

Landscaping Septic Systems




Figure 1. Cross section of a mound system. Illustration by James Kiehne.

Editor's Note: This column is a response to calls received over the National Small Flows Clearinghouse (NSFC) technical assistance hotline. If you have further questions concerning landscaping septic systems, call (800) 624-8301 or (304) 293-4191 and ask to speak with a technical assistant.

The following is a fact sheet published by the University of Minnesota College of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Sciences.

Mary H. Meyer, Extension Horticulturist; Brad Pedersen, Extension Horticulturist; Marguerite Jaster, Landscape Design Assistant Department of Horticultural Science; James Anderson, Extension Soil Scientist, Department of Soil, Water, and Climate; Kenneth M. Olson, Extension Educator, Sherburne County; David M. Gustafson, Extension Specialist, Onsite Sewage Treatment, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering.

nance of the mound all interact in determining how well the system will function. Placement of plants on and near the mound must be done with care to ensure a properly functioning septic system. Plants enhance the system by removing moisture and nutrients from the soil and providing cover to prevent erosion.

Mound Placement

A rectangular mound rising 18 inches to 5 feet above the surface of a relatively flat home landscape may be quite noticeable and possibly very unsightly. Careful design planning before the mound system is installed can help to create a sustainable landscape with lower maintenance costs, greater environmental benefits, and much higher aesthetic value. Mounds can be placed to suit individual landscaping and lot size needs (see Figures 2 and 3). Properly landscaped areas around the mound can serve as privacy barriers, windbreaks for homes, and a screen from unsightly views.

As a homeowner considering the placement of a septic mound, know your options. The earlier in the process that you become involved in

Mines, who originally developed the research protocol for this study. We appreciate the input and direction provided by Ted Loudon, Ph.D., Michigan State University, Doug Joy, Ph.D., University of Guelph, and Larry Nelson, Ph.D., North Carolina State University (Emeritus), who reviewed the protocol, the final project report or statistical design for the study.

We also acknowledge the substantial efforts of those who served on field performance assessment teams or who helped coordinate/assist with its implementation. These individuals included Oregon DEQ staff Ed Woods, Chuck Harman, Mike McNickel, Sherm Olson, Bijan Pour, Bob Baggett, Del Cline, Larry Brown, and Bernie Duffy; Clackamas County soils staff Larry Olander, and Karen Livingston; Deschutes County soils staff Dan Halderman, Jerry Kathan, and Jeff Freund; Clackamas and Deschutes Counties GIS staffs; as well as environmental health specialists, soil scientists, geologists and technicians, including John McKelvey, Stephanie Miscovich, Ryan Davenport, Christine R. Reisz, John Davis, Tony Sacco, Beth Chagaris, and Amy Morgan from North Carolina and Oregon.

We also appreciate the assistance of homeowners who allowed us to evaluate the performance of onsite wastewater systems at their homesites.

Finally, we acknowledge the project funding agencies, Environmental Studies Group and Infiltrator Systems, Inc., for funding such a broad-scale, independent, third-party research study of both chamber and traditional aggregate-laden septic systems across two divergent climatic zones.

Note that while we appreciate the assistance of these individuals, organizations, and funding agencies, the views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and are not those of the collaborators mentioned, their institutions or the funding agencies.

Authors

Larry D. King, Ph.D., NCLSS, is a consultant for The On-Site Corporation and Professor Emeritus of Soil Science at North Carolina State University (NCSU). King has nearly 30 years experience in soils and land application of wastewater to them. He worked for the Tennessee Valley Authority and

since 1975 at NCSU until his retirement in 2000. He also has professional experience at the University of Guelph, the New Zealand Government Experiment Station, and in the geography department at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland. King has a broad-based background having obtained engineering and agronomy degrees and has taught university Soil Science courses dealing with land application of wastewaters, including on-site systems, biosolids and spray irrigation of wastewater.

Michael T. Hoover, Ph.D., NCLSS, is professor of soil science at North Carolina State University (NCSU) and president of The On-Site Corporation (under which auspices this project was directed). Hoover obtained his B.S., M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Pennsylvania State University. He has over 27 years experience in the onsite wastewater field.

Thomas H. Hinson, RS, NCLSS, NCPG, is principal scientist at Cpec Environmental, Inc., in Beaufort, North Carolina. He began his professional career as an environmental health specialist in the Carteret County, North Carolina, Health Department, after which he served as project manager for a NCSU project to investigate failure rates and performance of onsite technologies in northeastern North Carolina. Hinson has a Bachelor's Degree in Geology from the University of North Carolina at Wilmington and a Master's of Science Degree in Soil Science from NCSU.

Richard L. Polson, CPSS, was formerly program manager for soils in the Clackamas County, Oregon, Department of Community Services. He is currently building codes manager for Clackamas County. He has an A.B. degree from Albion College in biology, an M.S. in soil science from Oregon State University, and has been a soil scientist in Clackamas County since 1976.

Roger W. Everett, RS, is director of environmental health for Deschutes County, Oregon. He began his career in 1974 in Douglas County, Oregon, and began working for the environmental health program in Deschutes County in 1979.

in Pennsylvania. In: N. I. McClelland and T. L. Evans (Ed.) Individual on-site wastewater systems: Proceedings of the 7th national conference. Ann Arbor, Mich.: National Sanitation Foundation.

Hoover, M., and A. Amoozegar. 1989. Performance of alternative and conventional septic tank systems. Raleigh, N.C.: North Carolina State University.

Hoover, M. T., R. O. Evans, T. H. Hinson, and R. C. Heath. 1993. Performance of sand-lined trench septic systems on wet, clayey soils in northeastern North Carolina. Raleigh, N.C.: College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. North Carolina State University.

Hoover, M. T., and T. H. Hinson. 2002. Oregon on-site wastewater system field performance assessment. Final Project Report to Infiltrator Systems, Inc. and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, The On-Site Corporation and Cpec Environmental, Inc.

Jenssen, P. D., and R. L. Siegrist. 1990. Technology assessment of wastewater treatment by soil infiltration systems. *Wat. Sci. Tech* 22(3/4): 83-92.

Joy, D. 2001. Review of chamber systems and their potential use in Ontario for on-site wastewater treatment systems. Guelph, Ontario: University of Guelph.

Keys, J. R. 1996. Septic tank effluent infiltration and loading rates for gravel and chamber absorption systems. M.S. thesis. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Kristiansen, R. 1982. The soil as a renovating medium - clogging of infiltrative surfaces. In: A.S. Eikum and R.W. Seabloom (ed.) *Alternative wastewater treatment*. Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Co. pp. 105-120.

Lindbo, D. L., T. M. Campbell, N. Deal, and R. Hollowell. 1998. Performance of sand lined trench and conventional systems within a management entity. In: D. Sievers (ed.) *On-site wastewater treatment: Proceedings of the 8th international symposium on individual and small community sewage systems*. March 8-10, Orlando, Fla. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASAE pp. 177-185.

Louden, T. L., G. S. Salthouse, and D. L. Mokma. 1998. Wastewater quality and trench system design effects on soil acceptance rates. In: D. Sievers (ed.) *On-site wastewater treatment: Proceedings of the 8th international symposium on individual and small community sewage systems*. March 8-10, Orlando, Fla. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASAE pp. 186-194.

Siegrist, R. L. 1986. Wastewater-induced soil pore clogging development as affected by effluent composition and loading rate. Doctoral dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Siegrist, R. L., S. Van Cuyk, A. Logan, S. Masson, and E. Fischer. 1999. Hydraulic and purification behavior in wastewater soil treatment systems as affected by infiltrative surface character and vadose zone soil depth. Proceedings of the annual conference of the National On-Site Wastewater Recycling Association. Nov. 3-6, Jekyll Island, Ga.

Siegrist, R. L., S. Van Cuyk, J. Logan, M. T. Hoover, and T. Hinson. 2000. Field performance survey protocol for determining the equivalency of hydraulic performance of EQ24 chambers and aggregate onsite trenches in Oregon.

Snedecor, G. W., and W. G. Cochran. 1980. *Statistical methods*. 7th edition. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.

Tyler, E. J., and J. C. Converse. 1985. Soil evaluation and design selection for large or cluster wastewater soil absorption systems. Proceedings of the 4th national symposium on small sewage systems. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASAE pp. 179-190.

Tyler, E. J., M. Miller, and J. C. Converse. 1991. Wastewater infiltration from chamber and gravel systems. Proceedings of the 6th national symposium on small sewage systems. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASAE pp. 214-222.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1978. *Management of small waste flows. Report of small scale waste management project* University of Wisconsin-Madison. Cincinnati, Ohio: EPA Municipal Environmental Res. Lab. EPA-600/2-78-173.

—. 1980. *Design manual for on-site wastewater treatment and disposal systems*. Cincinnati, Ohio: EPA Municipal Environmental Res. Lab.

—. 2002. *On-site wastewater treatment systems manual*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Water. February. EPA/625/R-00/008.

Van Cuyk, S., R. Siegrist, A. Logan, S. Masson, E. Fischer, and L. Figueroa. 1999. Purification of wastewater in soil treatment systems as affected by infiltrative surface character and unsaturated soil depth. 72nd Water Environment Federation exhibition and technical conference. October 9-13, New Orleans, La.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the efforts of Bob Siegrist, Ph.D., and his colleagues at the Colorado School of




Figure 2. A and B represent possible placement of mound septic systems.




Figure 3. C and D show additional mound system locations.

field or mound is determined, protect it from compaction and disturbance to ensure proper sewage treatment.

When planning a landscape, there should be an invisible or concept line the eye follows around the yard (see Figures 2, 3 and 4). Where space allows, this line is a graceful curve that represents the division between two different types of plant material (turf or ground cover versus shrubs) or between plants and hard goods (turf, patio, or deck). The concept line becomes a real bedline where the lawn ends and the shrubs begin. If your property is large enough to plan an unbroken turf area as the first priority, then place the septic system beyond the bedline, disguising it as part of a shrub or perennial area or screening it with trees or large shrubs. If your property is smaller, blending the mound into the overall landscape is still the key. Try moving the focal point from the mound to other plants or features. Extending the actual berm with additional topsoil at the same height and curving the perimeter, then sloping down and away can conceal the existence of the system (see Figure 4). If the drainfield must be located near a drive, patio, or walkway, retaining walls may be used to save space, but only on the uphill side of the berm. Connect the extended berm to another large feature in the yard, such as a pool enclosure or other fenced area, using retaining walls for transition. ALWAYS design

with the entire yard or viewing area in mind—connect it to the whole picture.

Guidelines for Planting on and Near Septic Mounds

It is very important that the integrity of the mound be kept intact and that soil does not wash away. A permanent vegetation cover is required to minimize topsoil loss. Open sites are more susceptible to frost, heaving, and erosion. Plants trap snow, which acts as a mulch and prevents erosion.

- Topsoil on the mound should be a minimum of 6 inches and a maximum of 30 inches.
- Use minimal tilling when planting and establish a cover as soon as possible to limit erosion.
- Always wear gloves when working over septic systems to minimize your contact with soil.
- Use plants that do not like water or wet soils near the septic system. This will prevent their root systems from interfering with the septic system. The larger the plant, the more extensive (not necessarily deeper) the root system.
- Do not place trees and shrubs ON the mound; they may be planted at the foot or on side slopes. Frame

the mound with trees and shrubs at a distance, but use only herbaceous (non-woody) plants on the mound itself. Trees should be planted a minimum of 20 feet from the edge of the mound. Trees known for seeking water reservoirs, such as poplar, maple, willow, and elm, should be planted at least 50 feet from the mound. Shrubs should not be planted on top of the mound.

- Avoid irrigation and fertilization on a mound; in fact, never plan to irrigate this area. Use plants that can withstand dry conditions. Plants listed below tolerate and thrive on natural rainfall in Minnesota.
- Minimize traffic on the mound, both human and animal, to avoid soil compaction. Do not exercise pets or stake pets on septic mounds. Never drive a car or other vehicle across the mound or mow when the soil is wet. Compacted soil can lead to soil erosion and impedes the flow of air around the system. In winter, activity on a mound can cause frost to penetrate, resulting in freezing problems.
- Do not plant edible plants, such as vegetables and herbs on a mound or drainfield.
- Annually inspect the mound for ani-

mal damage, such as burrowing and tunneling. Control animals at the first sign of tunneling or burrowing before damage is extensive.

- Root barriers (geotextiles impregnated with a long-lasting herbicide that kills plant roots) have been used around mounds. Installation is expensive and can be avoided with proper plant selection.

Suggested Plants for Use on Septic Mounds

Herbaceous plants, such as wildflowers and grasses, are good choices for mound plantings. Grasses are especially desirable due to their fibrous root systems, which hold soil in place. Grasses also provide year-round cover.

The following native prairie plants grow well on dry soils and would be good choices for a mound septic system:

Wildflowers

- prairie onion (*Allium stellatum*)
- pussytoes (*Antennaria neglecta*)
- butterflyweed (*Asclepias tuberosa*)
- heath aster (*Aster ericoides*)
- bigleaf aster (*Aster macrophyllus*)*
- Pennsylvania sedge (*Carex pensylvanica**)
- prairie clover (*Dalea* spp.)
- pale purple coneflower (*Echinacea angustifolia*)
- rattlesnake master (*Eryngium yuccifolium*)
- wild geranium (*Geranium maculatum**)
- prairie smoke (*Geum triflorum*)
- oxeye (*Helianthus helianthoides*)
- rough blazing star (*Liatris aspera*)
- wild bergamot (*Monarda fistulosa*)
- penstemon (*Penstemon* spp.)
- pasqueflower (*Pulsatilla patens*)
- violets (*Viola* spp.)*

Grasses

- sideoats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*)
- blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*)
- little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*)
- prairie dropseed (*Sporobolus heterolepis*)
- June grass (*Koeleria macrantha*)

* shade tolerant

These plants are propagated by seed or plants. A combination of

both will make a faster cover. Use a mulch of clean straw or a cover crop of annual ryegrass or oats to prevent erosion while the plants become established.

Low-maintenance lawn grasses, such as fine fescues, can make a dense cover and only need to be mowed once or twice a year. Mow in October and late June to reduce weeds. Fescues are traditional lawn grasses that tolerate dry soils and shady sites. A mixture of fine-textured fescues, such as creeping red, hard,

and sheep's fescues (*Festuca rubrum*, *Festuca longifolia*, *Festuca ovina*), in equal proportions can be seeded at the rate of 3.5 pounds per 1,000 square feet. Traditional lawn grasses, such as common Kentucky bluegrass and perennial ryegrass, can be planted on a mound and regularly mowed. Mowing will increase evaporation from the mound and aid in rodent control.

Perennial flowers, such as daylilies and peonies, can be grown; however, extra care must be taken to mulch or plant close together so soil will not be exposed and erode. Low maintenance plants that do not need tending and care (remember minimal traffic on the mound) are best. Enjoy from afar, and do not walk on the mound.




Figure 4. Model landscape plan for mound septic system.

Proper selection and placement of plants best suited to the site means that those plants will be healthier, more attractive, and have fewer pest problems.

References and Further Information

Septic System Owners Guide, PC-6583

Plants in Prairie Communities, FO-3238

The publications can be ordered from the University of Minnesota Extension Service. Call (612) 624-4900 or (800)976-8636.

For landscape design publications, refer to SULIS URL in Extension site: www.sustland.umn.edu