

## City of Cedar Hills

### System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan


The City of Cedar Hills believes that one of the keys to preventing sanitary sewer overflows is to evaluate system capacity and to monitor flows throughout the system in order to ensure that capacities are not exceeded. Should a collection sub-system exceed the capacity of the pipes, the system will be immediately re-evaluated and corrective action taken. The following elements are all part of Cedar Hills' SECAP program.

1. Initial Capacity Modeling and Master Planning
2. Flow Monitoring
3. Surcharge Flow Analysis
4. Re-evaluation Modeling and Analysis
5. Flow Reduction Evaluation and Implementation
6. Capacity Increase Evaluation and Implementation

The actual implementation process associated with each of the elements above is shown in figure on the next page. This flow chart process forms the backbone of the SECAP.

#### Initial Capacity Evaluation

The City of Cedar Hills has performed an analysis and modeling of each critical subsystem contained within its collection system. Subsystems are segregated based on the branching of the collection system. Trunk lines and collector lines are evaluated until the system reaches a point where less than 400 residential dwelling unit equivalents (RE) are upstream of that point in the system. The 400 RE point was chosen based on the minimum slope requirements of the State of Utah. An 8-inch pipe constructed on minimum slope will carry the flow from 400 RE based on 3.2 persons per dwelling unit, 75 gpcd and a peaking factor of 4. The RE equivalent is based typical Utah information and assumes the peaking factor will account for a reasonable amount of inflow and infiltration. If an area is known to have, or flow metering identifies, a significant amount of inflow and infiltration, additional evaluation will be needed. In these areas the capacity of an 8-inch pipe system may be significantly reduced below 400 RE.



**SECAP Flow Chart**

In addition to developing an equivalent flow for a residential unit, consideration should also be given to time of concentration in the collection system. Based on typical diurnal flow patterns, if the transit time in the branch system is less than 2 hours, time of concentration can be ignored.

### Flow Monitoring

Sewer flow monitoring is performed by Timpanogos Special Service District in conjunction with the Public Works Department and consists of annually inspecting manholes at the trunk lines and main collector lines throughout the city. Timpanogos Special Service District records flows daily and calibrate the meters quarterly. Flows are recorded at 3 locations: CH #1 Temple Shadows, CH #2 4500 W, CH #3 North County BLVD

### Surcharge Flow Analysis

If any collection subsystem is identified as having any of the following problems the system will be evaluated to determine future action. These problems are:

1. Sanitary Sewer Overflow to the Environment
2. Sanitary Sewer Break Remaining in the Trench
3. Basement Backup
4. Observed Subsystem Surcharging.

The flow evaluation may result in multiple conclusions, some of which may require further action. Possible conclusions and their further action are listed below. This list is not inclusive nor does it require the specific action detailed. These are given as possible examples and will be used by the Public Works Department to determine correct future action.

### **Flow Reduction Evaluation**

Should excessive flows be identified during the surcharge analysis, the solution may be to proceed with an inflow and infiltration study with the ultimate goal of reducing flows. These flow reductions may be achieved by reconstruction of specific areas, internal spot repairs, removing illegal storm water or sump pump connections from homes or storm water systems, and system grouting. Tools used in flow reduction may include extensive in line camera inspection, smoke testing, dye testing, and increased inspection or flow monitoring.

### **Foreign Objects or Obstructions**

There are multiple foreign objects which may be found in sewers. These may include objects knocked into sewers during construction, illegally placed in sewer manholes, roots, grease and soaps, bellies in piping systems, etc. Each of these problems should be found during the backup investigation and a plan developed to insure the problem does not reoccur. Types of action may include increased cleaning frequency, spot repairs, greater pretreatment activity, lining of pipes, and other corrective actions which resolve the problem.

### **Allowable Surcharging**

Some piping systems may be able to accept surcharges without creating problems. Such systems may be deep and surcharging occurs below the level of basements or manhole rims, or they may be in areas where there are no connections. In such cases the resolution of the observed surcharge may just be additional monitoring.

### **Revised System Modeling**

Where piping system problems cannot be resolved in a less expensive way, the system may be further modeled to determine upgrade needs. Modeling should include known flow information and future projections. Since the system has been shown to have problems, further modeling should be more conservative in flow projections. Revised modeling should follow the guides given next.

#### *Re-evaluation Modeling and Analysis*

When a subsystem needs demonstrate unresolvable problems by less costly means, the subsystem should be re-modeled and required action determined. Revised modeling may show that flow reduction may still be viable or it may show that the system can allow current surcharge conditions. Most likely, however, the modeling will normally form the basis for construction to enlarge the subsystem capacity. Modeling should be done either by

1. Cedar Hills staff using commercially available software
2. Cedar Hills staff using spreadsheet models
3. Engineering firms using available software or spreadsheets.

It is important to insure the modeling is comprehensive and includes all the potential flow sources. While the current area zoning and land use planning should be used in the

model development, care should be taken to discuss possible changes with appropriate officials. Where possible zoning changes appear likely, the model should be re-run with the revised zoning alternatives. Once a resolution has been selected, the resulting project should be placed on the capital improvement plan (CIP).

### Capacity Increase Evaluation and Implementation

The capacity evaluation should be expedited based on the impact of the problem on the environment and the possible repeat of the overflow/backup/surcharging. Details on prioritization are given in the next section.

Systems requiring additional capacity should be engineered for expansion by qualified staff or engineering consultants. Project design should be based on acceptable engineering standards and should comply with State of Utah regulations found in R317-3. Easements should be obtained, where needed and the design should include an analysis of other utilities in the vicinity. Design review should be done by the applicable regulatory agency, as appropriate. A design report should be prepared for each project. Where appropriate, the subsystem modeling may be substituted for the design report.

Finalized projects should be placed on the CIP.

### System Improvement Prioritization

The priority for improvement should follow the following general guidelines:

#### **High Priority Projects**

When there is significant potential for sanitary sewer overflows, or frequent basement backups, the improvement should be considered a high priority and any available budget should be allocated to the project.

#### **Medium Priority Projects**

Where the problem is infrequent and the possibility exists that it may not repeat in the near future, the priority for correction is medium. Medium priority projects may be delayed until appropriate budget is available or the priority is adjusted to high priority. Should an SSO or basement backup repeat in the same area, the priority should be immediately revised.

#### **Low Priority Projects**

If the observed problem is infrequent, there is possibility that it may not repeat in the near future and the possibility that increased flow in the subsystem is low, the correct priority is low. Low priority projects will be placed in the budget process and evaluated against other needs. These projects will eventually be completed, but the work is not prioritized above plant and equipment needs.

### Capital Improvement Plan

The CIP is part of the Cedar Hills' budgeting process to insure sufficient revenue to address identified weaknesses in the sanitary sewer system. Items which have been identified as needing a structural fix are placed on the CIP list and the cost for each estimated. Sources of funding should be identified for all high priority projects so that SSO's or other failures do not re-occur. Forecasts of available funding for medium and low priority projects should be made to facilitate future revenue needs.