



**ICC 825 Private Sewage Disposal Systems
Standard Consensus Committee (IS-PSDS)**

Meeting #1 Minutes – April 12, 2023

The first meeting of the ICC 825 Private Sewage Disposal Systems Standard Consensus Committee (IS-PSDS) was held on April 12, 2023 in virtual format. The meeting was conducted in accordance with ICC’s Consensus Procedures. https://www.iccsafe.org/wp-content/uploads/ICC-Consensus-Procedures-ANSI-approved-8_2_21-BOD-apprvd-8_27_21.pdf

1. Welcome - Staff Secretariat, Ramiro Mata, welcomed attendees and convened the meeting at 2:04pm EDT. Matt Sigler and Karl Aittaniemi also introduced themselves.
2. Housekeeping Items - Mata noted the following items prior to calling the meeting to order:
 - a. The meeting will be conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order.
 - b. All attendees will have an equal opportunity to speak but must first be recognized to do so. The raise hand feature in Teams may be used for this purpose.
 - c. Only committee members may call for and vote on motions.
 - d. Attendees must abide by ICC’s code of Ethics and Anti-Trust Policy which can be found in the publicly accessible website <https://www.iccsafe.org/products-and-services/standards-development/is-swddv/>
3. Roll Call and Committee Introductions – Mata called the meeting to order with a roll call of IS-PSDS committee members – Symbol indicates present. With attendance below, Mata indicated the threshold of 6 for quorum has been met. ICC Staff Members present: Matt Sigler (ICC-PMG), Karl Aittaniemi, Mark Fasel, Rich Anderson.

Regulator		User		Manufacturer		SDO/Test Lab	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Carlos Hernandez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Esber Andiroglu PhD, PE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bob Carpenter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Derek DeLand
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Shaun May	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tunzyaan Griffin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jonathan Kaiser		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Thomas Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Philip Parisi Jr. PE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jeffrey Lexvold		
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ray Kennedy		

4. Nomination and Election of Chair and Vice Chair – Shaun May volunteered for and was elected as Chair. May then nominated Derek DeLand for Vice Chair which he accepted.
5. University of Miami Private Sewage Presentation – Austin Perry, PhD Candidate provided a slideshow about the research project underway. The slideshow will be stored in the meeting minutes folder of the standard website previously mentioned. A question-and-answer session followed the presentation with Perry and Primary Research Director, Esber Andiroglu PhD PE, responding.

Discussions:

- Shaun May requested to have the presentation uploaded onto the dedicated website. Mata agreed to do so.
 - Bob Rubin suggested adding Charlie Humphrey from East Carolina University to the Interested Parties list.
6. Next Steps- Title/Purpose/Scope – Mata introduced the ANSI PINs submission as a starting point to revise the purpose and scope as needed. Comments below:
- a. DeLand: Are we allowed to alter the scope submitted to ANSI? Would water reuse be included?
 - i. Sigler: We are somewhat restricted to what was submitted to ANSI. Are there areas we should elaborate on, perhaps related to climate change and water scarcity? Should it focus on disposal and/or include water reuse which is related? What is the desire of the committee?
 - ii. Kaiser: I think the project need reads well but there is room to expand with technology. At the end of the Project Need where it says ‘Where a public sewer is not available’ I know of cases where a public sewer is available but decentralized option is more sustainable, maybe more cost effective.
 - iii. Sigler: I think our focus is the scope statement and what you’re referring to is project need. We don’t get into the application of these systems.
 - iv. Roberts: Requirements differ in many areas. Across most jurisdictions, there are various government agencies with different controlling interests around onsite water management. How are minimum requirements adaptable to environmental factors that influence these systems? Issue in Australia is the move towards tiny houses with smaller number of occupants. The minimum requirements are oversized for these systems. Onsite sustainability is being driven by people rather than government to get a degree of independence and resilience. How can this be adapted into the scope?
 1. May: Great point. This is probably why there isn’t a standard already. This is why we need to do this work. We’ll work through it together.
 - v. Griffin: Private can be commercial or residential. Which one will we focus on? Is it both? Consider property lines and what process they have in the facility.
 1. May: Most jurisdictions cap how many gallons per day and characteristics of the sewage.
 2. Anidroglu: Based on literature review, the spectrum is broad. We are looking for direction from the committee, where are the boundaries for the scope? Private sewage can be packaged systems and can vary from developing nations to fully developed nations. It intersects with water reclaim and reuse.
 - vi. Mata: This exactly the discussion we are looking to have regarding the scope. It is intentionally written to provide flexibility in revising if needed. The Private Sewage Disposal Code may be a good starting point.

- vii. Rubin: Disposal and reuse are incompatible. Should we change the title to Private Sewage Treatment Systems?
 - 1. May: Valid point.
 - 2. Sigler: Rubin is correct. ICC is open to the direction the committee wishes to go. Terminology will define the difference between reuse and disposal.
 - 3. Anderson: Adding 'Treatment' makes sense and cast a broader scope.
 - 4. May: Non-residential facilities with higher sewage would be under the same sewage requirements as waster water treatment plants. Need to clearly define the facilities.
 - 5. Andiroglu: Is treatment for disposal or reuse? This is where sub-standards may be developed.

- 7. Meeting Cadence – The committee discussed 2, 3 or 4 hour sessions once a month but ultimately agreed to the Chair's recommendation of scheduling 4 hours once a month. Though the Chair expect meetings not to last more than 3 hours. Having this schedule will allow working groups to meet and for the committee to do its work.
- 8. Action Items
 - a. Send doodle poll and invitations for future meetings – Mata
 - b. Upload research presentation onto public website – Mata
 - c. Provide guidance to committee regarding the use of MS Teams for file sharing – Mata
- 9. Meeting adjourned at 4:05pm EDT.