## PRIVATE PROPERTY PROGRAM OUESTIONNAIRE

The WEF Collection System Committee is primarily interested in successfully operating programs for work performed on the privately-owned portion of the lateral line and inflow/infiltration sources located on private properties. We want to assemble policy descriptions, enabling resolutions or ordinances, funding details, public education/information materials, standard design or construction details, etc., for programs that have proven to be successful. This specific program documentation will be made available to other wastewater utilities through a virtual private property program on-line library.

While we are interested in "planned" programs, we want to first concentrate on programs that have been demonstrated to have been effectively implemented. Planned programs will be included in the virtual library after the program has been implemented and actual experience with the program is available.

Descriptions of private property programs that were previously implemented, but considered "failed" or only "partially successful" will be included if the reasons for the problems with the program have been identified and can be included as a "lessons learned" component of the virtual library.

<b>Interview Conducted by</b>	WEF Representative: Name:
	Date:
1. General Information	
Utility Name & Location:	Aberdeen WWTP, Aberdeen, WA
Contact Name & Details:	Mike Myers, Wastewater Systems Manager
	1205 W. State St.
	Aberdeen, WA 98520
Utility Characteristics:	Number of Customers
	Number of Taps
	Total Miles of Public Sanitary Sewers (separated sewers and combined sewers)
	O Miles of Public Combined Sewers (sanitary only, not including storm sewers) (estimate % of system that is combined if total miles is unavailable or unknown)
	Are basements (thus potentially sump pump connections) typical in your area? (indicate yes or no)
	Municipal_ Utility Type (municipal government, special purpose district, private utility, etc.)
2. Lateral Definition Private Lateral Definition: (check definition that appl	x Building to ROW/Easement Line Only  es)  The city is responsible from the inspection tee in ROW to the sewer main  (Note if (& how) utility treats laterals in easements differently than laterals in ROWs
	Building To Tap on Sewer Main Line
	Other (Specify details)
	(Note if (& how) utility treats residential building laterals differently than commercial building laterals – this may affect responses to subsequent questions)
Cleanouts: (check all that apply)	Usually Required Exists
	x At building
	x At ROW The city requires an inspection tee at the property line.

1

At easement
3. Lateral Program Description
Type of Lateral Program (check all that apply and describe program – try to be brief in program description, but add separate sheets as needed). If utility operates more than one private lateral program, it may be preferable to complete a separate questionnaire form for the remaining questions for each of those private lateral programs.
Lateral Maintenance (e.g., cleaning, root control, etc.):
The homeowner is responsible up to the city's inspection tee.
Lateral Repair (e.g., point repairs, etc.):
The homeowner is responsible up to the city's inspection tee.
Lateral Replacement:
The homeowner is responsible up to the city's inspection tee.
$\underline{x}$ I/I Control (Specify type; e.g., cleanout caps, sump pump disconnect, downspout/yard drain disconnect, backflow preventer installation, etc. If basements are typical in area, where are building owners directed to connect the foundation or tile drain lines that have to be disconnected?):
Prior to 1999, the homeowners were responsible for I/I on their property. Beginning in 1999, the city tried incentives to encourage homeowners to fix I/I problems. The property owners were either reimbursed for work done (up to \$300) or the city did the work needed to correct the I/I. Drains of different types were redirected to storm lines or road curbs which ran to street drains.
Lateral Reconnects (Specify conditions; e.g., when utility relocates main, etc. Specify special situations; e.g., sewers under building(s) requiring building plumbing changes or extensive lateral relocation):
<u>x</u> Lateral Inspections (Specify conditions; e.g., point of sale, special utility project, etc.):
City staff inspect new installations, replacements and repairs.
<u>x</u> New Connection Permitting (e.g., special coordination with Building Codes, etc.):
The city Building Department issues permits.
x New Connection Enforcement Mechanisms:
City staff inspect new connections. The city stipulates requirements for how to make a new connection.
4. Lateral Program Implementation
Implementation Date: 1977-92; 1992-99; 1999-Present Why implemented? Federal funding; State Shellfish Grant; Consent Decree (e.g., consent order/decree, reduce CSOs/SSOs, obtain capacity to alleviate sewer moratorium, more cost-effective than "old" program, etc.)
Ongoing Program? Or End Date: Why Ended? Between 1977 and 1999 the focus was lateral replacement for achieving I/I reduction. Between 1999 and the Present the focus has been to eliminate large sources

of I/I. Example: One three story house with a well landscaped yard had both a very leaky side sewer and a large roof. Redirecting the storm water and replacing the side sewer cost \$16,000, but eliminated 84,000 gpd during a heavy rain(>1 inch). What Legal Authority was Required to Implement the Lateral Program? Resolution (check all that apply, inquire if electronic copy is available for virtual library; inquire if utility type [i.e., municipality vs. x\_\_\_\_ Ordinance district] affects the necessary legal authority) \_\_\_\_\_ State Enabling Legislation Other (Specify) Prior to 1999 the property owner paid for replacing, repairing lateral, and disconnecting sump pumps. After 1999 the city reimbursed property owners for work done by a certain date. Those property owners that did not cooperate pain double sewer bills. In 1999 letters were sent to 380 property owners who were found to be illegally draining I/I to city sewers. City staff smoke tested the whole city twice in 1999. About 30 property owners paid double sewer bills until the cooperated. Most of the 380 property owners who previously received letters were not eligible for incentives. 5. Lateral Program Funding Who Pays: \_\_\_\_ Utility \_\_\_\_ Property Owner \_\_\_\_ Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_ (other could include grants, loans, low & moderate income programs, block development grants, etc.; inquire if electronic copy is available for virtual library) Funding Description: Prior to 1999 the homeowner paid for replacing, repairing lateral, and disconnecting or redirecting sump pumps. After 1999 the city reimbursed for work done or did the job to correct I/I. 6. Program Construction Who Does the Work: Utility Internal Forces \_\_\_\_\_ Utility Selects & Pays Contractor \_\_\_\_\_ Property Owner But Only From Utility List Property Owner Other (Specify:) Construction Description: See above Construction Details: Are standard details/specifications used? \_\_\_\_\_ Are electronic copies available? \_\_\_\_\_ Describe/List Details: 7. Public Education/Information Program Are electronic copies available? \_\_\_\_\_ How is Lateral Program Publicized? \_\_\_\_\_ Door hangers Bill stuffers Are electronic copies available? \_\_\_ Meetings Are electronic copies available? Are electronic copies available? Brochures

X	(e.g., provide proper	Are electronic copies available? rty owner with CCTV still shot of lateral in cone] problem, provide picture of field loc ved, etc.)	
	Other (Specify)	Are electronic copies available?	
Additional Description of Material(s):			
8. Lessons Learned			
What Would You Do Differently? During utilized as inspectors to make sure the work Require all sump pumps be connected to the connected to the storm drainage system.	was done correctly. Re	equire all laterals in the city be updated to p	plastic pipe.
What Performance Measures Are/Were Use (e.g., plant flow reduction, CSO/SSC reduction moratorium lifted, etc.,) Describe results of Over the years the city staff have reduced In the WWTP. In the last ten years average dawas as low as 3.50 mgd in 2000 (only 62.5 The 1999 incentives were the first step. Readditional storm water pumps strategically 125,000,000 gpd to over 250,000,000 gpd. heavy rains and significantly reduced the fle However, in 2006 the city experienced a twin I/I of 6.28 mgd for the year.	tion, basement backup raction, basement backup raction, basement backup raction by about 700, aily flow to the WWTP inches of rain that year) directing sump pump flow around the city has increased in the additional pumps a ow to the WWTP. I/I has backup ractions in the way of the way o	eduction, service call (roots, etc.,) reductions se performance measures:  000 gpd, as evidenced by base dry weather has been reduced from 6.4 mgd to 4.0 mgd.  Our focus since 1999 has been on reducing two from 135 sump pumps has helped. Instead the city's storm water pumping capaced most completely eliminated street flooding has been reduced from 6.36 mgd (1998) to 3.	r flows at . Total I/I ng Inflow. ttalling 14 city from g during 3.39 (2000).
Lessons Learned: Inflow has always been solving Inflow problems and managing the			ources
9. Follow-Up Electronic Submittal			
Willing to Send Electronic Materials to WE (list all items utility agrees to send below sh			
Is utility willing to provide a contact (e.g., 6 name due to possible privacy concerns] for			bly not a
WEF Tracking List of Materials:			