

Eastgate Environmental Health Services

14350 SE Eastgate Way
Bellevue, WA 98007-6458
206-477-8050 Fax 206-296-0946
TTY Relay: 711
www.kingcounty.gov/health



Summary of Public Comments Regarding Proposed Revisions to King County Board of Health Title 13

November 2024

This document includes the comments that that On-site Sewage System (OSS) Program received during the public comment period for proposed revisions to King County Board of Health Title 13, September 17 through October 21, 2024. Longer comments have been summarized for succinctness.

Table 1: KC BOH Title 13 General Support

Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
I'm glad for those who have helped make changes. Five years from now plans can change. My grocery store got a letter stating that we need to have an inspection done, so just be aware that down the road and things can change.	No change to proposed rule. No specific recommendation.
Like the idea of pursuing grants to convert OSS to sewer in urban areas.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and will continue to pursue funding.
The proposed codes have changed 180° since this thing began. This group has really taken comments into consideration and applied them.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and support for proposed rules.
I am glad that people are being held accountable to fix their systems. It caused a big problem when my neighbor's system failed.	No changes to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and support for proposed rules.
Supports proposed changes. Satisfied with increase in minimum lot size. Believes proposed changes will ensure water quality is protected. Recommends more stringent sewer connection requirements in critical areas.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and support for proposed rules.

Table 2: KC BOH Title 13 General Opposition

Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
------------------	---------------------

<p>Opposes proposed changes. Believes county should focus on public sewers instead of on-site sewage systems to address water quality issues.</p>	<p>No proposed change to rule. No specific recommendation.</p>
<p>Opposes proposed changes. Believes that SB 5503 was not taken into consideration and that sewer overflows are the greater problem.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. PHSKC has evaluated the proposed code revisions to ensure compliance with RCW 43.20.065. KC BOH Title 13 allows the least expensive option that meets standards to address an OSS failure.</p>
<p>Opposes proposed changes. Believes that additional time is necessary to evaluate impact of proposed revisions. Raises concerns about the cost of sewer connections, especially in urban areas that were originally developed on OSS and questions the intent behind requiring properties to connect to sewer.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. PHSKC has completed an in-depth review of code revision options, including an extensive community input and public comment period.</p>
<p>Opposes proposed changes. Believes information was distributed appropriately and changes may unreasonably limit the rights of property owners.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback but respectfully disagrees with assertions made. The proposed codes have been developed to reduce costs, including those associated with inspections and maintenance. The proposed revisions were reviewed by King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office to ensure compliance with property right and public comment requirements.</p>
<p>I am opposed to this ordinance at this time. I feel the language and enforcement is far too vague and needs better clarification before consideration.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback. Proposed codes have been reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee and King County Prosecuting Attorney's office to ensure the level of detail is appropriate for Board of Health codes.</p>
<p>Opposes the proposed regulations due to the impact of more stringent inspection, maintenance, and reporting requirements on property rights and increased costs to property owners; anticipated unlawful regulatory takings and inverse condemnation; and violation of public comment and notice requirements</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback but respectfully disagrees with assertions made. The proposed codes have been developed to reduce costs, including those associated with inspections and maintenance. The proposed revisions were reviewed by King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office to ensure compliance with property right and public comment requirements.</p>
<p>Opposes proposed changes. Believes code revision should be postponed to allow more time for public comment.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback. Revised codes must be adopted by April 1, 2025 to comply with the effective date of the revised chapter 246-272A WAC. PHSKC has completed an in-depth review of code revision options, including an extensive community input and public comment period.</p>

Opposes proposed changes. Believes changes are not clear and will increase costs.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback. The proposed rule changes aim to reduce costs. The OSS Program will provide more information about the adopted changes through the OSS newsletter. Sign up at www.kingcounty.gov/oss/alerts .
OSS are miraculous and the water is 99% returned to the water table when using a septic system. Public sewer dumps billions of gallons of sewage into surface water causing pollution. OSS should be encouraged rather than pushing people to sewer. The county should ease the critical determination ordinances to help people use OSS. It's insanity to push people to sewer.	No proposed change to rule. On-site sewage systems are not feasible in all areas of King County, especially in areas with increased population density.
Repairing a failed OSS requires bringing OSS up to current standards - very limited gravity OSS allowed in KC - preferred pressure system 2 tanks more expenses.	No change to proposed rule. System type is determined by site conditions, including but not limited to soil type and depth and available area.

Table 3: KC BOH Title 13 General Input – Content

Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
Code should be detailed prior to acceptance by the BOH. Open ended code changes are not straight forward or factual information for the public to operate on.	No change to proposed rule. No specific recommendation.
Maybe with more remodels, additions, or extra bedroom, ADU/DADUs, or cottage housing, there needs to be consideration for training/info and probably TECHNICAL way to MEASURE the number of gallons being used per day for that dwelling or residential units.	No change to proposed rule. Water usage typically fluctuates throughout the week and/or on a day-to-day basis. Current septic system sizing is based on average water use with a safety factor to account for peak flow situations.
We need to prioritize making repairs to existing systems that have major issues or failures as easy and affordable as possible. The uncertainty and potentially catastrophically high costs associated with repairs disincentive homeowners from inspecting, acknowledging issues and failures, and entering the official process.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and recognizes the importance of cost-effective repairs. The proposed changes aim to reduce costs of repairs.
List or point out any areas where KC is proposing stronger than state AND change to lower state regulations.	No change to proposed rule. Changes that ensure compliance with WAC are listed as mandatory changes. Codes that are more restrictive than WAC have been thoroughly evaluated by the TAC and the reason for additional requirement is explained in the plain language summary and associated technical memos.

KISS - Keep it simple, stupid! Less than 0.5% failure.	No change to proposed rule. No specific recommendation.
Be clear that gravity systems can still be built.	No change to proposed rule. Title 13.28-1 shows the conditions under which gravity OSS can be installed.
Timing is everything! When OSS is repaired, property owner no longer interested in converting to sewer.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and is working hard to proactively address sewer availability because of the challenge raised in this comment.
Consider reviewing notices on title for accuracy during OSS Time of Sale. Update notices at this junction when inaccurate to increase educational information provided to property owners.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC will review OSS Time of Sale forms in partnership with Northwest Multiple Listing Service to ensure consistency and clear communication for the buyer.
Consider expanding public OSS education resources and disseminating more OSS education materials to residents utilizing on-site septic systems.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the commentor's focus on education and will work to find resources to increase OSS education opportunities for King County residents.

Table 4: KC BOH Title 13 General Input - Process

Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
Request that the public comments be extended to meet the minimum standard of 30-day.	No change to proposed rules. The public comment process was reviewed by King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office to ensure compliance with public comment requirements.
Think about a shared hook up to sewer cost between the sewer district, the county, and the home owner.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC pursues grant opportunities, when available, to help bridge the wastewater gap in communities in need.
Fine those who have failures.	No change to proposed rule. This is already allowed per the progressive enforcement process outlined in BOH Title 1.
We just found out about this process. More time is needed for septic owners to evaluate 100 pages of code. The was not well advertised.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC has completed an in-depth review of code revision options, including an extensive community input and public comment period.
I don't see that Fall City (all septics) is aware of this. Fall City Community Association should be notified. As we are a rural unincorporated town. FCCA is our community info.	No change to proposed rule. The OSS Program worked hard to share this information broadly. The Program has scheduled a meeting with the FCCA on 11/12.
I'm struggling to understand some of the changes a full red line version of the proposed changes should be provided to the public	No change to proposed rule. A full version will be made available after final proposed R&R is completed.

Table 5: KC BOH Title 13 General Question

Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
What is the scientific proof of the need for this proposed change?	No change to proposed rule. The proposed changes are based on evaluation by TAC, public input, and anticipated impact to public health and program services.
My property is definitely well over 200 ft from the nearest sewer. How do I determine if my address is in an urban growth area? I just want to understand if we built an ADU and needed additional septic if we can get a waiver. We have over an acre so plenty of space for another drain field.	No changes to proposed rule. The King County Assessor's Districts and development conditions report can be used to determine whether a property is located within the Urban Growth Area.
Does more restrictive OSS impact property values?	PHSKC does not have data available to determine any impact. King County assessor does not evaluate septic systems when assessing the value of a property.
Changes mandated by state or federal?	The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) for on-site sewage systems is being updated and will take effect April 1,2025. The WAC applies to all on-site sewage systems within Washington state. PHSKC is updating King County Board of Health Code Title 13, which will also be effective in 2025 and applies to on-site sewage systems within King County in addition to the WAC.
Does King County acknowledge there is a \$\$ cost for property owners?	Yes, PHSKC works hard to identify cost savings and financial assistance options.
Changes apply to existing property owners with or without OSS or just new OSS?	The changes impact maintenance of existing systems, construction -- design of new and replacement septic systems, and oversight of the septic industry to protect property owners.
Who inspections septic systems?	Gravity systems without a pump may be inspected by certified pumpers, except at time of property sale, licensed maintainers, or the resident owner. All other OSS must be inspected by a licensed on-site system maintainer. Non-discharging toilets may be inspected by the resident owner.
Do you have to upgrade if your system fails?	When a replacement system is required, it must meet current standards for an OSS replacement where possible.
Explain what you mean if septic fails and sewer is coming - do you still have to replace after you install new septic?	Title 13 requires connection to sewer if sewer is available and the OSS has failed.
What are requirements to get financial assistance? - income	Income limits are adjusted annually and depend on the program. See King County Housing Repair and Craft3 for more information.

Which code revision are proposing to revise so King County code can be consistent with WA state code revision according to WA State cost cutting for homeowner?	PHSKC has evaluated the proposed code revisions to ensure compliance with RCW 43.20.065. KCBOH Title 13 allows the least expensive option that meets standards to address an OSS failure.
Shouldn't the County already know how many septic systems since they approved them in the first place	The OSS Program estimates that there are 85,000 OSS in King County. Some were installed before the 1960s when OSS permits were first issued.

Table 6: KC BOH Title 13.04

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.04	Add following last sentence in Equity Impact Review. No part of Ch.13 that is more restrictive than state code may be applied until the equity impact review is completed.	No change to proposed rule. The equity impact review will inform implementation of codes through Local Management Plan, which does not cover all code sections.
13.04	Add the following. The equity impact assessment shall be subject to a public process including surveying and conducting focus groups throughout the county including both urban (within UGA and within city) and rural (outside UGA) areas. The equity impact review must be approved by BOH to consider it complete.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC does not have the resources to implement such a process at this time. The Equity Impact Reviews will follow King County standards and best practices and will include as much public input as possible.
13.04	This awkward language is confusing to the reader. In stating the local management plan will be under WAC 246-272A-0015 does the county mean to exempt from the decision making on a local management plan any ordinance language in the draft or final ordinance that is more stringent than the applicable law in the WAC? What assurance is there in code that an equity impact review will be applied equitably in all local management plans?	No change to proposed rule. WAC 246-272A-0015 requires a review of the Local Management Plan at least every 5 years. The proposed rule requires an equity impact review whenever a review of the Local Management Plan occurs. For more details about how an Equity Impact Review is implemented, see https://kingcounty.gov/en/legacy/elected/executive/equity-social-justice/tools-resources.aspx .
13.04.050	New section G. Sewer is not considered to be available within 200 feet in the case of repair of an existing OSS (or replacement stemming from a repair case) regardless of distance if the cost of sewerage inclusive of all necessary items to convert to sewer exceeds the cost of the least OSS that meets health requirements	No change to proposed rule. Sewer availability is determined by the sewer utility provider based on whether they would permit a connection from the property to the existing sewer line. PHSKC must comply with RCW 43.20.065 and allow the least expensive option that meets standards to address an OSS failure.

	<p>for said OSS. The cost of sewerage shall include all GFCs, trunkage, ULID connection charges, any fees, permitting, retirement of the OSS, side sewer, changes to the owner property to install side sewer including but not limited to sidewalk and driveway and road repairs, restoring landscaping, rerouting the building sewer, utility relocation, cleanouts, need for individual or shared lift stations, public roadway repairs in the event of a ULID, stormwater changes as a result of the conversion or ULID formation, all permitting and environmental review charges by the county and/or local jurisdiction needed to support conversion to sewer, costs related to the owner needing to secure a temporary residence or rent portable bathrooms and/or showering facilities while the cutover from septic to sewer takes place, and like. Likewise the cost of OSS repair or replacement must also consider changes to the property to use the reserve area, replace tanks, relocate utilities, address drainage on the property, temporary residence or needing to rent bathrooms and/or showering facilities while the OSS is unable to provide sewerage treatment, and the like. Additionally the OSS owner and/or applicant may include analysis showing the operations and maintenance cost of the OSS over time versus monthly costs for public sewer, including taxes and any additional charges that are part of the recurring charges for sewer (e.g., trunking charges, lift station charges, and so on).</p>	
13.04.050	Strike “the lands or”	<p>No change to proposed rule. The Technical Advisory Committee reached a consensus on proposed language after much discussion. The situation described can be addressed through the proposed waiver process.</p>
13.04.050	Remove word “failing” and replace with “failed”	<p>No change to proposed rule. The word "failing" is not present in the referenced code section.</p>
13.04.050	Opposes sewer connection requirements. Believes the most cost-effective solution should be considered when evaluating connection to sewer versus on-site sewage system.	<p>No change to the proposed rule. The sewer connection requirements with the addition of a waiver process were thoroughly evaluated and approved by the Technical Advisory Committee. The proposed rule ensures compliance with the Growth Management Act and King County Comprehensive Plan, allows conforming OSS replacements, and helps to address cost concerns through a waiver process.</p>

13.04.050	The language presented in the draft ordinance here conflicts with SB 5503, Chapter 21, Laws of 2019. Clearly the proposed ordinance language would impose the kind of circumstances denying the ability to use and own OSS and more stringent requirements of an OSS owner in seeking waivers or administrative appeals than is intended by the legislature in SB 5503.	No changes to proposed rule. PHSKC has evaluated Title 13 requirements to ensure compliance with new 43.20.065. PHSKC's first priority is to allow minor repairs and replacements within the applicable standards.
13.04.050	Insert between the words “failed” and “and” the following phrase “and all efforts to restore the OSS to operation the existing OSS have failed”	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed per this comment to clarify that minor repairs to address OSS deficiencies are prioritized prior to requiring sewer connection.
13.04.050.C	Sewer conversion requirement in legal code still contains distance as measured from land, from building sewer is a fairer method	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC considered the option of measuring from building sewer with the Technical Advisory Committee, but it was determined that adding an option to waive the sewer connection requirement was the more appropriate way to proceed.

Table 7: KC BOH Title 13.08

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.08	Bedroom definition: remove double negative from proposed language	Proposed rule has been revised per comment. Double negative has been replaced with positive language to improve clarity.
13.08	In the definition for bedroom the double negative is confusing	Proposed rule has been revised per comment. Double negative has been replaced with positive language to improve clarity.
13.08	The word “intended” in the bedroom definition is vague and should say “actively used” instead	Adopt rule with amendment. The bedroom definition has been updated in the proposed rule to improve clarity, including removal of the "intended for" language.
13.08.115	sq footage, bedrooms and OSS. Cabins that are used only on weekends, or randomly will not have the same usage as those used daily.	No change to proposed rule. The methodology of using bedrooms as the basis for design is the best available method at the time. We are evaluating for use for the life of the drainfield (can be over 50 years). Randomly used right now, but they could turn into a permanent residence
13.08.226	Replace “is not failing” with “has not failed”	No change to proposed rule. This is a direct copy of language in WAC 246-272A.

13.08.226	Add sentence to E. "Inadequately treated means treatment which fails to meet the treatment levels of the OSS design at its time of original permitting."	No change to proposed rule. Groundwater and surface water contamination is determined based on federal water quality standards.
13.08.226	Change K to "Jetting or use of water or other fluid to unclog any piping used in the SSAS such as pipes in a pressure distribution system, hard plastic or PVC or similar in a gravity OSS or pump to gravity, or piping or emitters in a low pressure emitter system".	No change to proposed rule. Jetting of concrete pipes in gravity OSS is not permitted as a minor repair due to the risk of damage to old concrete pipes.
13.08.226	Add section L. Tank depth sensors or transducers.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC is not aware of any OSS that use tank depth sensors or transducers. The PHSKC OSS Repair Memo can be updated to reflect new technologies as needed.
13.08.226	Rewrite Failure as: "Failure" means a conditions of an OSS system or its components that present an unacceptable risk to public health by not meeting the sewerage treatment standards the OSS was designed for at the time of its original permitting or by any OSS system or component malfunction where direct or indirect contact with sewerage exists that presents an unacceptable risk to the public.	No change to proposed rule. The described scenario of concern (OSS owner is keeping it operational within the limits of the original design) does not meet the current definition of an OSS failure, so the intent of this public comment has been met with existing proposed rule.
13.08.226	Defines "Minor repair" and states which OSS components may be replaced, added, or altered. There is no mention of a permit for such work listed. May a homeowner do these repairs or hire the work done without going through the permitting process? This must be specified clearly in code!	No changes to proposed rule. This is clearly stated in BOH 13.64.010.C.
13.08.226	Add section M. To repair or replace any piping which leads to the SSAS.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed per this comment. This is a technical change to the rule to clarify permitting requirements. Added Section 13.08.226.G "Pipes that lead to the SSAS and any non-perforated pipes in the SSAS."
13.08.226	Can you provide examples of "Throughout - Minor repairs no longer require permits"? What is a minor repair vs a major repair?	No change to proposed rule. BOH 13.08.226 includes a definition of a minor repair.

13.08.342	Ahead of “OSS” add “pressure distribution and”	No change to proposed rule. Septic pumpers may inspect the tank components of a pressure distribution OSS during the pumping, but are not qualified to inspect other components of a pressure distribution OSS. An individual may obtain an on-site system maintainer certification if they wish to conduct inspections of pressure distribution OSS.
13.08.342	Create new definition “Owner maintainer”. Owner maintainers shall be able to perform any inspection, monitoring, reporting, or maintenance activity for their OSS. Actions performed by an owner maintainer shall be treated as if done by a licensed professional. BOH shall establish mechanisms for owner maintainers to report inspection and monitoring. BOH shall establish educational materials for owner-maintainers.	No change to proposed rule. The current rule does not prevent property owners from performing their own OSS maintenance and inspections. PHSKC currently does not have capacity to implement a homeowner inspection program, but supports property owners in inspecting their own OSS.
13.08.342	Create new definition “Public domain owner maintainer”. Public domain owner maintainers shall be able to perform the inspection, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting of their own public domain technology OSS. Actions performed by a public domain owner maintainer shall be treated as if done by a licensed professional. BOH shall establish mechanisms for public domain owner maintainers to report inspection and monitoring. BOH shall establish educational materials for public domain owner maintainers.	No change to proposed rule. The current rule does not prevent property owners from performing their own OSS maintenance and inspections. PHSKC currently does not have capacity to implement a homeowner inspection program, but supports property owners in inspecting their own OSS.
13.08.350	Repair means the replacement, reconstruction or relocation of relocation of, or addition or addition to alternation, a sewage tank, distribution box, tight line, or other appurtenances of an existing OSS, and including any replacement, reconstruction or relocation of, or addition or alteration to a soil absorption system.	No change to proposed rule. The proposed rule updates the definition to align with the WAC definition. Other changes can be considered during the next code revision.
13.08.490	The definition for surface water should be amended to include the word navigable	No change to proposed rule. Further changes to the surface water definition cannot be made without additional research. This will be addressed through a memo developed with the TAC that provides more specificity.
13.08.490	Definition of “Surface water”. The term springs has been included as new language for the draft code. At public meetings the definition of surface water has been debated and it has been stated by county representatives that the definition needs improvement. The inclusion of springs as a term for surface water should be removed or more descriptively defined.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rules includes a minor change of adding "drinking water" to provide further clarity about what type of spring is referenced. Further changes cannot be made without additional research. This will be addressed through a memo developed with the TAC that provides more specificity.

Table 8: KC BOH Title 13.12

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.12	Add the recommendation decision, along with the appeal ID and committee member list, shall be available at https://www.kingcountyoss.info/BOH-OSS-appeal-determination for transparency.	No change to proposed rule. Recommendation does not need to be incorporated into code. OSS Program policy and procedures will be reviewed and updated if possible.

Table 9: KC BOH Title 13.16.010

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.16.010	Change voting members to include consumer representatives in marine, urban, and commercial OSS	No change to proposed rule. Existing language has included the consumer representatives as voting members.
13.16.010	Change to “at least 12 members” with the inclusion of the adds for a consumer representative in marine, urban, and commercial later referenced.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed per this comment. Technical change to the rule to ensure representative TAC membership.
13.16.010	Replace Lines 477-489 with: 1. Professional Engineer, 2. Sanitarian, 3. Geologist or Soil Scientist, 4. Seattle-King County Board of Realtors Representative, 5. Representative from a nonprofit, nonpartisan public affairs or environmental organization, 6. Consumer Representative from the King County Unincorporated Area Councils, 7. Representative from Incorporated Cities, 8. Representative from a Sewer Utility District, 9. Three OSS owners from different cities to ensure there are not underrepresented and should take turns to public and environment.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed to add three additional seats on the TAC for OSS owners.

Table 10: KC BOH Title 13.20

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
---------------	------------------	---------------------

13.20.010	Sections B-H are no longer clear in light of definitions of “repair” and “minor repair” and this code should not be adopted. Again the intent (from a repairs and replacement driven by repairs perspective) in the focus groups was to differentiate REPAIR of the SSAS from the rest (minor REPAIR)	No change to proposed rule. Section 13.20.010.A includes language to reference other allowances throughout Title 13, including the allowance to perform minor repairs without a permit. Sections B-H only apply to repairs, which is consistent with how the language is used.
13.20.010	This section needs work and object to its adoption in its current form. During the focus groups the intent was to discourage repairs to the most vital element of an OSS... the drainfield... but this appears to be expanded to cover any part of an OSS and further refers to installation permits which are associated with “repairs” and not “minor repairs”. The level of this fine--\$15k- or \$5k--if under criminal code would be a felony offense.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed per this comment. PHSKC will perform additional analysis of enforcement mechanisms to prevent unpermitted OSS installations and propose new rule language in a future ordinance.
13.20.010.A	Some industries depend on regulatory driven artificial demand for services. The septic industry has an effective lobby which pushes “green services”. There is a tremendous need for clarity - a minor repair is not well defined. If a property owner does a small repair to their OSS and it turns out to actually be considered a repair by the county, they could be in for a \$5000 fine. King County is being made to carry the water for what the industry wants.	No change to proposed rule. The proposed rule includes an updated definition of minor repairs, as well as several measures to ensure that PHSKC has the tools necessary to hold industry to a consistent standard of service.
13.20.010.A	“Permits general”. Line 509 through 520 is not clear as to what is allowed to be done by the homeowner without an installation permit because it states “Unless otherwise specified in this title, it is unlawful to construct, install, repair or modify an OSS without an approved OSS installation permit. Further, it is stated “Any person, other than the owner of the property where the OSS is located, who constructs, installs, repairs, or modifies any part of an OSS without an approved OSS installation permit, including but not limited to replacing a drainfield, will be subject to the assessment of civil penalty fines of up to fifteen thousand dollars per violation. The owner of the property where the OSS is located will be subject to the assessment of civil penalty fines of up to five thousand dollars per violation for performing the work without an approved OSS installation permit. The health officer may reduce or waive the penalty assessed against the property owner under this section after a permitted OSS installation or repair has been completed and the health officer has approved the installation or repair.” The waiver process referred to in this section is not expressed in	No change to the proposed rule. BOH 13.64.010.C specifies that a permit is not required for a minor repair. The proposed penalties comply with the authority granted to a local health officer to assess civil penalties per RCW 70A.105.120.

	<p>code is the waiver a health officer may apply to a property owner based on an RCW, WAC, or King County Code? If so, the code used for the waiver process should be included in this section of the title.</p> <p>The language does not make clear where in this title it is otherwise specified that it is not unlawful to construct, install, repair, or modify any part of an approved OSS installation permit.</p>	
13.20.010.E	<p>The added code reads “The applicant for an OSS installation permit may not also be the designer named on the site application unless the work to be done consists solely of OSS failure repair.”</p> <p>This is confusing and seems to contradict other language in code, for example on Page 25 line 533 through 535“E. Unless otherwise provided in this title, the applicant for an OSS installation permit shall be a certified master installer and shall be responsible for all work done under that permit” In this and throughout the proposed changes document, any instance of the phrase “unless otherwise provided in this title”should have a reference to the title, section, chapter that otherwise provided refers to.</p> <p>It seems this requirement in the proposed draft code stating an applicant for an OSS installation permit may not also be the designer named on the permit would complicate and create unnecessary additional expense to the process of installing an OSS. The code language in the permit general section is confusing and needs to be written clearly so it can be widely understood by the reader.</p>	<p>No change to the proposed rule. This requirement is in place to ensure that the OSS designer is providing adequate oversight for new OSS installations by creating a separation of duties. Title 13 allows design and installation of failure replacements to be completed by the same individual with the intent of reducing costs.</p>
13.20.030	<p>Add, “BOH shall provide typical permit templates for gravity, sand filter, and pressurized systems so that individuals can follow the standards along with simple guidance.”</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. Environmental Health Services is implementing a new permitting software that will allow for greater transparency.</p>
13.20.040	<p>4. The property is not adjacent to a ((marine)) shoreline; a resident owner is singled out for a more stringent compliance level than all other OSS builds as the county has eliminated the word marine from the phrase marine shoreline, thus making all shorelines subject to the more stringent features for a resident owner design, construction or monitoring while not applying that standard in any other code language in a comparable build.</p>	<p>Adopt rule with amendment. A definition of shoreline has been added to the proposed rule to clarify which properties are eligible for resident owner design. Resident owners may design and install their own OSS when the property conditions support a gravity OSS. The soil conditions and setback requirements necessary for a gravity OSS are outlined in this code section. Shoreline properties require a design by a licensed OSS designer or professional</p>

	<p>This language is a regulatory over-reach that has no stated purpose or need. The elimination of the word marine in the draft code in this section must be corrected so as to not place an additional burden on a landowner without corresponding studies that reveal specific scientific standard requiring expanded or doubled buffers that would not apply to the land otherwise. Another standard applying only to Resident owner design, construction and monitoring is found on page 34, line 727: 1. The area where the drainfield and reserve area are to be located has a minimum of four feet of original permeable soil, and a minimum vertical separation of three feet is maintained. This sentence again requires a standard called out only in the circumstance of a resident owner design, construction and monitoring.</p> <p>If a resident owner must apply for a permit, and have an engineered design which includes soils testing, there would appear to be no other differences in the OSS permitting process other than that of ownership, the expansion of a horizontal set back from 100 to 200 feet, and any shoreline based on an owner's design, and the requirement of an unattainable 48 inches of original permeable soil, for a resident owner design, construction or monitoring is capricious and arbitrary if not based on fact, law, and scientific study.</p>	<p>engineer given the high risk of water contamination if the OSS is not properly designed or installed.</p>
13.20.040	<p>Don't take marine out of the marine shoreline requirement. People don't have a choice if there's a ditch or storm water by their property. The 200-foot setback is not good.</p>	<p>Adopt rule with amendment. A definition of shoreline has been added to the proposed rule to clarify which properties are eligible for resident owner design. The setback has also been reduced to 100 ft to ensure consistency with other code sections.</p>
13.20.040	<p>Add to 3 "or pressure distribution" after "soil"</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. A pressure distribution OSS is technically complet and must be designed by a licensed OSS designer or professional engineer.</p>
13.20.040	<p>Add "or pressure distribution" after "gravity" sections B and C</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. A pressure distribution OSS is technically complet and must be installed by a certified OSS installer.</p>

13.20.040	Add new section E. An owner shall be able to conduct minor repairs on any component of an OSS when the minor repair is like for like or identical of the component under minor repair. BOH shall create a process where owners can report minor repairs.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule was changed per this recommendation. Language was added to clarify that OSS owners can perform minor repairs on gravity OSS and septic tanks components without a permit.
13.20.040	The system primary area and reserve area are not less than two hundred feet from surface water; this is added language derived from what other law, statute, or study? The table shown on page 57, through 58 calls for a horizontal separation or set back of 100 feet from surface water. Why does the text differ from what is represented in the table? The county in this language creates a more stringent horizontal set back based on the fact the resident owner is the designer, constructor, or monitor of the property while not forcing in code the same standard on all other design, construction, and monitoring for other than resident owner. This is a clear example of a regulatory exaction that singles out and applies a standard to a single class of land owner and not any other. This code language must be eliminated.	Adopt rule with amendment. This language has been removed from the proposed rule.
13.20.040	Remove "Resident," as it is unrelated to the protection of health and the environment. In fact, the OSS owner is both a victim of unsanitary conditions and the primary responder with the resources to restore the failing system.	No change to proposed rule. Additional changes cannot be made without additional research. This request will be considered during the next code revision.
13.20.040	Add "or pressure distribution" after "gravity" section D. Strike "septic tank" and replace with "any"	No change to proposed rule. This request is beyond the scope of the proposed code revisions and will be considered during the next code revision.
13.20.040	strike "a low pressure distribution system" and replace with "any"	No change to proposed rule. This request is beyond the scope of the proposed code revisions and will be considered during the next code revision.
13.20.040	After gravity add pressure distribution and replace "septic tank" with "any"	No change to proposed rule. This request is beyond the scope of the proposed code revisions and will be considered during the next code revision.
13.20.040	change "a low pressure distribution system" to "any"	No change to proposed rule. This request is beyond the scope of the proposed code revisions and will be considered during the next code revision.

13.20.040	What is the definition of shoreline? Why have you struck the word marine before shoreline?	Adopt rule with amendment. A definition of shoreline has been added to the proposed rule to ensure clarity. The increased risk to public health is relevant to shoreline properties for all large bodies of water, not just marine water. The new shoreline definition includes marine waters, rivers and streams with a mean annual flow exceeding 20 cubic feet per second, lakes larger than 20 acres, and wetlands.
13.20.040	Why increase the setback to 200 feet? It's not clear that it's only applicable to when an owner installs their own septic system.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been updated to ensure consistent requirement of 100 foot setback to surface water

Table 11: KC BOH Title 13.24

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.24.010	Add section D. As an alternative to the critical aquifer recharge area requirements a proposal may indicate whether the underlying mapping is correct, that compliance can be achieved via following the state WAC 246-272A for any treatment parameter, or that the area or development does not require compliance to critical area treatment requirements based on the history or characteristics of the area in question.	No change to proposed rule. An applicant may at any time use the waiver process of WAC 246-272A-0420, as described in 13.08.084, to request alternative approaches to meeting the intent of the code.
13.24.010	Add remark to C. The application of KCC 21a.24.316 shall not be enforced until critical area ordinances have been updated in association with county 2024 Comprehensive Plan and the equity review has been completed.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC already applies nitrogen treatment requirements per KCC in all of unincorporated King County. The proposed change ensures consistent application in incorporated areas as well. PHSKC is supportive of County efforts to improve CARA data.
13.24.020	Part B and add remark on item 15. Compliance may also be demonstrated by submitting a proposal that indicates the mapping is not correct, that compliance can be achieved via following the state WAC 246-272A for any treatment parameter, or that the area or development does not require compliance to critical area treatment requirements based on the history or characteristics of the area or development in question.	No change to proposed rule. An applicant may at any time use a waiver process of WAC 246-272A-0420, as described in 13.08.084, to request alternative approaches to meeting the intent of the code.
13.24.020.A.1	Clarification of the three unit volume of sewage per parcel is unclear and should be rewritten in plain language	No change to proposed rule. Additional detail is included in the unit volume of sewage definition, KCBOH 13.08.496.

13.24.020	Part B and add remark following item 15. The application of KCC 21a.24.316 shall not be enforced until critical area ordinances have been updated in association with county 2024 Comprehensive Plan and the equity review has been completed.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC already applies nitrogen treatment requirements per KCC in all of unincorporated King County. The proposed change ensures consistent application in incorporated areas as well. PHSKC is supportive of County efforts to improve CARA data.
-----------	--	--

Table 12: KC BOH Title 13.28

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
Table 13.28-1	Replace “Table 13-281 Footnote c. A water table study shall be conducted shall be conducted during a time of high seasonal water table to establish available soil depth.” with “The Health Officer shall verify the groundwater information using the Natural Resources Soil Survey and WA Department of Natural Resources data. If unavailable, the soil shall be evaluated by either an OSS designer or a professional engineer to determine if there are indications of groundwater within 24 inches of the bottom excavation.”	No change to proposed rule. On-site soil conditions vary extensively within the lot. Winter watertable conditions inform us of actual site conditions that cannot be determined from other sources.
13.28.010.C	Add, “with the Health Officer’s supervisor’s approval.”	No change to proposed rule. This is addressed through internal policies and procedures. This is our current practice.
13.28.030	Add to Y. As an alternative to the critical aquifer recharge area requirements a proposal may indicate whether the underlying mapping is correct, that compliance can be achieved via following the state WAC (refs XXX) for any treatment parameter, or that the area or development does not require compliance to critical area treatment requirements based on the history or characteristics of the area in question.	No change to proposed rule. An applicant may at any time use the waiver process of WAC 246-272A-0420, as described in 13.08.084, to request alternative approaches to meeting the intent of the code.
13.28.030	Add section AA. The local health officer is authorized to grant exceptions and waivers to any part of 13.28.030 where in the health officer’s judgement an unreasonable or burdensome outcome may result. An applicant may indicate where unreasonable. The health officer shall determine the reasonableness as requested by an application and provide their reasoning for or against. The determination by the health officer in this case shall be appealable by an applicant.	No change to proposed rule. An applicant may at any time use the waiver process of WAC 246-272A-0420, as described in 13.08.084, to request alternative approaches to meeting the intent of the code.

13.28.030	Add remark to Y. The application of KCC 21a.24.316 shall not be enforced until critical area ordinances have been updated in association with county 2024 Comprehensive Plan and the equity review has been completed.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC already applies nitrogen treatment requirements per KCC in all of unincorporated King County. The proposed change ensures consistent application in incorporated areas as well. PHSKC is supportive of County efforts to improve CARA data.
13.28.030	Replace 2 with “Has a method enabling power to be cutoff and accessible from the exterior of the structure served by the OSS to maintain or service an OSS component needing power such as: 1) A removeable plug 2) A circuit breaker, disconnect, signal, or switch that disconnects the power to the OSS component”.	No change to proposed rule. This level of detail is not required in code. Additional details can be addressed through a policy or memorandum if needed.
13.28.030	Table 13-28-1 and R appear to be in conflict as the table includes requirements for 36” and greater while part R states no OSS cannot be permitted unless the minimum vertical separation is three feet, clearly separation greater than 36” is greater than the minimum of three feet. Propose deleting the rows corresponding to >36 inches.	Adopt rule with amendment. Table 13-28.1 was revised to provide greater clarity.
13.28.030	Reference W has same defect as above on R / table 13-28-1	Adopt rule with amendment. Table 13-28.1 was revised to provide greater clarity.
13.28.070	Change to 150 to 120 in A part 1.	No change to proposed rule. This requirement has been in effect since at least 1987. This code revision process did not include an in-depth analysis of design capacity. The request should be evaluated in detail for consideration in future code revisions.

Table 13: KC BOH Title 13.36.010

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.36.010	describes design standards that include increased tank sizes, and increased flow standards. It is not clear if the design standards are to apply to replacement of OSS considered to have failed. Failure is defined on page 17, lines 350 through 364. The ordinance does not provide code that describes the standards for replacement of an OSS to non-failure status. On page 42, line 888 calls for” a plan that demonstrates that the standards required in this title are met.” But it does not specifically state	No change to proposed rule. This code revision is not proposing to increase tank sizes or flow standards. Per 13.64.010, an OSS replacement must meet standards to the maximum extent possible allowed by the site conditions. This includes evaluation of existing tanks and reusing them if possible. Consideration is given to what is feasible for replacement OSS.

	where in code those standards are located. It could be assumed the section on page 82, beginning on line 1730 “Repairs of failing OSS.” Could be the standard referred to on page 42, but it is not clear if that is what is intended in code. This should be made clear in code language if this is the standard referred to on page 64.	
13.36.010	Change 1500 to 1000 and “one thousand five hundred” to “one thousand”	No change to proposed rule. This requirement has been in effect since 2008. This code revision process did not include an in-depth analysis of design capacity. The request should be evaluated in detail for consideration in future code revisions.
13.36.010	Part D change 250 to 240.	No change to proposed rule. This requirement has been in effect since at least 1987. This code revision process did not include an in-depth analysis of design capacity. The request should be evaluated in detail for consideration in future code revisions.
13.36.010.E	The required septic system size should not be increased because a residence has a garbage grinder	No change to proposed rule. This code revision process did not include an in-depth analysis of design capacity. The request should be evaluated in detail for consideration in future code revisions.

Table 14: KC BOH Title 13.40.030

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.40.030	Change one thousand five hundred to one thousand.	No change to proposed rule. This requirement has been in effect since 2008. This code revision process did not include an in-depth analysis of design capacity. The request should be evaluated in detail for consideration in future code revisions.

Table 15: KC BOH Title 13.48.010

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.48.010	Strike under 2 “meet treatment level B or greater”	No change to proposed rule. Treatment level B is required due to the combination of the OSS structure of a bed and the soil type. A change to this requirement can be evaluated in a future code revision.

Table 16: KC BOH Title 13.52.010

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.52.010	Consider making monitoring device optional and allowing the monitoring to be utilized in lieu of the 3-year bond in an effort to be more equitable. Recommend not implementing requirement for monitoring device on existing holding tanks.	No change to proposed rule. The code is about the design, installation, and monitoring of a new holding tank. This does not introduce a requirement to alter existing permit conditions for holding tanks, but a property owner may voluntarily do so. PHSKC will continue to advocate for additional financial assistance for all OSS-related needs.

Table 17: KC BOH Title 13.60

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.60.010	Table 13-60-1 should be modified to allow for owner and pumper inspection and monitoring / preventative maintenance for at least public domain systems and further to not require it more frequently than every 3 years for systems without a garbage disposer.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed to incorporate part of this comment. Gravity OSS with a garbage disposal will not be required to have more frequent maintenance inspections. The current rule does not prevent property owners from performing their own OSS inspections. PHSKC currently does not have capacity to implement a homeowner inspection program, but supports property owners in inspecting their own OSS.
13.60.010.F	I understand the importance of shellfish areas, but yearly by third party such as on Vashon sounds expensive for the homeowner.	No change to proposed rule. The regular maintenance of a septic system is not just for the health of shellfish in the Sound. Making sure the septic system functions properly and getting it checked makes it easy for the homeowners to be prepared for any incidents of sewage overflow, and this can help improve the health of community.
13.60.010.H	Clarify definition of Failure: surfacing sewage or backing up into the house	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule changed per comment. Language has been changed from "failure" to "effluent surfacing from an OSS component or sewage backing up into a structure."
13.60.010.H	Require failure report after 30 days	No change to proposed rule. The 5 day turnaround time was selected to balance feasibility of reporting with the imminent health risk of surfacing effluent.
13.60.010.H	Requirement to report a failure within 5 days could give professionals another tool to force property owners to pay them more money.	No change to proposed rule. The failure reporting requirement has been amended to provide greater specificity. It applies to scenarios with high risk to public health. Because a reporting

		requirement already exists, PHSKC does not anticipate that this will increase unprofessional conduct by OSS industry.
13.60.010.H	It should be 2 weeks for reporting failed system. Some properties involve several parties like estate of.	Adopt rule with amendment. Proposed rule has been changed to provide more specificity about the failure reporting requirement. This only applies to failures with surfacing effluent or sewage back up into a structure - high public health risk situations. This will help improve the understanding of how many failures occur in King County to support applications for funding.
Table 13.60-1	Changing a 6 month inspection to 12 months is another huge cost to the homeowner.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC appreciates the feedback and respectfully disagrees. Decreasing the frequency of inspections will reduce costs for OSS maintenance.
Table 13.60-1	On pumpers: feel simple PD systems inspection should be able to be done by a pumper	No change to proposed rule. Septic pumpers may inspect the tank components of a pressure distribution OSS during the pumping, but are not qualified to inspect other components of a pressure distribution OSS. An individual may obtain an on-site system maintainer certification if they wish to conduct inspections of pressure distribution OSS.
Table 13.60-1	Allow pumpers to inspect simple pressure distribution or public domain systems. For example float only or float and timer only. Might consider simple systems with ATU (aerators).	No change to proposed rule. Septic pumpers may inspect the tank components of a pressure distribution OSS during the pumping, but are not qualified to inspect other components of a pressure distribution OSS. An individual may obtain an on-site system maintainer certification if they wish to conduct inspections of pressure distribution OSS.
Table 13.60-1	Can you explain what pump to gravity would fall under in the table that describes the frequency of maintenance inspections? Please explain that public domain includes pump to gravity	No change to proposed rule. This has already been addressed through proposed code revisions.
Table 13.60-1	Allow owners to inspect simple public domain systems. Test alarm, test floats, inspect baffles, check effluent filter, check timers, check sludge/scum levels, check field observation ports. A pumper can do this as well.	No change to proposed rule. The current rule does not prevent property owners from performing their own OSS maintenance and inspections. PHSKC currently does not have capacity to implement a homeowner inspection program, but supports property owners in inspecting their own OSS.

Table 18: KC BOH Title 13.64.010

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
---------------	------------------	---------------------

13.64.010	After otherwise fail add “In no case shall failure mean failure to treat beyond the standards and/or treatment level at the time of permitting of the subject OSS. If no standard or treatment level was established at the time of the permitting of the OSS then no level may be used to in the assessment to declare failure or threats to public health.	No change to proposed rule. A failure is defined in section 13.08.152. The definition and prescribed requirements are necessary to meet minimum state requirements.
13.64.010	Add section O. The person submitting a repair or replacement proposal (if done as a result of a repair applying to a failed SSAS) may submit any information to the local health officer that any requirement within the title is onerous, not supported by experience, incorrectly mapped, placed incorrectly into a critical area or any other similar area (such as any type of source protection area), not applicable to the environmental, physical, and/or conditions on site and the health officer may waive any requirement or condition in this title. The health officer whether requested or not by the party performing a repair or developing a repair proposal may waive any part of this title in approving a repair (or replacement driven by an effort to repair a failed SSAS). The denial of a repair (or replacement proposal in the case of replacements stemming from repair of a failed SSAS) shall be subject to appeal.	No change to proposed rule. An applicant may at any time use the waiver process of WAC 246-272A-0420, as described in 13.08.084, to request alternative approaches to meeting the intent of the code. Per section 13.64.010.A, the health officer may waive compliance with these requirements. The denial of a repair can be appealed through the process outlined in section 13.12.
13.64.010	Delete 1 and quarterly reporting of monitoring on treatment level A. Add text on #1 to be within 1 business day for cases in the immediate vicinity of a commercial shellfish harvesting area.	Proposed rule has been changed per this comment. Section 13.64.010.F is addressed through other section of the code. Any other relevant requirements will be reviewed and incorporated into the Local Management Plan.

Table 19: KC BOH Title 13, Miscellaneous

Title Section	Comment Received	Response from PHSKC
13.60.005; 13.64.020	"secured" not clearly defined; "remodel" and "alter" should be specified to exclude changes unrelated to OSS usage	No change to proposed rule. Due to differences in tank lid construction, it is not possible to add additional details to the code requirement. The code clearly states that the lid needs to be secured so that it cannot be lifted or the tank accessed. Per 13.64.020.A, remodels and alterations that do not impact the OSS usage are excluded from this requirement.

New section	The proactive replacement of a drainfield that is NOT failed shall be allowed under the original permit conditions provided a like drainfield to a reasonable degree is constructed and within the reserve area identified under the original OSS. Health shall require a design application that shows the location of the drainfield, may require a soils study and/or water table assessment, and drainage review of the property.	No change to proposed rule. PHSKC aims to ensure that a property can be served as long as possible by existing OSS and replacement OSS installed in reserve area. By prematurely replacing the original OSS, the lifespan of the OSS in the reserve area is started earlier than necessary, leading to potential issues when the reserve OSS fails.
New section	Remediation. The repairs, minor repairs, and/or any other technique that may be used or trialed to restore an OSS and its components including an SSAS shall be allowed reasonable time to work and restore the OSS from a malfunctioning SSAS or treatment component before requiring a repair. Such may include but not limited to: hydrojetting, vaccuming and pumping, introduction of chemicals or additives to the tank or any component of an OSS, introduction of chemicals or additives atop an SSAS, injecting chemicals or additives to the SSAS, field fracturing, injection of materials within the SSAS to aid in drainage or treatment, addition of ATUs, sand filters, aeration, bioreactive treatment components, resting of an SSAS via repeated pumping or other means, reduction in design flow (such as via reducing water use in the home), removal of garbage disposers, increase in dilution of sewerage entering the OSS as may be warranted for high strength sewerage being a cause of malfunction of the OSS, addition or alteration of drainage where drainage contributed to the malfunction of an SSAS, conversion from anaerobic to aerobic, adjustment or introduction of timed dosing, modification to the treatment sequence and/or timing of a proprietary OSS, use of additives to reduce or eliminate biomat, and/or any other method, practice, or technique known to the industry, owners, health, researchers, academics, engineers, or licensed professionals.	No change to proposed rule. Section 1 adopts WAC 246-272A by reference, including allowance for remediation. PHSKC's current remediation policy memo is available at on the OSS webpage. The remediation policy may be amended if determined necessary by the OSS Technical Advisory Committee.
New section	Remediation. Add the following. Health adopts remediation per the state WAC 272 246A 230.	No change to proposed rule. Section 1 adopts WAC 246-272A, including WAC 246-272A-230, by reference.

<p>Definition removed post 2008 revision</p>	<p>I am curious about graywater infiltration systems; I have heard of their legality in other jurisdictions but am not aware of whether seattle permits them. Would this fall under your department's purview? Are they already legal and I have missed the memo? Consider this a comment in their favor!</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. Graywater infiltration systems are sized based on the evapotranspiration rate in the area it is proposed. The septic system for the blackwater must still be sized for the number of bedrooms in the residence (no reduction in system size is allowed in conjunction with a graywater system). The amount of space required for both systems is often not feasible and/or is not pursued by applicants.</p>
--	---	--

Table 20: KC BOH Title 13 – General Input Not Related to Title 13

<p>Comment Received</p>	<p>Response from PHSKC</p>
<p>A single family residence and an ADU on one lot using a private well should not be required to change that private well to a Group B well.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. This is outside the scope of Title 13 code revisions.</p>
<p>Consider exploring green systems such as methane digestive systems.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. Wastewater treatment technologies must be approved by Washington State Department of Health.</p>
<p>Questions and concerns about when sewer connection is required for a residence currently served by an on-site septic system, especially when water quality is good.</p>	<p>No change to the proposed rule. BOH Title 13 sewer connection requirements only apply to failing OSS.</p>
<p>What about sewer expansion: sewer districts should be required to provide notification for any expansions with specifics and any proposed future expansions.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. BOH Title 13 does not have jurisdiction over sewer expansion or notification processes.</p>
<p>Sewer department and/or Disticts really should NOTIFY folks when sewer is coming into an area--via development or even by single sewer extensions as sewer creep reaches people... and they should be aware and know costs and options.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. BOH Title 13 does not have jurisdiction over sewer expansion or notification processes.</p>
<p>If septic system fails and sewer system is coming but forced to fix/upgrade system until sewer is available, owner should get reimbursed by putting money they had to pay toward sewer hook up.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. BOH Title 13 does not have jurisdiction over sewer connection costs.</p>
<p>I have a sprinkler system. I'm required to get back flow testing every few years. I did that and then the requirement changed and now I am being required to get the backflow testing every year. I had a hard time finding a professional to do it and I almost didn't. Then I got a letter from the water system and they were going to start enforcement. These people may not enforce right now but there are enforcers out there.</p>	<p>No change to proposed rule. BOH Title 13 does not have jurisdiction over water purveyor requirements.</p>

