

Part 1A: Mecklenburg County Health Department, Groundwater and Wastewater Services Program: Standardize Certain Regulatory Review Procedures

Reference Session Law 2014-120, Section 29. (b).

Background: Mecklenburg County Health Department receives Regulatory Submittals for review under multiple scenarios as provided for in statute and rule. The processes for each type of review in the Groundwater and Wastewater Services Program are described below.

I. Systems with design daily flows <3,000 total gallons per day [15A NCAC 18A 1938]

A. Application submittal

1. MCHD (Mecklenburg County Health Department) receives an application for an onsite wastewater system that requires a Registered Professional Engineer design the system in accordance with Rule .1938 (d) or per policy BP-1007-1 “Onsite Wastewater System Design” from the NCBEES (North Carolina Board of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors) or a Design Consultant by MCHD Policy.
2. MCHD Notifies the applicant that a Registered Professional Engineer or a Design consultant is required to continue processing the application.
3. MCHD reviewers: Agents authorized by OSWP including a Licensed Soil Scientist (LSS) and/or a REHS (Registered Environmental Health Specialist) are assigned to the review. [15 A NCAC 18A .1938(a)]
4. MCHD receives an application for a system that requires a state review in accordance with Rule 1938(f). Process outlined in section III.

B. Optional Initial Meeting: The owner or their consulting PE (Professional Engineer) may request a meeting with the MCHD staff to review the preliminary project information based on submittal rules, procedures and requirements.

C. Daily Design Flow Review Process

1. The MCHD staff authorized by the state (hereafter “REHS”) receive a project submittal for the proposed daily design flow.
2. The REHS reviews the proposed daily design flow.
3. The REHS either approves the design daily flow or contacts the system designer and requests that the items be addressed or that additional information provided.
4. When the proposed daily design flow is approved, then a soil and site evaluation review will be conducted as described in Section D below.
5. If the proposed daily design is not approved and the REHS and the system designer cannot reach consensus, MCHD will request a State review [15A NCAC 18A 1938 (f)]. Process outlined in III(A).

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

D. Soil and Site Evaluation Review

1. The REHS conducts a soil and site evaluations independently of the applicant's private LSS (licensed soil scientist) consultant.
2. Site Visit:
 - a. The REHS visits the site with the LSS and/or PE, reviews the submitted soil and site data from the LSS and the independent review for concurrence and checks any areas where there was not concurrence.
 - b. The REHS and LSS, discuss the proposed LTAR (long-term acceptance rate), configuration and installation depths of drainfield(s), treatment standard and any other design requirements dictated by the soil and site conditions.
 - c. Upon concurrence, the private LSS, and REHS determine the number, depth and location of any hydraulic assessments and whether any additional information must be provided with those analyses.
3. The REHS evaluates results of hydraulic assessments and site loading capacity relative to the proposed LTAR.
4. The REHS provides all concerned parties with written documentation of the LTAR and maximum trench depth.

E. System Engineering Plans Specification and Field Review

1. REHS receives the system engineering plans and specifications.
2. The REHS will review the system engineering plans and specifications to ensure compliance with 15A NCAC 18A .1900
 - a. An approval of the system engineering plans per 15A NCAC 18A .1900
 - (a) Office review of plans are stamped signed, dated approved by REHS
 - b. A request for revisions to comply with 15A NCAC 18A .1900
3. The REHS will complete a field review of the system layout to ensure compliance with 15A NCAC 18A .1900
 - a. An approval of the field review of the system layout per 15A NCAC 18A .1900
 - (a) Field review of plans are stamped signed, dated approved by REHS
 - b. A request for revisions to comply with 15A NCAC 18A .1900
4. When the office and field review have been signed and dated approved the REHS will issue the IP (Improvement Permit)
5. If the proposed system engineering plans and specifications are not approved and the required revision and/or additional information identified by the REHS is submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
6. If the system engineering plans and specifications are not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provide the required additional information identified by the REHS, then MCHD will request a state review in a accordance with Rule 1938 (f). Process outlined in section III.

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

F. Preconstruction Meeting: The MCHD requires a preconstruction meeting.

G. System Start-Up Inspection

1. The PE and the MCHD determine that system construction is complete.
2. The PE, MCHD, and system installer conduct a system start-up inspection to document baseline performance parameters.
 - a. All parties document any deficiencies in the installation and develop plans to correct them.
3. The MCHD issues the OP (Operation Permit) upon:
 - a. Receipt of certifications by all licensed professionals, including record (“as-built”) drawings if significant changes to the system design occurred during installation [15A NCAC 18A .1938(h)];
 - b. Receipt of updated Operation and Maintenance procedures and manual prepared by the PE, incorporating O&M requirements specific to the equipment provided by system component manufacturers [15A NCAC 18A .1939(i)(4)];
 - c. Confirmed execution and recordation of all required legal documents [15A NCAC 18A .1937(h), 15A NCAC 18A .1938(j)];
 - d. Receipt of a copy of a contract with an operator [15A NCAC 18A .1961(e)] certified by the Water Pollution Control System Operators Certification Commission to operate and maintain this system (G.S. 90A-46) and;
 - e. Confirmation that any requirements listed in the IP and CA are complete, inspected or reviewed, and approved by the MCHD and/or the OSWP.
 - f. A statement signed by the PE stating that construction is complete and in accordance with approved plans and specifications and approved modifications. 15A NCAC 18A .1938 (h)

II. Systems with design daily flows $\geq 3,000$ total gallons per day [15A NCAC 18A .1938(e)] or for treatment of industrial process wastewater) [15A NCAC 18A .1938(f)]: *State review required.*

A. Application submittal

1. MCHD (Mecklenburg County Health Department) receives an application for a system that requires state review in accordance with Rule .1938(e) or (f) as applicable.
2. MCHD notifies the OSWP of receipt of the application, fills out a Request for Review and conveys it to the OSWP with the project submittal.
3. OSWP reviewers: An engineer and RSS (regional soil scientist) are assigned to the review.

B. Optional Initial Meeting: The owner or their consulting PE (Professional Engineer) may request a meeting with the MCHD and/or OSWP staff to review the preliminary project information based on submittal rules, procedures and requirements.

C. Daily Design Flow Review Process

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

1. The OSWP staff engineers (hereafter “staff engineer/s”) receive a project submittal for the proposed daily design flow.
2. The assigned staff engineer enters the project submittal information into the database and assigns a project number.
3. The staff engineer notifies MCHD of receipt of the submittal.
4. The staff engineer contacts MCHD to discuss the proposed daily design flow.
5. The staff engineer issues one of the following types of letters to MCHD, the PE and other applicable parties:
 - a. An approval of the proposed design daily flow;
 - b. A request for revisions to the proposed daily design flow that includes
 - (a) A section detailing any required revisions with citation of the applicable statute or rule;
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested or recommended revisions based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice);
 - c. A request for additional information that includes:
 - (a) A section detailing any required additional information with citations to rules or statutes; and
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested or recommended additional information based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals or standards of practice).
6. If the proposed daily design flow is approved, then a soil and site evaluation review will be conducted as described in Section D below.
7. If the proposed daily design is not approved and the required revision and/or additional information identified by the staff engineer is submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
8. If the proposed daily design is not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provides the required additional information identified by the staff engineer, the Submitting Party may request an Informal Internal Review as described in Part 2 of this report.

D. Soil and Site Evaluation Review

1. The OSWP RSS (Regional Soil Scientist) receives copies of reports of soil and site evaluations independently performed by both the applicant’s private LSS (licensed soil scientist) consultant and the MCHD.
2. Site Visit:
 - a. The RSS visits the site with the LSS and MCHD, reviews the submitted soil and site data from the LSS and MCHD for concurrence and checks any areas where there was not concurrence.
 - b. The LSS, RSS and MCHD discuss the proposed long-term acceptance rate (LTAR), configuration and installation depths of drainfield(s), treatment standard and any other design requirements dictated by the soil and site conditions.
 - c. Upon concurrence, the private LSS, RSS and MCHD determine the

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

number, depth and location of any hydraulic assessments and whether any additional information must be provided with those analyses.

3. The RSS evaluates results of hydraulic assessments and site loading capacity relative to the proposed LTAR.
4. The RSS provides all concerned parties with written documentation of the LTAR, drainfield configuration and installation depth, treatment standard, site modifications and any other design requirements.

E. Preliminary Site Plan Review

1. The applicant's PE prepares and submits a preliminary site plan showing system location, configuration and layout based upon the LSS report.
2. The staff engineer reviews the site plan and layout in consultation with the RSS and updates the project review status in the database.
3. Staff engineer issues one of the following types of letters to the MCHD, the PE and other applicable parties:
 - a. Approval of the site plan;
 - b. A request for revisions that include:
 - (a) A section detailing any required revisions with citation of applicable statute(s) or rule(s).
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested or recommended revisions based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice);
 - c. A request for additional information that includes:
 - (a) A section detailing any required additional information with citations to statute(s) or rule(s); and
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested additional information based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals or standards of practice).
4. If the preliminary site plan is approved, then system engineering plans and specifications review will be conducted. MCHD can now issue the IP (Improvement Permit) upon confirmation of:
 - a. OSWP (staff engineer and RSS) approval of soil and site evaluation, site plan and layout, and site loading capacity analysis;
 - b. MCHD approval of the field layout of the initial and repair drainfields and;
 - c. Identification and specification of any permit conditions.
5. If the preliminary site plan is not approved and the required revision and/or additional information identified by the staff engineer is submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
6. If the preliminary site plan is not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provide the required additional information identified by the staff engineer, then the Submitting Party may request an Informal Internal Review.

F. System Engineering Plans and Specifications Review

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

1. Staff engineer receives the system engineering plans and specifications.
2. The OSWP engineer reviews system engineering plans and specifications and updates the project status in the database.
3. The staff engineer will issue one of the following types of letters to the MCHD, the PE, LSS and other applicable parties:
 - a. An approval of the system engineering plans and specifications (See Section G);
 - b. A request for revisions that include:
 - (a) A section detailing any required revisions with citation of applicable statute or rule(s);
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested or recommended revisions based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals or standards of practice).
 - c. A request for additional information that includes:
 - (a) A section detailing any required additional information with citations of applicable statute or rule(s) and;
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested additional information based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice).
4. If the proposed system engineering plans and specifications are not approved and the required revision and/or additional information identified by the staff engineer is submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
5. If the system engineering plans and specifications are not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provide the required additional information identified by the staff engineer, then the staff engineer will issue a denial letter of the project submittal to the MCHD, the PE, the LSS and other applicable parties.
6. The Submitting party may request an Informal Internal Review.

G. State Review Approval

1. The OSWP engineer sends a final approval letter to the MCHD, the PE and other applicable parties.
2. Upon approval, the OSWP engineer will send copies of the plans and specifications stamped approved to the MCHD and the project PE.
3. The staff engineer enters the final project information in the database.
4. MCHD can now issue the Authorization to Construct (AC) upon:
 - a. Receipt of an approval letter and copies of approved plans and specifications;
 - b. Confirmation that any site modifications required in the IP are complete, inspected or reviewed, and approved by MCHD and/or the OSWP [G.S. 130A-336(b)];
 - c. Field verification that the drainfield and repair areas have not been otherwise altered since IP issuance (unless IP/CA are concurrently issued) and re-confirmation that the drainfield layout is acceptable per approved plans;
 - d. Review and approval of legal documentation as necessary, e.g.:

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

- (a) Draft tri-party agreements [15A NCAC 18A .1937(h)];
- (b) Final (recorded) easement agreement(s) and encroachment agreement(s) [15A NCAC 18A .1938(j)] and;
- e. Final (recorded) encroachment agreement(s).

H. Optional Preconstruction Meeting: The OSWP strongly recommends a preconstruction meeting and will attend upon request by any party.

I. System Start-Up Inspection

1. The PE and the MCHD determine that system construction is complete.
2. The PE, MCHD, operator and (if requested) the OSWP staff engineer and RSS conduct a system start-up inspection to document baseline performance parameters.
 - a. All parties document any deficiencies in the installation and develop plans to correct them.
 - b. The parties either agree to meet on the site again to document correction of deficiencies or allow the PE to independently oversee correction and provide documentation to that effect.
3. The MCHD issues the Operation Permit (OP) upon:
 - a. Receipt of certifications by all licensed professionals, including record (“as-built”) drawings if significant changes to the system design occurred during installation [15A NCAC 18A .1938(h)];
 - b. Receipt of updated Operation and Maintenance procedures and manual prepared by the PE, incorporating O&M requirements specific to the equipment provided by system component manufacturers [15A NCAC 18A .1939(i)(4)];
 - c. Confirmed execution and recordation of all required legal documents [15A NCAC 18A .1937(h), 15A NCAC 18A .1938(j)];
 - d. Receipt of a copy of a contract with an operator [15A NCAC 18A .1961(e)] certified by the Water Pollution Control System Operators Certification Commission to operate and maintain this system (G.S. 90A-46) and;
 - e. Confirmation that any requirements listed in the IP and CA (or referenced in the OSWP approval letter) are complete, inspected or reviewed, and approved by the MCHD and/or the OSWP

III. OSWP Regulatory Review Procedures when state review is requested by the MCHD pursuant to 15A NCAC 18A .1938(f). The review protocol for these types of Regulatory Submittals includes one or more of the activities described above in Section I. The specific type of Regulatory Submittal and associated processes are shown below:

- A. Design daily flow review pursuant to Rule .1949; (*The MCHD only requests review of the proposed flow for a facility.*)
1. OSWP staff engineers (staff engineer/s) receives a project submittal for the proposed daily design flow and a Request for Review form.
 2. The assigned staff engineer enters the project submittal information into the

- database, assigns a project number.
 - 3. The staff engineer notifies MCHD of receipt of the submittal.
 - 4. The staff engineer contacts MCHD to discuss the proposed daily design flow.
 - 5. The staff Engineer issues one of the following types of letters to MCHD, the PE and other applicable parties:
 - a. An approval of the proposed design daily flow;
 - b. A request for revisions to the proposed daily design flow that includes:
 - (a) A section detailing any required revisions with citation of the applicable statute or rule;
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested or recommended revisions based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice);
 - c. A request for additional information that includes:
 - (a) A section detailing any required additional information with citations to rules or statutes and;
 - (b) A section detailing any suggested or recommended additional information based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice).
 - 6. If the proposed daily design is not approved and the required revision and/or additional information identified by the staff engineer is submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
 - 7. If the proposed daily design is not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provide the required additional information that the staff engineer has identified, the Submitting Party may request an Informal Internal Review.
- B. Design plans and specifications pursuant to Rule .1938(f). *(This is typically an engineered design that does not specifically require State review based on Design Daily Flow <3,000 gpd. The depth and nature of State review for such projects will vary based on relative MCHD need.)*
- 1. Application Submittal:
 - a. The MCHD fills out a Request for Review describing which elements of the Submittal the OSWP should review. The MCHD conveys the Regulatory Submittal and Request to Review to the OSWP.
 - b. OSWP reviewers: An engineer and/or regional soil scientist (RSS) are assigned to the review, as applicable.
 - 2. The OSWP then follows one or more of the protocols described in Section I above based on the MCHD request. Most typically, the review would include:
 - a. Daily Design Flow Review Process (Section I.C)
 - b. Soil and Site Evaluation Review (Section I.D)
 - c. System Engineering Plans and Specifications Review (Section I.F)
- C. Design plans and specifications pursuant to Rule .1948(d); *(Proposals intended to overcome an UNSUITABLE classification)*

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

1. Application Submittal: The MCHD fills out a Request for Review for a proposal submitted based on Rule .1948(d) and conveys it to the OSWP with the Regulatory Submittal.
 2. The OSWP then follows one or more of the protocols described in Section I above based on the nature of the submitted information. Most typically, the review would include:
 - a. Soil and Site Evaluation Review (Section I.D)
 - b. System Engineering Plans and Specifications Review (Section I.F)
- D. Design plans and specifications for flow reduction utilizing low-flow fixtures or low-flow technologies pursuant to Session Law 2013-413 or 2014-120.
1. Application Submittal: The MCHD fills out a Request for Review for a proposal submitted based on Design Daily Flow reduction and conveys it to the OSWP with the Regulatory Submittal.
 2. The OSWP then follows one or more of the protocols described in Section I above based on the nature of the submitted information. Most typically, the review would include:
 - a. Daily Design Flow Review Process (Section I.C)
 - b. System Engineering Plans and Specifications Review (Section I.F)

IV. Other Types of Regulatory Submittals and associated review protocol:

- A. Prefabricated septic tanks, pumps tanks, effluent filters, risers and riser covers, and pipe penetrations [15A NCAC 18A .1953 and .1954];
1. Submittal to OSWP
 - a. The manufacturer (or their representative) of the component provides a submittal with information identified in Rule .1953 and .1954 or G.S. 130A-335.1.
 - b. The assigned staff engineer notifies the manufacturer of receipt of the submittal.
 - c. The staff engineer reviews the application based upon Rule .1953, .1954, G.S. 130A-335.1, and/or posted guidance documents.
 - d. The staff engineer issues one of the following types of letters to MCHD, the PE and other applicable parties:
 - (a) An approval of the component;
 - (b) A request for revisions to the component design that includes:
 - (i) A section detailing any required revisions with citation of the applicable statute or rule;
 - (ii) A section detailing any suggested or recommended revisions based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals or standards of practice).
 - (c) A request for additional information that includes:
 - (i) A section detailing any required additional information with citations to rules or statutes;

- (ii) A section detailing any suggested or recommended additional information based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals or standards of practice).
 - 2. If the component is not approved and the required revision and/or additional information identified by the staff engineer is submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
 - 3. If the component design is not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provide the required additional information that the staff engineer has identified, the Submitting Party may request an Informal Internal Review.
- B. Residential wastewater treatment systems (RWTS) [15A NCAC 18A .1957(c)]
 - 1. Submittal to OSWP
 - a. The manufacturer (or their representative) of the RWTS provides a submittal with information identified in Rule .1957(c).
 - b. The assigned staff engineer notifies the manufacturer of receipt of the submittal.
 - c. The staff engineer reviews the application based upon Rule .1957(c) and posted guidance documents.
 - d. The staff engineer issues one of the following types of letters to MCHD, the PE and other applicable parties:
 - (a) An approval of the component;
 - (b) A request for revisions to the component design that includes:
 - (i) section detailing any required revisions with citation of the applicable statute or rule;
 - (ii) A section detailing any suggested or recommended revisions based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice);
 - (c) A request for additional information that includes:
 - (i) A section detailing any required additional information with citations to rules or statutes; and
 - (ii) A section detailing any suggested or recommended additional information based upon current knowledge base (guidance, manuals, or standards of practice).
 - 2. If the component is not approved and the required revisions and/or additional information identified by the staff engineer are submitted, then the proposal is reviewed again.
 - 3. If the component design is not approved and the Submitting Party declines to make the required revisions and/or provide the required additional information that the staff engineer has identified, the Submitting Party may request an Informal Internal Review.

- C. OSWP Regulatory Review Procedures Applications for wastewater systems, components, or devices that are submitted under Rule 15A NCAC 18A .1969. *(These are Experimental and Innovative (E&I) approvals.)*
1. The review procedures for these applications are outlined in Rule .1969 and Branch Guidance Documents and include:
 - a. Presentation to the E&I Committee (a Technical Advisory Committee pursuant to G.S. 130A-334) and potential naming of a special subcommittee.
 - b. Subcommittee and full Committee recommend approval or disapproval (with justification) of applications in writing to the OSWP Branch.
 - c. The OSWP Branch recommends approval or disapproval of applications to the Section Chief.
 2. The Section Chief issues one of the following types of letters to the applicant:
 - a. Notice of Approval and finalized approval document.
 - b. Notice of Disapproval with justification.

**Part 1B: Mecklenburg County Health Department,
Food and Facilities Sanitation Program:
Standardize Certain Regulatory Review Procedures**

Reference Session Law 2014-120, Section 29.(b).

Background: Mecklenburg County F&FS (Food & Facilities Sanitation) Program
Environmental Health staff, acting as authorized agents of the NCDHHS (Department of Health and Human Services) receives plan submittals for review of individual food service establishments, child care centers, and local institutions. Plans for construction of public swimming pools are also reviewed by F&FS environmental health staff acting as authorized agents of the Department. Plan review applications, checklists, NCDHHS position statements and guidance documents, specific to the facility type are used by F&FS staff and are provided to our customers to assure that all needed information is in order for review and approval.

- A. Checklists for food service establishments, childcare centers and institutions are used to assure uniform review for compliance with the Rules.
- B. A public swimming pool plan review checklist is used to assure all safety requirements are met and circulation system components are able to meet the water quality requirements.

Part 2A: Mecklenburg County Health Department, Groundwater and Wastewater Services Program Informal Internal Review Processes and Procedures to Develop and Maintain a List of Review Engineers

Reference Session Law 2014-120, Section 29.(c).

I. Definitions

The following definitions apply throughout this document:

- A. Practice of Engineering. – As defined in G.S. 89C-3.
- B. Professional Engineer (PE). – As defined in G.S. 89C-3.
- C. Regulatory Authority. – The Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Department of Health and Human Services, and any unit of local government operating a program (i) that grants permits, licenses, or approvals to the public and (ii) that is either approved by or delegated authority from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources or the Department of Health and Human Services.
- D. Regulatory Submittal. – An application or other submittal to a Regulatory Authority for a permit, license, or approval. In the case of a unit of local government, Regulatory Submittal shall mean an application or submittal submitted to a program approved by or delegated authority from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources or the Department of Health and Human Services.
- E. Submitting Party. – The person submitting the Regulatory Submittal to the Regulatory Authority.

II. Scope:

This guidance is applicable to Regulatory Submittals prepared, sealed and signed by a professional engineer licensed pursuant to Chapter 89C of the General Statutes. These Regulatory Submittals are reviewed by either the On-Site Water Protection Branch (OSWP) or the Mecklenburg County Health Department (MCHD) environmental health staff acting under delegated authority.

A. Regulatory Submittals that include the following must be submitted to OSWP for review:

1. Systems with design daily flows $\geq 3,000$ total gallons per day [15A NCAC 18A .1938(e)];
2. Systems designed pursuant to 15A NCAC 18A .1949 (c) or (d);
3. Systems designed for treatment of industrial process wastewater (IPWW) [15A NCAC 18A .1938(f)];
4. Prefabricated septic tanks, pumps tanks, effluent filters, risers and riser covers, and pipe penetrations [15A NCAC 18A .1953 and .1954];
5. Residential wastewater treatment systems [15A NCAC 18A .1957(c)]; and
6. Applications for wastewater systems, components, or devices that are submitted under

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

Rule 15A NCAC 18A .1969.

B. Other Regulatory Submittals are submitted directly to the MCHD who, in turn, either reviews or requests review by OSWP [15A NCAC 18A .1938(f)].

III. Informal Internal Review Process

North Carolina Session Law 2014-120, Section 29(c) identifies two circumstances that allow a Submitting Party to request an Informal Internal Review of the MCHD or OSWP review:

A. The Regulatory Submittal includes a design or practice sealed by a PE that is not included in the Regulatory Authority's existing guidance, manuals or standard operating procedures. The internal review process for these requests depends on whether the Regulatory Submittal was submitted to the MCHD or OSWP:

1. Submittal to OSWP

- a. The OSWP staff engineer (hereafter "staff engineer") reviews the Regulatory Submittal in accordance with procedures outlined in Part IA of this report.
- b. If the staff engineer is not a NC licensed PE, then the Submitting Party may request an Informal Internal review by the reviewer's supervisor.
- c. If the reviewer's supervisor is not a NC licensed PE, review may be provided by a consulting NC licensed PE selected from a list developed and maintained by the Regulatory Authority in accordance with Article 3D of Chapter 143 of the North Carolina General Statutes.
- d. The Regulatory Authority may charge the Submitting Party for costs of the review by the consulting NC licensed PE.
- e. The OSWP Branch has the authority to make the final decision, even if review of the Regulatory Submittal is conducted by a consulting NC licensed PE.

2. Submittal to MCHD

- a. If a Submitting Party requests an Informal Internal Review of an engineered design, the MCHD will forward the request to the OSWP in accordance with Part 2A Section III A (1).

B. There is a disagreement between the reviewer of the Regulatory Submittal and the Submitting Party regarding whether statute or other regulatory authority mandates the revisions or requests for additional information made by the Regulatory Authority.

1. In these cases, the Regulatory Authority will conduct an informal hearing with one of the following groups, as appropriate:

- a. A review panel including the Environmental Health Section Chief or their designee, MCHD personnel, Stakeholders representative(s) chosen by the Submitting Party and others as appropriate for the following instances:
 - (a) Systems with design daily flows $\geq 3,000$ total gallons per day [15A NCAC 18A .1938(e)];
 - (b) Systems designed pursuant to 15A NCAC 18A .1949 (c) or (d);
 - (c) Systems designed for treatment of industrial process wastewater (IPWW) [15A NCAC 18A .1938(f)];

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

- b. Members of the Experimental and Innovative (E&I) Technical Advisory Committee for the following types of Regulatory Submittals:
 - (a) Prefabricated septic tanks, pumps tanks, effluent filters, risers and riser covers, and pipe penetrations [15A NCAC 18A .1953 and .1954];
 - (b) Residential wastewater treatment systems [15A NCAC 18A .1957(c)]; and
 - (c) Applications for wastewater systems, components, or devices that are submitted under Rule 15A NCAC 18A .1969.
2. The OSWP Branch will notify the MCHD, the Submitting Party and other applicable parties of the decision reached during the Informal Internal Review process.

IV. Procedure For Developing and Maintaining a List of PEs for Informal Internal Reviews

- A. PEs for Informal Internal Reviews will be selected in accordance with Article 3D of Chapter 143 of the NC General Statutes (<http://www.ncbels.org/forms/minibrooksact.pdf>) including:
 1. Announcing requirements for these engineering consultative services;
 2. Selecting firms that are qualified to provide such services on the basis of demonstrated competent and qualification without regard to fee; and
 3. Negotiating a contract.
- B. The OSWP will publish an announcement of the need for Consultative Services on its website and request that various professional engineer associations such as NCBELS, PENC, and NSPE post our intention to compile this list on their websites.
- C. Draft a Request for Inclusion on the EH Section's NCPE Informal Internal Review List for dissemination to the general professional engineer population. Using this form, respondents will provide:
 1. Licensee's name;
 2. NCPE license number;
 3. Licensure field/area;
 4. Contact information; and,
 5. Years of experience designing ground absorption sewage treatment and dispersal systems.
- D. The protocol to review Requests for Inclusion will include:
 1. Appropriate field of engineering expertise;
 2. Benchmark minimum number of years engaged in this activity;
 3. Benchmark minimum number of engineered designs approved.
- E. The list will be finalized based on prequalification to do business in the state via the State of North Carolina Interactive Purchasing System.
- F. The EH Section will post the list of PEs approved for Informal Internal Review processes on its website and update it as appropriate.

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

- V. There were no informal appeals processed for the period January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

Part 2B: Food Protection and Facilities Branch Informal Internal Review Processes and

Procedures to Develop and Maintain a List of Review Engineers

Reference Session Law 2014-120, Section 29.(c).

I. Definitions

The following definitions apply throughout this document:

- A. Practice of Engineering. – As defined in G.S. 89C-3.
- B. Professional Engineer (PE). – As defined in G.S. 89C-3.
- C. Regulatory Authority. – The Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Department of Health and Human Services, and any unit of local government operating a program (i) that grants permits, licenses, approvals to the public and (ii) that is either approved by or delegated authority from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources or the Department of Health and Human Services.
- D. Regulatory Submittal. – An application or other submittal to a Regulatory Authority for a permit, license, or approval. In case of a unit of local government, Regulatory Submittal shall mean an application or submittal submitted to a program approved by or delegated authority from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources or the Department of Health and Human Services.
- E. Submitting Party – The person submitting the Regulatory Submittal to the Regulatory Authority.

II. Scope:

This guidance is applicable to Regulatory Submittals which may be submitted by an engineer or architect for food establishment or public swimming pools and may apply to plans submitted for institutions that provide health care, confinement or educational services.

- A. When plan approval is not granted on a submittal, the submitting party is notified of which rules are not met and what problems need to be corrected upon resubmittal.
- B. If resubmittal does not fully comply with the rules, the process of resubmittal may be repeated or notification will be given that the plans are not approved, what rules are not met, and what the formal appeals procedure is, explaining that there is a 30-day window for formal appeals.
- C. Differences of opinion regarding the interpretation of a rule may be resolved through an informal review as provided in rule 15A NCAC 18A .2676.

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

15A NCAC 18A .2676 INFORMAL REVIEW PROCESS AND APPEALS PROCEDURE

(a) If a permit holder disagrees with a decision of the local health department on the interpretation, application, or enforcement of the rules of this Section the permit holder may:

- (1) Request an informal review pursuant to Paragraphs (d) and (e) of this Rule; or
- (2) Initiate a contested case in accordance with G.S. 150B.

(b) The permit holder is not required to complete the alternative dispute resolution prior to initiating a contested case in accordance with G.S. 150B.

(c) When a petition for a contested case is filed, the informal review process shall terminate.

(d) If the permit holder requests an informal review, the request shall be in writing and shall be postmarked or hand delivered to the local health department within seven days of notice of the decision giving rise to the review. The request shall state the issues in dispute. If the inspection giving rise to the informal review was conducted by the Environmental Health Supervisor in the county or area where the food establishment is located, or when the county or area has only one registered environmental health specialist assigned to inspect food establishments, the Environmental Health Regional Specialist assigned to that county or area shall conduct the local informal review. As soon as possible, but at least within 30 days of receipt of the request, the person conducting the review shall contact the permit holder, provide that permit holder an opportunity to be heard on the issues in dispute and issue a written decision addressing the issues raised in the appeal. Copies of the decision shall be mailed to the permit holder and to the State Health Director. That decision shall be binding for the purposes of future inspections of the establishment in question unless modified pursuant to Paragraph (e) of this Rule or by the State Health Director.

(e) Following receipt of the written decision of the Environmental Health Supervisor or his or her representative issued pursuant to Paragraph (d) of this Rule, the permit holder who initiated the informal review may appeal the resulting decision to an Informal Review Officer designated by the Department to be responsible for final decisions on appeals from throughout the state. Notice of such appeal shall be in writing, shall include a copy of the Environmental Health Supervisor's or his or her representative's decision, and shall be postmarked or hand-delivered to the local health department and to the Department within seven days of receipt of the written decision issued pursuant to Paragraph (a) of this Rule. Within 35 days of receipt of this appeal, the designated Informal Review Officer shall hold a conference in Wake County. At least 10 days prior to the conference, the Informal Review Officer shall provide notice of the time and place of this conference to the permit holder and the Environmental Health Supervisor for the county or area where the issue arose. Within 10 days following the date of the conference, the Informal Review Officer shall issue a written decision addressing the issues raised in the appeal and that decision shall be binding for purposes of future inspections of the establishment in question unless modified pursuant to Paragraph (g) of this Rule or by the State Health Director.

(f) If the decision on appeal at the local or state level results in a change in the score resulting from an inspection of an establishment, the regulatory authority shall post a new grade card reflecting that new score.

(g) Appeals of the decision of the designated Informal Review Officer shall be in accordance with G.S. 150B.

(h) Nothing in this Rule shall impact the right of a permit holder to a re-inspection pursuant to Rule .2661 of this Section.

History Note: Authority G.S. 130A-248; S.L. 2011-394, Section 15(a);

Eff. September 1, 2012.

D. If the Submitting Party requests Informal Internal review by a PE, the FPF will follow the procedure described below.

III. Procedure For Developing and Maintaining a List of PEs for Informal Internal Review of Regulatory Submittals from an Engineer

Mecklenburg County F&FS will utilize the listing of PEs as developed by NCDHHS and described below.

A. PEs for Informal Internal Reviews will be selected in accordance with Article 3D of Chapter 143 of the NC General Statutes (<http://www.ncbels.org/forms/minibrooksact.pdf>) including:

SL 2014-12- 2015 Annual Report- Mecklenburg County Health

1. Announcing requirements for these engineering consultative services;
 2. Selecting firms that are qualified to provide such services on the basis of demonstrated competent and qualification without regard to fee; and
 3. Negotiating a contract.
- B. The FPF will publish an announcement of the need for Consultative Services on its website and request that various professional engineer associations such as NCBELS, PENC, and NSPE post our intention to compile this list on their websites.
- C. Draft a Request for Inclusion on the EH Section NCPE Informal Internal Review List for dissemination to the general professional engineer population. Using this form, respondents will provide:
1. Licensee's name;
 2. NCPE license number;
 3. Licensure field/area;
 4. Contact information; and,
 5. Years of experience designing food service facilities or public swimming pools
- D. The protocol to review Requests for Inclusion will include:
1. Appropriate field of engineering expertise;
 2. Benchmark minimum number years engaged in this activity;
 3. Benchmark minimum number of engineered designs approved.
- E. The list will be finalized based on prequalification to do business in the state via the State of North Carolina Interactive Purchasing System.
- IV. The EH Section will post the list of PEs approved for Informal Internal Review processes on its website and update it as appropriate.
- V. There were no informal appeals processed for the period January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

**Part 3A and 3B: Mecklenburg County Health Department Review of
Working Job Titles**

Reference Session Law 2014-120, Section 29.(h).

- I. Review the Working Job Titles of every employee with job duties that include the review of Regulatory Submittals
 - A. **MCHD does not have any employees with job duties that include the review of Regulatory Submittals with job titles that include the designation "engineer" and staff are prohibited from using the term in working titles.** The following positions in the Mecklenburg County F&FS may conduct reviews of Regulatory Submittals of engineered plans. None of those position descriptions require that employees be licensed PEs. Position titles are as follows: Plans Examiner, Senior Environmental Specialist, Environmental Supervisor and Program Manager.