

Home Heating Oil Tank Best Practices

Residential home heating oil tanks contain hundreds of gallons of fuel. These tanks should be inspected annually using a visual review and ultrasonic testing. It is extremely important for you, your investment in your home, and the environment to replace your oil tank when the inspection indicates its lifespan has expired. Addressing and upgrading recommended best practices are also extremely important.

A Tank Replacement Recommended



Patched/Repaired

Most common patching or repairing involves fiber glass or a magnetic temporary patch. In either case the steel has lost its true integrity due to internal corrosion. If you have a patched tank it is recommended you replace the tank as soon as possible to avoid costly clean-up and remediation.



Fails Ultrasonic Test

Oil tanks typically corrode from the inside out. Your tank may look fine from the outside but could be wearing dangerously thin. The ultrasonic test will show the true thickness of the tank.



Weeping

Weeping tanks are corroded internally and can be identified by a "saturation" of the metal by oil. Replacement is recommended as soon as possible to avoid costly clean-up and remediation.

An Equipment Upgrade Recommended

Unsheathed Feedline in Concrete



If the oil feed line running from your tank to your boiler or furnace is encased in your concrete basement floor and is not coated in a material like plastic to protect it from degrading an upgrade is recommended. Most homeowner's are unaware that bare copper will degrade when in direct contact with concrete. This [chemistry] can create a situation whereby your feed line may degrade to a point where it is leaking and you may not realize it due to the encasement. We would suggest that the line be replaced with a modern coated line and relocated above the floor. This is a relatively easy fix and could help avert an issue should the line be degrading now or leak in the future.

Undersized Vent



It is extremely important that your oil tanks' venting systems is maintained correctly; as advancements in technology have increased the rate at which oil flows from oil delivery trucks to your tank (60 Gallons per Minute). If your tanks' venting system is undersized you could have an accidental oil release from over-pressurization of your tank. This is something that all of us would like to avoid. If you have an undersized vent we would suggest that you consider making this very important upgrade.

Vent Alarm Needed



It is extremely important that your oil tanks' venting system has a vent alarm installed. A vent alarm is a small device installed between the tank and the vent pipe which signals the driver that your tank is full. A vent alarm is important because it can help prevent accidental over pumping of oil into your tank. If your tank system does not have a vent alarm a new installation is a relatively inexpensive fix in most cases costing less than \$100.

Kyle Koerber TO: Marjorie, Nancy, Chip, Carol, Jane, James, Chris, Vika, Caitlin, Gloria, Danny

November 12, 2018

Attached is some information we could distribute about oil tank inspections. Also found the item below about septic options worth reviewing.

Can we do a POS ordinance? Seems like some benefits based on the ability to finance...

From the viewpoint of the Subcommittee there are five potential options for the L/HR Committee to consider:

1) Maintain the status quo and wait for the Legislature to implement a statewide ordinance. Unfortunately, over the past eight years the State's Legislature has not been able to resolve various differences and concerns related to septic regulations. This has led to various counties and district health departments creating a variety of ordinances. It is the Subcommittee's belief that the State may not be willing to implement uniform regulation in the foreseeable future, however, one state legislator has indicated her intent to pursue legislation regarding this matter in the near term.

2) Move forward with a public education campaign. This could involve the KCHD partnering with local watershed management councils, environmental groups (i.e. Clean Water and West Michigan Environmental Action Council [WMEAC]), and septic haulers. The purpose would be two-fold. First, it would include the creation of a public health campaign (such as Stick it to the Flu) that raises awareness and leads homeowners to a website that shares best practices. Second, it would provide hands-on seminars to teach new homeowners and those that are accustomed to sewer systems about proper maintenance and how to identify potential system deterioration. With County General funds being limited, the funding of this option would need to be reviewed carefully.

3) Implement a 'Point of Sale' (POS) ordinance as various counties (Ottawa, Washtenaw) and Health Districts (Barry/Eaton) have throughout the State. A typical POS ordinance requires that a septic inspection be conducted upon sale or transfer of property and if any repairs are required they be completed before the property is conveyed. The traditional benefits to a POS ordinance are as follows:

- ⌚ It is a recognizable point in time for an inspection because of the sale or transfer.
- ⌚ Because a significant financial transaction typically occurs during sale/transfer there are methods to finance the repair or replacement of a septic system into the financial transaction.

The typical opposition to a POS ordinance is that it can terminate a potential sale or transfer if a system is found to be failing or needs replacement.

4) Develop a preventative/maintenance ordinance. A preventative/maintenance ordinance is usually designed to require an inspection every so many years. Typically the range of time required between inspections is three to seven years. Based on a 23 year average life span of a septic system (Kent County average based on administrative data) this would result in between three and seven inspections per septic life-cycle. The benefits of a preventative/-maintenance ordinance are fairly straightforward in that it requires regular inspections to detect necessary repairs or failures. The drawbacks of such an ordinance are the potential impact to a homeowner if a system is found in non-compliance and they do not have the financial resources to make the needed repairs. There is also concern about unnecessary invasion of property for those who are properly maintaining their septic systems. Also disturbing the system may lead to a shorter lifespan.

5) Work with the Grand Rapids Association of REALTORS® (GRAR) on a voluntary basis to accomplish the following:

1) Better document the number of homes sold annually with septic systems that have an inspection conducted; and

2) amend the current GRAR buy/sell agreement identifies a septic inspection as a condition of sale, but it can be waived. Moreover, there is not a requirement for what the inspection includes or the qualifications of those conducting it.

Places in Maine that control pesticide use

About 6 percent of the state's nearly 500 municipalities have enacted local ordinances.

Since 1970, 30 towns and cities in Maine – roughly 6 percent of the state's 488 municipalities – have enacted local ordinances to control pesticide use. The ordinances vary in scope and intent from town to town and in some cases refer to pesticides, herbicides or both.

- Allagash: Population 239. Aroostook County. In 2004 Maine's largest town (sizewise, it's spread out over 135 square miles) enacted an ordinance banning the use of herbicides for forestry purposes. It was motivated by concerns over herbicides sprayed by the J.D. Irving company on its forest holdings in the area.
- Amherst: Population 265. Hancock County. The town, which is bisected by the Union River, passed a land use ordinance in 1991 establishing resource protection districts and limiting chemical applications in shoreland areas only; applications in those areas require a permit from the planning board.
- Arrowsic: Population 501. Sagadahoc County. In 1984, the town voted to ban herbicide use by its public works department, but only as it was applied to leaves. Using herbicide on stumps is still allowed.
- Brighton Plantation: Population 70. Somerset County. The town voted to ban use of pesticides in woodlands within the town in 1996. The vote in this tiny town was 19-1 in favor of the ban.
- Brunswick: Population 20,278. Cumberland County. In 2005 Brunswick's Town Council enacted an ordinance to prohibit use or storage of most pesticides within aquifer protection zones. The ordinance also prohibits aerial spraying other than for public health applications. Citing language from the Environmental Protection Agency that "all pesticides are toxic to some degree," the council agreed that the purpose of the ordinance was to "safeguard the health and welfare" of residents and protect the town's "good water and other natural resources."
- Castine: Population 1,366. Hancock County. The town passed an ordinance in 2008 that included prohibition of pesticide storage within aquifer protection zones and requires permits for any non-residential use of pesticides.
- Coplin Plantation: Population 135. Franklin County. The town voted in 2001 to ban all aerial and mechanical spraying of pesticides. Twenty-six voters were present at the meeting; all voted in favor of the ban.
- Cranberry Isles: Population 141. Hancock County. In 1992 the island communities voted on a land use ordinance "to further the maintenance of safe and healthful conditions" and the protection

of natural resources that included requiring permits for pesticide and herbicide use in forestry management with the exception of timber harvesting.

- Harpswell: Population 4,740. Cumberland County. This coastal community (216 miles of shoreline) established strict rules on the use of pesticides in 2004 and updated them in 2016. The motivation was to protect and maintain the health of “shellfish resources, marine environment, and pollinators.” The ordinance prohibits the use of “insect growth regulators,” or IGRs, which act on insect hormones to limit the insects’ life cycle, as well as insecticides that contain neonicotinoid. It explicitly exempts commercial agriculture, nurseries and golf courses.
- Lebanon: Population 6,031. York County. Lebanon voted to ban all aerial pesticide application at a town meeting in 1980. In 1983, Lebanon revisited the ban to limit it to non-agricultural use and to allow exemptions if approved at a town meeting.
- Limerick: Population 2,832. York County. At a town meeting in 1988, the town adopted an ordinance prohibiting herbicide application to rights-of-way. Town clerk Judy LePage said the issue was raised by a local mother who believed roadside spraying may have contributed to her daughter developing leukemia. The vote was 252-206 in favor of the ordinance.
- Limestone: Population 2,314. Aroostook County. This town banned aerial spraying of insecticides, pesticides and herbicides in 1970 “due to health hazard from air and water pollution.” Fungicides were allowed.
- Manchester: Population 2,580. Kennebec County. Manchester voted in June 2017 to prohibit the use of pesticides on all town-owned lands. The ordinance cites the intent to “safeguard the health and welfare of residents” and protect and conserve natural resources. It includes specific exemptions such as outdoor animal repellents, indoor use of rodent control and organic pesticides.
- Montville: Population 1,032. Waldo County. Montville passed an anti-spraying ordinance at its annual town meeting in 1980 without specifying pesticides, “based on the increasing evidence that the types of sprays most commonly used for bush control can cause cancer and birth defects in humans.”
- Newburgh: Population 1,551. Penobscot County. The town voted at its annual meeting in 1980 to prohibit use of herbicides along the roadside right of way.
- New Gloucester: Population 5,542. Cumberland County. In 1982 the town passed an ordinance that said the spraying or spreading of chemical fertilizers or pesticides had to be consistent with the standards of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- New Sweden: Population 602. Aroostook County. The town voted in 1990 to ban aerial spraying of herbicides and pesticides within town limits.
- Oquonquit: Population 892. York County. The ordinance first passed in June 2014 but had to be voted on again at a special town meeting in November 2014 because the town failed to give proper notice to the state Board of Pesticide Control. It restricts the use or applications of synthetic pesticides on private

property – the first Maine ordinance to do so – but allows for some uses, including on invasive species and on venomous or disease-carrying insects. It specifically exempts agriculture.

- Owls Head: Population 1,580. Knox County. At its March 1970 annual meeting, Owls Head voted “to outlaw the use of defoliants and stop all roadside spraying with poisons” in the town. The vote was the first of its kind in Maine (Limestone voted later in the same month on its pesticide ordinance).
- Porter: Population 1,498. Oxford County. The newest pesticide ordinance in Maine was enacted in March in response to a utility crew spraying roadsides without permission.
- Portland: Population 66,937. Cumberland County. Portland passed one of the strongest pesticide ordinances in the country in January 2018. Regulations restricting synthetic pesticides apply to city property as well as to private homeowners. It includes exemptions for Hadlock Field and Riverside Golf Course. Five city-owned playing fields will be exempt until 2021.
- Rangeley: Population 1,168. Franklin County. Rangeley’s pesticide ordinance limits mechanical application of pesticides on areas larger than two acres. It was submitted to the Board of Pesticide Control in 1989, but may predate that.
- Rockland: Population 7,179. Knox County. Rockland’s pesticide ordinance took effect in 2014. It restricts the application of pesticides and herbicides on town owned, leased or managed land, but organic pesticides are allowed.
- South Portland: Population 25,577. Cumberland County. South Portland developed its pesticide ordinance over the course of more than a year. When it passed in September 2016 it marked the first time a city of this size in Maine had enacted such an ordinance. It is one of the toughest ordinances, placing limits on private as well as municipal property. It allows the use of only pesticides allowed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and classified as “minimum risk” by the Environmental Protection Agency. Exemptions include commercial agriculture and golf courses.
- Southport: Population 606. Lincoln County. Southport was one of the first towns to restrict pesticides in Maine, voting in 1972 to “prohibit all state and commercial of pesticides and herbicides in the town of Southport.”
- Standish: Population 9,285. Cumberland County. Adopted in 2002, Standish’s ordinance limits the storage of pesticides and herbicides in shoreland areas “other than amounts normally associated with individual households or farms.”
- Sweden: Population 391. Oxford County. Sweden’s pesticide policy was last amended in 1991 and lays down restrictions on pesticides within the aquifer protection zone. Aerial spraying of herbicides and pesticides is entirely restricted within the zone, but agricultural and home use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicide use beyond that “use reasonably associated with home lawn and garden care” require a conditional-use permit.
- Waterboro: Population 7,693. York County. Waterboro calls its 1986 regulation a hazardous waste ordinance, and it covers much more than pesticides; in fact the word pesticide isn’t even used in the

ordinance (“toxics” is, though). It’s really about storing toxics and intended to make sure anyone storing hazardous waste gets a town permit. It exempts agricultural and household waste, as well as gasoline stations.

- Wayne: Population 1,189. Kennebec County. Wayne restricts only the storage of pesticides and fertilizers (not the use) and only in shoreland zones. This ordinance includes an exemption for amounts “normally associated with individual households or farms.”
- Wells: Population 9,589. York County. In 1990 Wells voted to restrict pesticide use within a protected resource area around Branch Brook and the Branch Brook aquifer. Permission for pesticide use in those areas may be granted by a codes enforcement officer with at least 60 days’ notice.

— MARY POLS

#1 Protection of groundwater aquifer

- Carol: may require people to give town data about wells.
- Marjorie gave an example from Vinalhaven
- Clean up junk yards
- Test pond at Bennett's
- Look at Comp Plan for suggestions
- 250' setback from shore for well
- Drug take-back
- Septic pumping education – maintenance of septic is important
- Control pesticide application
- Talk to outside experts
- Should we have public workshop to talk about all this?
- Require low-flow fixtures
- Do we encourage or regulate?

#2 Preservation of Great Chebeague as a viable and diverse year-round community

- Smaller lot sizes, affordable housing, cluster housing
- Parking for 700+ per year
- Public outreach – economic development not Planning Board purview
- Is AirBnB a problem?
- Circuit Breaker program – comp plan
- Transportation

#9 Maintenance and improvement of the historic character of all islands in the Town ...

- Recommend property for preservation
- Work with Land Trust?
- Looking at open spaces that are at risk
- Use cluster housing to preserve property
- Access to shore
 - Look at map
 - Springettes - is there a right-of-way?
 - Invite Land Trust to a meeting?
- Do we encourage tourism or not?
- What is the balance? How do we encourage stewards of the community?