

MEMORANDUM

To: K. Derickson
W. Elzinga

From: R. Rosenberger

Subj: Coraville Lake EA

Date: 18 September 2000

I finally talked with Mr. Wayne Farraud Iowa DNR Environmental Protection Division (515) 281-8877 today in regard to my letter to him of 11 August 2000.

1. He acknowledged receiving above letter and indicated that the issues raised has created considerable internal (and he said external) discussions regarding the current wastewater treatment set-back requirements.
2. He said that they have received a Rule Making Petition from Johnson County regarding the current separation distances. This has been passed on to the Environmental Protection Commission and a staff committee has been established to review the requirements.
3. He said that a primary concern regarding smaller semi-public type treatment systems is not so much the initial installation, but follow-on operation and maintenance procedures, i.e. who will be around to insure proper compliance in the future?
4. Requests for variances can be applied for at any time and they will provide review on a case-by-case basis. However, with respect to the MYCA proposal, application would not be appropriate in advance of the FINAL EA.
5. I explained the basics of the problem with the 106 acre site and the fact that no areas were suitable for treatment and on-site disposal based on the current 1,000 foot set-back from existing residences and 400 foot set-back from wells and lake impoundments. I thought it was interesting that he asked me what effect a 400 foot separation distance from residences would have on our analysis. I replied that this reduced criteria would produce opportunities within the site to provide the required treatment.
6. I asked him to clarify the 400 foot setback from a lake impoundment. He said to apply the distance from the project "normal" pool elevation.
7. He asked about the specific type of treatment system proposed by MYCA and I briefed him on the FAST system and components proposed by their consultants. I will send him these materials if you feel that it is appropriate.
8. He understands that he owes us a response to our letter of 11 August 2000 and indicated that a reply was "in the process" of being prepared. No time frame on this was offered.