING

Installation of Onsite Systems Course August 3-4, 2021 Hilton Conference Center, Scranton, PA

Installation of Onsite Systems Course September 28-29, 2021 Holiday Inn, Lansdale, PA

101 Basic Inspector Certification Course September 28-29, 2021 Holiday Inn, Williamsport, PA

102 Advanced Inspector Cert. Course September 28-29, 2021 Holiday Inn, Williamsport, PA

REGISTER ONLINE at PSMA.NET



Pennsylvania Septage Management Association

P.O. Box 144 Bethlehem, PA 18016 Phone: (717) 763-PSMA (7762) Fax: (215) 689-4263 www.PSMA.net

Administrative Director: Mark Mitman, director@psma.net

PSMA LOBBYIST: Angela Leopold, angela@nsallc.com (717) 234-9909 This newsletter is a publication of the Pennsylvania Septage Management Association

Material in this newsletter may be republished with permission of PSMA and with proper line credit. Mention of commercial products in this publication is solely for information purposes and endorsement is not intended by PSMA. Material does not directly reflect the opinions or beliefs of the Board or staff.