

Technical Review Panel
Environmental Public Health Division
Indiana Department of Health
Meeting Minutes of March 27, 2026
10:00am – 11:45pm, Yoho Conference Room, IDOH and via Teams

Panel Members Present:

In Person:

Kelly MacKinnon, IDOH, OLA
John Linn, IBA
Jason Ravenscroft, academia
Mark McClain, IRSS
L.A. Brown, IOWPA
Brian Neilson, ACEC

Via Teams:

Amanda Lahners, LaPorte County HD

Others Present:

In Person: Mike Mettler, Julia Hayes, Claire Dyer, Ethan Wright, Alice Quinn, IDOH

Via Teams: Chad Schofield, Norweco

Michael Gay
919-668-4471
Lisa Welch, IDOH

Mackinnon called the meeting to order at 10:00am and announced that the meeting was being livestreamed and recorded. The recording will be available for at least 90 days. By participating in the meeting, the attendees are consenting to being recorded.

Introduction of panel members

L.A. Brown – representing IOWPA, long time installer, new panelist replacing Claude Goguen

Mark McClain – representing IRSS, consulting soil scientist

Brian Neilson, P.E. – representing ACEC

John Linn, P.E. – representing Indiana Builders Association, new panelist replacing Dick Blazer

Jason Ravenscroft – representing IU Fairbanks School of Public Health and also works at Marion County Health Department

Amanda Lahners – representing LaPorte County Health Department

Kelly MacKinnon – representing IDOH, IDOH Chief Legal Counsel. This will be MacKinnon's last meeting. She introduced Claire Dyer, IDOH attorney, who will replace MacKinnon on the TRP.

Minutes

The minutes of the February 27, 2026 meeting were reviewed. Ravenscroft made a motion to approve the minutes. Brown seconded.

Ayes: Ravenscroft, McClain, Brown, Lahners

Nays:

Abstaining: Neilson (not at that meeting), Linn

Motion passed.

Residential Rule Promulgation Update

Brown asked for an update on the residential rule. MacKinnon stated that we are waiting on the public hearing which is scheduled for April 15, 2026. After which IDOH will compile an agency response and bring that information back to the TRP. She indicated that there have been comments, so a second public hearing would be required. The timing of the second public hearing will be dependent upon how quickly the response can be prepared and the TRP convened.

Brown stated that IOWPA had recently held a Town Hall meeting to discuss the residential rule. Two more Town Hall Meetings are planned prior to the public hearing.

Commercial Rule Revision Discussion

Mettler provided a copy of the proposed commercial rule revision to the panelists. Yellow highlighting indicates variations from the residential rule, and the green highlighting are those things that vary from the previous version of the proposed commercial rule that the panelists had been provided, most of which were also variations from the residential rule. Statutorily, the revised commercial rule must be effective by January 1, 2027. McClain asked what would happen if that deadline was not met. MacKinnon stated that there would be no real impact; the panel is working as fast as possible to get the revised commercial rule to the point of promulgation.

The panelists went through the proposed revisions to Rule 410 IAC 6-10.1 section by section and discussed the sections that are proposed for revision. The following is a summary of those sections and comments.

Section 5.1 – no comment.

Section 5.2 – Brown asked if the definition of best judgment in any way affected off lot discharge systems. Mettler said that permitted discharge systems are under IDEM regulation so best judgment did not affect the permitted discharge systems.

Section 5.3 – no comment.

Section 8 – no comment.

Section 8.1 – Quinn suggested a change to this section so that “in an attempt” was changed to “to.” There was consensus among panelists for this change.

Section 9 – Linn stated that “not” needed to be inserted in both (A) and (B) after “is.” Consensus for change.

Section 9.1 – no comment.

Section 9.2 - no comment.

Section 9.3 - no comment.

Section 9.4 - no comment.

Section 9.5 - no comment.

Section 13.1 – McClain indicated that he was opposed to an architect being included here and in 51(a)(2). Neilson was not opposed. Consensus to remove the proposed last sentence that has been stricken.

Section 15 - no comment.

Section 15.1 - no comment.

Section 17.1 - no comment.

Section 17.2 - no comment.

Section 17.3 - no comment.

Section 18 - Hayes indicated that recent legislation included grease interceptor, and she felt it was needed here. Consensus to leave as proposed.

Section 19 – Ravenscroft asked if using “health department” here would incorporate the Health and Hospital Corporation (HHC) of Marion County. MacKinnon said she would look into that.

Section 20 – McClain asked where limits for the definition of high strength waste came from. Quinn stated that originally, the National Sanitation Foundation (NSF) provided that definition, but it was no longer defined by NSF. Mettler stated that he had brought in the 2002 EPA Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Manual when this was being discussed for the residential rule where this information was also included.

Section 20.1 - no comment.

Section 21.1 - no comment.

Section 21.2 - no comment.

Section 22 - no comment.

Section 22.1 - no comment.

Section 22.2 - no comment.

Section 27 - no comment.

Section 29 - no comment.

Section 32 - no comment.

Section 32.1 - no comment.

Section 32.2 – Brown asked how long an installer would be responsible for the site where an on-site sewage system was installed. Quinn stated that the rule was also applicable to property

owners. After the system was installed, and the installer was no longer acting as the agent of the owner, the property owner would assume that responsibility. Consensus to leave as it is proposed.

Section 36 - no comment.

Section 38.1 – Ravenscroft asked if “septage management vehicle” needed to include “licensed.” After reviewing the applicable statute, it was determined that this should refer to a “licensed septage management vehicle.” There is also a typo in this section where “is” needs to be “in.” Consensus for change.

Section 40 - no comment.

Section 40.1 - no comment.

Section 41 - no comment.

Section 42 - no comment.

Section 42.1 - no comment.

Section 43 - no comment.

Section 46 - no comment.

Section 47 - no comment.

Section 47.1 - no comment.

Section 47.2 – This section varies slightly from the residential rule as there are additional piping specifications that can be used in commercial on-site sewage systems. Consensus on this change.

Section 47.3 - no comment.

Section 47.4 – There was a slight change in this section from the residential rule. A couple of words have been left out and are recommended for inclusion. Consensus for this change.

Section 48 - no comment.

Section 49 - no comment.

Section 49.1 - no comment.

Section 50 - no comment.

Section 51 –

(a)(2) McClain is opposed to including architects in this subsection. Linn suggested removing land surveyors from this section. Both of these are included in statutes as stated in this rule, so they must remain.

(a)(2)(E)(v) “Sub” was inadvertently left off of subsurface drainage. Consensus to add it back in.

(a)(2) There are two (G)s in this subsection. The second one needs to be changed to an (H).

(a)(6)(A) Linn asked what a “business plan” included. Hayes explained that it was just general information about the number of employees, shifts, type of service, etc. Linn suggested that this be changed to “project narrative” and to provide a definition for project narrative.

Consensus for this change.

(b) Neilson stated that the reference for (a)(12) needed to be changed to (a)(9). Consensus to change.

Section 53 - no comment.

Section 54 - no comment.

Section 54.1 - no comment.

Section 56 – MacKinnon indicated that “local” needed to be removed in this section. Consensus to remove.

Section 61 – Hayes indicated that the addition of footnote 9 is a deregulation. No change.

Section 62 - no comment.

Section 63 –

(c) Brown questioned why commercial on-site sewage systems were required to have a full perimeter drain regardless of the slope. He indicated that whenever possible, approximately 99% of the time, he installs full perimeter drains, as opposed to just interceptor drains, on all systems regardless of site slope. He feels it is unfair to require them on all commercial systems as it is a big expense. Hayes indicated that she was very much opposed to this change to the commercial rule. She believes that requiring a full perimeter drain on all commercial systems makes them function a lot longer without issues and that if there is an unknown increase in flow to the system, the full perimeter drain can help compensate for some of the hydraulic overload to the system. She also stated that there are some very large commercial systems, and not having drainage on the downslope side of these large systems could be problematic. Quinn suggested that if an interceptor drain was used, it was common in residential systems to require segment drains when the system and drainage exceeded 65' in width. Consensus was to change the commercial rule as proposed, allowing for interceptor drains on sites with slopes in excess of 2%.

(f)(3) Hayes requested that “interceptor drains” be added to this subsection to require segment drains if the width exceeded 65'. Consensus to add interceptor drains to this subsection.

Section 64 – (c) McClain stated that additional guidance was needed for the number of profile descriptions required and where they needed to be placed. Hayes states that she requires the upslope, downslope, proximal, and distal ends of the system to be evaluated. Neilson suggested a guidance document for this subject. Consensus to no changes to what is currently proposed.

Section 65 – Hayes stated that the proposed change to Table IV was correction of a typo, and this is what the verbiage calculates to. Hayes pointed out that the change to subsection (e) was a deregulation.

Section 67 - no comment.

Section 68 - no comment.

Section 69 - no comment.

Section 70 - no comment.

Section 70.1 – Quinn stated that this should be section 70.1. 62.1 was a typo. Consensus for this change.

Section 71 - no comment.

Section 72 - no comment.

Section 73 – Subsection (c)(4). Neilson stated that a heavy pump needed guide rails and a deep pump needed guide rails. Consensus for this requirement.

Section 74 – Linn stated that Dick Blazer, formerly representing IBA on the panel, is strongly opposed to requiring risers to grade on distribution boxes. He thinks they will cause problems and suggests that the lid to the distribution box be brought to within 6" of grade. Brown stated that sand lined systems really do not need a riser to grade on a distribution box. Consensus to leave as it for now.

Section 75 - no comment.

Section 76 - no comment.

Section 77 - no comment.

Section 78 - no comment.

Section 79 - no comment.

Section 80 - no comment.

Section 81 - no comment.

Section 82 - no comment.

Section 87 - no comment.

Section 88 - no comment.

Section 98 – Brown stated that subsection (b)(4) read like it required all tanks to be removed and taken to a landfill for abandonment. Quinn stated that these are the same three options that have been previously in the rule, but options (A) and (B) were previously combined into one subsection. It was agreed that removal of the tank and disposal at a landfill would be moved to option (C) rather than (A). MacKinnon stated that an "or" cannot be included between (A) and (B) but was needed between (B) and (C). Consensus for change.

Section 99 - no comment.

MacKinnon and Mettler stated that the next meeting date will be April 24, 2026.

MacKinnon adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Alice Quinn