

I dedicate this thesis
in honor of my son,
JORDAN LOUIS DIPAOLA,
and in memory of my son,
CHRISTIAN NICHOLAS DIPAOLA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author began her Master of Science in Crop and Soil Environmental Sciences at Virginia Tech in 1988 under the guidance of Dr. Charles Hagedorn III and Dr. Raymond B. Reneau, Jr. It has taken the author a long time to complete this document and many individuals have given much support, encouragement, and technical advice in her struggle to finish her degree. Several of these people were instrumental in helping the author with her research project and the compilation of information for this thesis. She wishes to acknowledge these individuals.

The author's research project was funded by the Virginia Department of Health (VDH). The Commissioner and his staff are thanked for their assistance with and dedication to this project and its successful completion.

The author graciously appreciates the continued support and dedication of her committee chairman, Dr. Charles Hagedorn III, and her committee members, Dr. Raymond B. Reneau, Jr. and Dr. Gregory Boardman. The combined experience and insight of these gentlemen have greatly impacted and influenced the author in her studies and in writing this thesis. Dr. Hagedorn and Dr. Reneau, as leaders of the Virginia Department of Health research project, taught her many valuable lessons regarding on-site waste disposal and treatment which aided her greatly in her position as Environmental Health Specialist for the Clarke County Health Department. Both were always encouraging to the author and have continued to work with her over the past ten

years in completing this thesis. She appreciates their enthusiasm and their desire to see her attain the M.S. degree.

Dr. Boardman is thanked for waiting diligently for completion of this document and for his commitment to the author. The author greatly appreciates his continued participation in her advisory committee.

Installation of the field sites, routine monitoring, field and laboratory testing would have been impossible without the efforts of several field and laboratory staff members. Dr. David C. Martens, Mr. Michael Saluta, Mr. Philip Keating, and Mr. Wes Atkinson were indispensable in the on-site installations. Their help enabled the research to be performed at these remote field sites. Mr. Hubert Walker, Ms. Jody Compton, Mr. Sean Clark, and Miss Dana Brown performed many of the chemical tests on the routine monitoring samples. Their assistance allowed monthly results to be generated and analyzed in a timely manner. The author is very appreciative to them for all of their hard work. She is very thankful to Mrs. Norma Nelson who taught her many useful laboratory techniques and practical applications of microbiology.

The author formed many meaningful friendships with fellow graduate students working on this project. She is indebted to Dr. Marcia Degen for her unending assistance in designing the research project and in setting up and performing the necessary studies. Dr. Gregory Monnett was instrumental in installing and monitoring the author's research site and she is very grateful to him for all of his time and work on her behalf. Dr. Marian Ijzerman, acting as the author's partner in the tracer and denitrification studies, provided much assistance and encouragement in completing the research. She is thanked for her

support, guidance, and understanding. The author is very appreciative to these three individuals for their continued friendship and support during the research period and over these many years.

Many thanks to secretaries Mrs. Helen Salmon and Mrs. Sybil Paul who many times answered questions and gave assistance with reports for the author.

The author could not have completed this document without the constant support of her husband, Louis DiPaola, who offered both technical and emotional support throughout the writing of this thesis. She is indebted to her parents, Phillip and Judy Stickley for their exceptional assistance, support, and encouragement throughout the completion of this Master of Science degree. The author thanks her family, and many close friends who remained supportive and encouraging over the last ten years. Mrs. Judy Whitacre, Mrs. Ann Simpson, Dr. Elizabeth Crowther, Dr. Dale Wolf, and Dr. William Edmonds are thanked for their desire to see the author attain her goal; their persistence will always be fondly remembered and appreciated.

The author has been greatly inspired by her sons, Jordan and Christian, and is very thankful for and to them for their unknowing inspiration to their mother. Finally, the author thanks God for His love and care in fulfilling this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
A. Public Health Significance of On-Site Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems (OSWTDS)	3
A. 1. Sewage Disposal in the United States	5
A. 2. Source of Water in the United States	6
A. 3. Waterborne Disease Related to Sewage Disposal	6
B. On-Site Wastewater Treatment and Disposal	7
B. 1. Alternatives to Conventional OSWTDS	8
B. 1. a. Sand Mound	8
B. 1. b. Low-Pressure Distribution System	9
B. 2. Comparison Studies Involving Conventional and Alternative Systems	11
C. Soil Property Effects on Wastewater Disposal	12
C. 1. Barriers to Flow	13
C. 2. Barriers to Renovation	15
C. 3. System Failure	16
D. Removal of Fecal Coliforms from Wastewater	17
D. 1. Bacterial Retention in the Soil Matrix	18
D. 1. a. Conventional OSWTDS Studies	19
D. 1. b. Alternative OSWTDS Studies	21
D. 2. Laboratory Recovery of Coliforms	22
E. Removal of Fecal Viruses from Wastewater	23
E. 1. Safe Viral Indicators	24
E. 2. Valid Viral Reference Strains	25
E. 3. Viral Transport in Soil and Water	25
E. 3. a. Adsorption by Soil	26
E. 3. b. Influence of Flow in the Soil Matrix on Virus Retention	27
E. 3. b. 1. Flow Rates	28
E. 3. b. 2. Saturated Versus Unsaturated Flow	28

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
E. 3. c. Varying Ionic Gradients within the Soil Profile	29
E. 3. d. Influence of the Soil Environment on Virus Retention	30
E. 4. Factors that Influence Virus Survival	31
E. 4. a. Temperature and Virus Survival	32
E. 4. b. Soil Moisture and Virus Survival	33
E. 5. Inactivation or Irreversible Binding in the Matrix	33
F. Removal of Nitrogen from Wastewater	34
F. 1. Potential Surface and Groundwater Contamination	35
F. 1. a. Surface and Groundwater Studies	35
F. 1. b. Conventional OSWTDS Studies	36
F. 1. c. Alternative OSWTDS Studies	39
F. 2. Denitrification	42
F. 2. a. Conditions Needed to Promote Denitrification	42
F. 2. b. Declines in Denitrification	44
G. Summary	44
III. MATERIALS AND METHODS	46
A. Research Site Description for Alternative OSWTDS	46
A. 1. Chambers	46
A. 2. Soil Infiltrator Low-Pressure Distribution System in Blairton Soil	46
B. Soil Sampling	57
C. Routine Monitoring Equipment	57
D. Routine Chemical Monitoring and Analysis	62
E. Tensiometer Values and Analysis	63
F. Microbial Tracer Studies	64
F. 1. Preparation--Summer 1989	64
F. 1. a. Bacteria	64
F. 1. b. Virus	64
F. 2. Preparation--Winter 1990	65
F. 2. a. Bacteria	65
F. 2. b. Virus	65
F. 3. Field Release	66
F. 4. Laboratory Recovery	68
G. Denitrification Studies	70
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	73
A. Studies of an Alternative OSWTDS	73
B. Hydraulic Performance of OSWTDS	74
B. 1. Flow Rates	74
B. 2. Seepage and Ponding	76

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
B. 3. Hydraulic Performance During Tracer and Denitrification Studies	77
B. 3. a. Summer 1989	77
B. 3. b. Winter 1990	80
B. 4. Summary	80
C. Water Quality in Alternative OSWTDS	81
C. 1. Background Water Quality	81
C. 2. Effluent and Absorption Area Soil Water Quality	84
C. 2. a. Effluent Water Quality During the Research Study	84
C. 2. b. Absorption Area Water Quality During the Research Study	85
C. 2. b. 1. Subsystem 1 Water Quality During the Research Study	85
C. 2. b. 2. Subsystem 2 Water Quality During the Research Study	87
C. 2. b. 3. Subsystem Comparison	88
C. 2. c. Effluent Versus Absorption Area Water Quality During the Research Study	89
C. 3. Summary	89
and Surrounding Areas	89
D. Microbial Tracer Studies in Alternative OSWTDS	90
D. 1. Background Coliform and Bacteriophage Counts	90
D. 2. Tracer Studies	90
D. 2. a. Subsystem 1	95
D. 2. a. 1. Summer Bacterial Study	95
D. 2. a. 2. Summer Viral Study	95
D. 2. a. 3. Winter Bacterial Study	96
D. 2. a. 4. Winter Viral Study	97
D. 2. b. Subsystem 2	97
D. 2. b. 1. Summer Bacterial Study	97
D. 2. b. 2. Summer Viral Study	97
D. 2. b. 3. Winter Bacterial Study	97
D. 2. b. 4. Winter Viral Study	98
D. 2. c. Subsystem Comparison and Overview	98
D. 2. c. 1. Summer Bacterial Tracer Study	99
D. 2. c. 2. Winter Bacterial Tracer Study	100
D. 2. c. 3. Summer Viral Tracer Study	101
D. 2. c. 4. Winter Viral Tracer Study	102
D. 3. Summary	103
E. Laboratory Denitrification Studies from Subsystem Samples	104
E. 1. Nitrous Oxide Production from Unamended Soil Samples	105
E. 1. a. Subsystem 1	105
E. 1. b. Subsystem 2	105
E. 1. c. Subsystem Comparison	106
E. 2. Nitrous Oxide Production from Unamended and Amended Soil Samples	108
E. 2. a. Subsystem 1	110

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
E. 2. a. 1. Summer Denitrification Study	110
E. 2. a. 2. Winter Denitrification Study	110
E. 2. b. Subsystem 2	110
E. 2. b. 1. Summer Denitrification Study	110
E. 2. b. 2. Winter Denitrification Study	111
E. 2. c. Subsystem Comparison	111
E. 2. c. 1. Depth Comparison	111
E. 2. c. 2. Amendment Comparison	112
E. 2. c. 3. Seasonal Comparison	112
E. 2. c. 4. Overall Subsystem Comparison	113
E. 3. Summary	113
V. CONCLUSIONS	115
A. Loading Rates	115
B. Soil Matric Potentials	116
C. Water Quality	116
D. Microbial Tracer Studies	117
D. 1. Bacterial Tracer	117
D. 2. Viral Tracer	117
E. Denitrification Studies	118
F. Overall System Performance	119
VI. LITERATURE CITED	121
APPENDIX	131
A. Site Location	132
B. Site Constraints	132
C. Drainfield Subsystem Designs	132
D. Dosing Volume	135
E. Pump Specifications	136
F. Topsoil Calculations	138
G. Listing Sheet for Vendor	139
H. Listing Sheet for VPI&SU	140
VITA	144

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Profile description for Subsystem 1 installed in Blairton silt loam located in Frederick County, VA.	48
2. Profile description for Subsystem 2 installed in Blairton silt loam located in Frederick County, VA.	49
3. Site description for Frederick County, VA.	51
4. The design loading rates and the actual loading rates for the two infiltrator subsystems in the Blairton silt loam.	52
5. Actual flow averages over the three-year research study in the soil infiltrator LPD system with a design flow rate of 1135.6 Lpd.	53
6. Particle size analyses, bulk densities, hydraulic conductivities determined for the Blairton silt loam.	59
7. Soil matric potentials determined for both of the subsystems installed in Blairton silt loam, with depth within the absorption area and down-gradient from the absorption area in the summer 1989.	78
8. Soil matric potentials determined for both of the subsystems installed in Blairton silt loam, with depth within the absorption area and down-gradient from the absorption area in the winter 1990.	79
9. Background water quality parameters with depth surrounding Subsystems 1 and 2 prior to and following microbiological tracer and denitrification studies.	83
10. Effluent and soil water quality means over the three-year study period for soil infiltrator LPD designed for a daily flow of 1135.6 Lpd.	86
11. Bacterial and viral tracers enumerated for Subsystem 1 with a design loading rate of 5.1 Lpd/m ² (actual loading rate 2.4 Lpd/m ²) in the Blairton silt loam during the summer 1989.	91

	<u>Page</u>
12. Bacterial and viral tracers enumerated for Subsystem 1 with a design loading rate of 5.1 Lpd/m ² (actual loading rate 2.4 Lpd/m ²) in the Blairton silt loam during the winter 1990.	92
13. Bacterial and viral tracers enumerated for Subsystem 2 with a design loading rate of 10.2 Lpd/m ² (actual loading rate 4.9 Lpd/m ²) in the Blairton silt loam during the summer 1989.	93
14. Bacterial and viral tracers enumerated for Subsystem 2 with a design loading rate of 10.2 Lpd/m ² (actual loading rate 4.9 Lpd/m ²) in the Blairton silt loam during the winter 1990.	94
15. N ₂ O-N emissions from soil samples collected during the summer 1989 and winter 1990 from Blairton silt loam.	107
16. N ₂ O-N emissions from Subsystems 1 (design loading rate 5.1 Lpd/m ² , actual loading rate 2.4 Lpd/m ²) and 2 (design loading rate 10.2 Lpd/m ² , actual loading rate 4.9 Lpd/m ²) samples collected and amended during the summer 1989 and the winter 1990 from Blairton silt loam.	109
Appendix Table 1. Delivery specifications for subsystems 1 and 2 in the soil Infiltrator LPD system as installed in Blairton silt loam.	133
Appendix Table 2. Discharge specifications for subsystems 1 and 2 in the soil Infiltrator LPD system as installed in Blairton silt loam.	134
Appendix Table 3. Frictional head loss in the soil infiltrator LPD system as Installed in Blairton silt loam.	136

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Longitudinal view and cross-section sketches of a soil infiltrator manufactured by Infiltrator Systems, Inc.	47
2. Trench system for shallow water table or restrictive layer.	54
3. General location of soil infiltrator low-pressure distribution system on Hastreiter lot in Stephens City, VA.	55
4. Piping layout of soil infiltrator low-pressure distribution system.	56
5. Cross-sectional sketch of installed soil infiltrator low-pressure distribution system.	58
6. Layout of routine monitoring equipment installed within and surrounding the soil infiltrator low-pressure distribution.	60
7. Cross-section sketch of installed pump chamber including pump and piping locations.	67
Appendix Figure 1. Hole spacings (inches) and diameters (inches) for Subsystem 2	142
Appendix Figure 2. Hole spacings (inches) and diameters (inches) for Subsystem 1.	143