

LATERAL REHAB WEBINAR MARCH 2018

Q&A

Q: Has anyone used the Sanipor S1 and S2 grout? If so was it successful?

A: The challenge we had as contractors was estimating costs. Implementation was difficult. You never knew how much S1 or S2 would be used, and the chemicals had a significant effect on project costs. We tried the process twice and then decided against using it again.

Q: How was the final lateral/main connection made?

A: In the sanitary line, the top hat liner was placed at each lateral location after installing the mainline CIPP.

Q: It was mentioned that private laterals contribute 50 % of the total I&I for Lakewood. How was this estimated or quantified?

A: The Right of Way and private property infrastructure were installed at the same period of time. The 2' long vitrified clay pipe sections in the right of way and private property have equivocally the same performance. The trapped storm laterals found at all the properties which were 100% blocked indicates that a majority of the storm water was not reaching the storm sewer and infiltrating the sanitary line.

Q: Mark indicated they could not do lateral launches in the storm sewers. What were the issues they had that prevented this?

A: The trapped storm sewer laterals which were blocked prevented the lateral launch.

Q: What happens if a resident opts out of the program?

A: The resident would be required to complete the work with their own contractor at 100% their own expense.

Q: What is test tee?

A: It is a sewer cleanout usually located adjacent to the sidewalk (between sidewalk and house) in urban areas. In Lakewood, a Tee is used so that snaking or CCTV of the lateral line can go to either the mainline in the street or to the house.

Q: Is the "Test Tee" a sewer cleanout?

A: Yes.

Q: What ordinance revisions were required for bidding?

A: Council had to pass an ordinance specific to the project to permit a design-build method for contracting.

Q: Per parcel cost estimate was \$7,500. What was the actual cost per parcel for the Lakewood pilot?

A: \$7,411 per parcel

Q: What was total project cost?

A: \$1,649,950

Right of Way work - \$893,950.

Private Property work (work not 100% completed yet) - \$756,000.

Q: What was average cost per house?

A: \$7,411 per house.

Q: Was any smoke testing performed?

A: No.

Q: Is the City's pilot project public literature available on the City's website?

A: Visit: http://www.onelakewood.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/2015_EPACleanWaterPilotPrg.pdf

Q: Can the City make the ordinance for getting on private property available in the FAQ?

A: See below Lakewood Codified Ordinance (LCO) Chapter 913 - Wastewater Disposal and Chapter 917 – Illicit Discharge and Illegal Connection Control. Also it should be noted that each property owner that opted-in were required to sign a separate “Right of Entry” agreement.

LCO 913.08 POWERS AND AUTHORITY OF INSPECTORS.

(a) The City Engineer shall inspect the facilities of any user to ascertain whether the purpose of this chapter is being met and all requirements are being complied with. Persons or occupants of premises where wastewater is created or discharged shall allow the City Engineer ready access at all reasonable times to all parts of the premises for the purposes of inspection, observation, measurement, sampling, testing, record examination or in the performance of any of his duties. The City Engineer, OEPA and U.S. EPA shall have the right to set up on the user's property such devices as are necessary to conduct sampling, inspection, compliance monitoring and/or metering operations. Where a user has security measures in force which would require proper

identification and clearance before entry into their premises, the user shall make necessary arrangements with any security guards so that upon presentation of suitable identification, the City Engineer, OEPA and U.S. EPA shall be permitted to enter, without delay, for the purposes of performing their specific responsibilities.

(b) The City Engineer shall have no authority to inquire into any industrial processes beyond that point in the process having a direct bearing on the kind and source of discharge to the sewers or waterways or facilities for treatment.

(c) While performing the necessary work on private properties referred to in subsections (a) and (b) hereof, the City Engineer shall observe all safety rules applicable to the premises established by the company.

(d) The City Engineer, bearing proper credentials and identification, shall be permitted to enter all private properties through which the City holds a duly negotiated easement for the purposes of, but not limited to, inspection, observation, measurement, sampling, repair and maintenance of any portion of the wastewater disposal system lying within such easement. All entry and subsequent work, if any, on such easement, shall be done in full accordance with the terms of the duly negotiated easement pertaining to the private property involved.

(Ord. 98-84. Passed 9-17-84.)

LCO 917.08 MONITORING OF ILLICIT DISCHARGES AND ILLEGAL CONNECTIONS.

(a) Establishment of an Illicit Discharge and Illegal Connection Monitoring Program.

The City shall establish a program to detect and eliminate illicit discharges and illegal connections to the MS4. This program shall include the mapping of the MS4, including MS4 outfalls and household sewage treatment systems; the routine inspection of storm water outfalls to the MS4, and the systematic investigation of potential residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional facilities for the sources of any dry-weather flows found as the result of these inspections.

(b) Inspection of Residential, Commercial, Industrial, or Institutional Facilities.

(1) The City shall be permitted to enter and inspect facilities subject to this chapter as often as may be necessary to determine compliance with this chapter.

(2) The City shall have the right to establish at any facility subject to this chapter such devices as are necessary to conduct monitoring or sampling of the facility's storm water discharge, as determined by the City.

(3) The City shall have the right to require the facility owner or operator to install monitoring equipment as necessary. This sampling and monitoring equipment shall be maintained at all times in safe and property operating condition by the facility owner or operator at the owner or operator's expense. All devices used to measure storm water flow and quality shall be calibrated by the City to ensure their accuracy.

(4) Any temporary or permanent obstruction to safe and reasonable access to the facility to be inspected or sampled shall be promptly removed by the facility's owner or operator at the written or oral request of the City and shall not be replaced. The costs of clearing such access shall be borne by the facility owner or operator.

(5) Unreasonable delays in allowing the City access to a facility subject to this chapter for the purposes of illicit discharge inspection is a violation of this chapter.

(6) If the City is refused access to any part of the facility from which storm water is discharged, and the City demonstrates probable cause to believe that there may be a violation of

this chapter, or that there is a need to inspect or sample as part of an inspection and sampling program designed to verify compliance with this chapter or any order issued hereunder, or to protect the public health, safety, and welfare, the City may seek issuance of a search warrant, civil remedies including but not limited to injunctive relief, and criminal remedies from any court of appropriate jurisdiction.

(7) Any costs associated with these inspections shall be assessed to the facility owner or operator.

(Ord. 28-13. Passed 10-21-2013.)

Q: Did the funding agencies question spending public funds on private property?

A: The project was funded 100% by local funds. 90% City and 10% property owner. It should be noted that recently funding agencies are relaxing conditions for spending public dollars on private property. It is now acceptable (with terms and conditions) to use public funds for private property work through Ohio Public Works Commission funds and Ohio EPA Water Pollution Control Loan Fund.

Q: Were there any property owners that contested the work? If so, how was that handled?

A: Yes, the program manual provided the following: *If you contest the necessity of the corrections contemplated by the city, you will have 30 days from the date you receive notice within which to appeal to the city's Board of Building Standards and Building Appeals. Applications for appeals to the board cost \$25 and must be submitted with the city's Division of Housing and Building and the board will hear your appeal in accordance with Article XIV of the city's charter and any applicable rules and regulations.* The two property owners that contested were heard and their requests were denied. The owners contested the installation of sump pumps.

Q: What could we have done better to make the project more efficient?

A: The initial dye testing could have been performed by the Contractor rather than the City.

Q: During the follow-up with the homeowner's after construction, did they find value in the project?

A: Yes, in general, the homeowners were satisfied. They received upgraded infrastructure and only had to pay 10% of the costs.