Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination



Monroe County Department of Environmental Services Michael J. Garland, P.E., Director

Sources of Illicit Discharges

- Sanitary wastewater
- Effluent from septic tanks
- Car wash wastewater's
- Improper oil disposal
- Radiator flushing disposal
- Laundry wastewater's
- Spills from roadway accidents
- Improper disposal of auto and household toxics
- Swimming Pools



Its about the Outfall







Cross Connections *Sanitary to Storm*



37,000 Gallons of Wastewater / Day

Outfall Inspection Techniques

Visual Inspection

• Sampling

Outfall Inspections

- Odors
- Stains
- Color
- Foam
- Oily Sheen
- Floatables
- Impacted Vegetation
- Dry Weather Flows

Follow the Water !!!

Outfall Monitoring Observation Sheet

| Outfall Number/Address | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Observers Name | Town | | | |
| Date | _ Time | | | |
| Weather Conditions:** Date of last rainfall or significant snow melt (if known) | | | | |
| | Or, Circle the one that applies | | | |
| 1. | No Rain/Snow Melt in past 72 hrs | | | |
| 2. No Rain/Snow Melt in past 48 hrs | | | | |
| 3. Recent Rain/Snow Melt within 24 hrs | | | | |
| 4. | Currently Raining or Snow Melt | | | |
| Approximate Pipe Diameter | Name of Receiving Stream | | | |
| Adjacent Land Use: (circle one) | | | | |
| Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Agricultural, Parkland/Open Space | | | | |
| At the time of the observation, is the outfall pipe: discharging? Yes / No Visable/Submerged | | | | |
| Please describe the outfall by circling the appropriate condition(s) within each category: | | | | |
| Odor: Color: | Chemical, Chlorine, Musty, Harsh, Sewage, Rotten Eggs, None Muddy, Cloudy, Grey, Green, Brown, Blue, Red, Clear, Other | | | |
| Floatables: | Oily, Rainbow, Trash, Foam, Toilet Paper, None, Other | | | |
| Vegetation: | Excessive Growth, Inhibited Growth, Dead Plants, Looks Normal | | | |
| Structural Damage: | Cracks, Deterioration, Peeling Paint, Other | | | |
| Deposits/Stains: | Dark Staining, White Deposit, Other | | | |
| Estimate the depth of flow in the outfall pipe (inches) | | | | |

Other Observations:

Sample Data Collection:

Overall Outfall Characterization:

_ Unlikely ___Suspect (one strong indicator) ___Potential (two or more indicators) ____ Obvious





Visual inspection can be an efficient method













Tracking Suspicious Flows or a Positive Sample Result

- Trace the upstream collection area of the outfall
- Drive the collection area and make visual observations looking for potential sources of the illicit flow







Dye Testing

Hundreds of Dye Tests Performed





Televising





Smoke Testing



An Illicit Discharge



Example of Staining

71

25.



Sewer Connection Records

SEWER CONNECTION DETAILS DISTRICT OWNED PRIVATE OWNED Size Comb. 🗍 Mat Depth Comb. [] Mat Size 6 Depth 0 San. Size Depth Mat San. [] Hat Size (đ Depth a Storm 🗌 Size Depth_ Storm [] lat Size Mat Depth CAST IRCH SAN. 3/9/88 CAST IRCH 4" DATE STORM 3/9/88 MAT. CAST IF 3N SIZE 4" C.O. INSTALLED DEPTH #261 2 STORY FRAME DWELLING GARAGE SAVITARY STORM 4" CAST IRON CLEANOUT CAST IRON CLEANOUT LEMOYN AVE.

Cleanouts with 4 inch Laterals

Sanitary waste pipe

Sump Pump Line

Sanitary Cleanout

Storm Cleanout

2007/08/21 11:59



New Subdivision Built in 2004

2 of 7 Homes Cross-Connected



Septic Systems





Discharge to Roadside Ditch

Sector States of

Drain

Dead Grass



Illicit Discharge Can Make a Difference

Slater Creek Stormwater Assessment

303d Stream

| Table 5 Summary of NY State Biomonitoring | | | | |
|---|------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Site | Date | Status | Comments | |
| Mt Read | 1999 | Severely Impacted | Sewage Strongly Indicated | |
| | 2002 | Severely Impacted | Sewage Strongly Indicated | |
| Britton | 2000 | Moderately Impacted | Consistent with Organic Waste Inputs | |
| Latta | 2000 | Slightly Impacted | Consistent with Organic Waste Inputs | |

One of Top 10 Most impaired Stream s in NYS

6 Months of Monitoring

Slater Creek Station 1 Ecoli MPN June - December 2014



Figure ?? Weekly Concentrations of Ecoli at Ling Rd Station 1




Great Lakes Protection Fund Research Project

New optical technology to efficiently detect and locate sewage contamination







Eliminating the Discharge

- Identify the source
- Notify property owner
- Warning Letters
- Investigation crew determine exact cause
- Pursue contractor/builder if possible
- DES perform residential repair











The Future of IDDE **Exfiltration and** Hotspots

Ex-filtration: Sanitary Waste Leaking into Storm

- Sanitary pipe above the storm
- Broken main or lateral
- High Ecoli levels, no floatables/solids
- May or may not have staining, odor
- High Ecoli during wet weather





Example of Exfiltration







09/09/09 13:21 74.1 FT.

CROSS CONECTION









| Cost to Repair Typical Cross Connections | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------|-------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 64 Maynard St | 87 Camo | len St | 45 Clio St | | | | |
| Investigation | \$ | - \$ | - \$ | - | | | | |
| Dye Test | \$ | - \$ | - \$ | 203.90 | | | | |
| Televising | \$ 187. | 70 \$ | 131.44 \$ | 120.45 | | | | |
| Repair | \$ 2,237.9 | 99\$ | 1,998.07 \$ | 4,064.42 | | | | |
| Restoration | \$ 666.9 | 90 \$ | 303.37 \$ | 1,376.94 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Total | \$ 3,092.5 | 59 \$ | 2,432.88 \$ | 5,525.47 | | | | |

| Cost to Repair Exfiltration | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|-------|-----------|--|--|--|
| | Labor & Material | | Vehicle | | Total | | | | |
| Investigation | \$ | - | | | \$ | - | | | |
| Dye test | \$ | - | | | \$ | - | | | |
| Televising | \$ | 188.96 | \$ | 325.00 | \$ | 513.96 | | | |
| Repair | \$ | 10,001.05 | \$ | 9,891.89 | \$ | 19,892.94 | | | |
| Restoration | \$ | 4,833.00 | | | \$ | 4,833.00 | | | |
| | | | | | \$ | - | | | |
| Total | \$ | 15,023.01 | \$ | 10,216.89 | \$ | 25,239.90 | | | |

Transitory Discharges









Inlets are the Link



Carpet Cleaner Discharge to CB

and the second of

Washing Kitchen Mats Outside

-











Pumping Sewage to the Street





Overflowing Grease Interceptor

Poor Housekeeping Behind the Bldg

fforona

1



1 100 1

Stain Indicates Dumping


Implications of the Illicit Discharge Ordinance

- Specific language prohibiting illicit connections, and illegal discharges
- Ensures access for inspection and monitoring
- BMP's
- May require septic system inspections?
- Penalties for non-compliance
- Enforcement by MS4





Section XIII. Watercourse Protection

Maintain watercourse within the property in a manner that prevents illicit discharges and keeps watercourse free of trash, debris or other items that would pollute, contaminate, retard flow



IDDE Common Deficiency: Failure to conduct ORI during dry weather

| | able 20: Field Screening for an IDDE Program |
|--|--|
| Step | Strategies |
| Step 1. Acquire necessary mapping, equipment and staff | Use basic street maps or detailed maps from initial assessment Minimal field equipment required; use a portable spectrophotometer if desired Two staff per crew with basic field training required; more specialized staff or training is optional |
| Step 2. Determine when to conduct field screening | During dry season and leaf off conditions After a dry period of at least 48 hours Low groundwater levels |

("EPA's IDDE Publication" Page 65)

<u>IDDE Common Deficiency:</u> Failure to identify and eliminate illicit connections/discharges



Example ORI:

- Dry weather flow
- Staining/Deposits
- Green algae growth

Example Next Steps:

- Sampling
- Tracking
- Televising
- Dye Testing



| | r the reporting period ending March 9, 2 0 1 4 |
|---|--|
| If submitting this form as part of a jo | int report on behalf of a coalition leave SPDES ID blank. |
| Name of MS4/Coalition Stormwater Coalition of Monroe (| SPDES ID Denuty N Y R 2 0 |
| Minimum Control Measure 3 | . Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination |
| The information in this section is being reporte | d (check one): |
| ○ On behalf of an individual MS4 ● On behalf of a coalition How many MS4s contributed t | o this report? 25 |
| 1. Enter the number and approx. perce | nt of outfalls mapped: 2 8 4 3 # 9 8 % |
| 2. How many of these outfalls have been reporting period (outfall reconnaissa | a screened for dry weather discharges during this nce inventory)? |
| 3.a.What types of generating sites/sewer: reporting period? | sheds were targeted for inspection during this |
| O Auto Recyclers | Landscaping (Irrigation) |
| Building Maintenance | O Marinas |
| O Churches | Metal Plateing Operations |
| Commercial Carwashes | Outdoor Fluid Storage |
| Commercial Laundry/Dry Cleaners | Parking Lot Maintenance |
| Construction Vehicle Washouts | Printing |
| Cross-Connections | Residential Carwashing |
| O Distribution Centers | Restaurants |
| Food Processing Facilities | Schools and Universities |
| Garbage Truck Washouts | Septic Maintenance |
| O Hospitals | Swimming Pools |
| O Improper RV Waste Disposal | Vehicle Fueling |
| Industrial Process Water | Vehicle Maint / Repair Shops |
| • Other: Outfalls may | • Nobe 1 n c 1 u d e a 1 1 a b o v e |
| | e store store stills addre solle solle solle store bobe b |

| 5953169299 |
|---|
| MS4 Annual Report Form |
| This report is being submitted for the reporting period ending March 9, 2 0 1 4. If submitting this form as part of a joint report on behalf of a coalition leave SPDES ID blank. |
| Name of MS4/Coalition Stormwater Coalition of Monroe County N Y R 2 0 |
| 3.b.What types of illicit discharges have been found during this reporting period? |
| Broken Lines From Sanitary Sewer Industrial Connections |
| Cross Connections Inflow/Infiltration |
| Failing Septic Systems O Pump Station Failure |
| Floor Drains Connected To Storm Sewers Sanitary Sewer Overflows |
| Illegal Dumping O Straight Pipe Sewer Discharges |
| O Other: None |
| |
| 5. How many illicit discharges have been confirmed during this reporting period? 6. How many illicit discharges/illegal connections have been eliminated during this reporting period? |
| 7. Has the storm sewershed mapping been completed in this reporting period? O Yes No If No, approximately what percent was completed in this reporting period? 7 5 % |
| 8. Is the above information available in GIS? ● Yes ○ No Is this information available on the web? ○ Yes ● No If Yes, provide URL(s); ○ Yes ● No |
| Please provide specific address of page where map(s) can be accessed - not home page. |
| |
| |
| URL |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| This report is being submitted for the super- | Report Form | 0 2 0 1 4 | 3 |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| This report is being submitted for the report | | | 1 |
| If submitting this form as part of a joint report o | | | 9 |
| | SPDES I | 1 1 1 1 | - |
| Name of MS4/Coalition Stormseater Coalition of Monroe Coapity | N I E | 20 | ĻЦ |
| Minimum Control 1 | Measures 4 and 5. | | |
| Construction Site and Pos | | l l | |
| Th | 20210 | | |
| The information in this section is being reported (check o | ше). | | |
| On behalf of an individual MS4 On behalf of a coalition | | | |
| How many MS4s contributed to this repo | ort? 2 5 | | |
| | | | |
| 1a. Has each MS4 contributing to this report adop | | | |
| mechanism that provides equivalent protection | to the NYS SPDES Genera | | |
| Stormenter Discharges from Construction Act | initiar? | Vac | 0.300 |
| Stormwater Discharges from Construction Act | tivities? | • Yes | O No |
| | | n en | |
| lb.Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law fo | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management | d that the la and Erosion | w is |
| 1b.Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney or | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY | d that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap | w is a and |
| 1b.Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY | d that the la and Erosion | w is a and |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY @ | ed that the la t and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No | w is a and |
| 1b.Has each Town, City and/or Village contributin equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney or | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY o f equivalent NYS Sample Lo | ed that the la t and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No | wis and ONT |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY o f equivalent NYS Sample Lo | ed that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. | wis and ONT |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY of equivalent NYS Sample Lo 0 09/2004 | ed that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. | wis and ONT |
| Has each Town, City and/or Village contributin equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law fo Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? If Yes, Towns, Cities and Villages provide date of Does your MS4/Coalition have a SWPPP review | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY of equivalent NYS Sample Lo O 09/2004 w procedure in place? | ed that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. 03/2006 Yes | wis and ONT ONT |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contribution equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? If Yes, Towns, Cities and Villages provide date of | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY of equivalent NYS Sample Lo O 09/2004 w procedure in place? | ed that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. 03/2006 Yes | wis and ONT ONT |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contributin equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law fo Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? If Yes, Towns, Cities and Villages provide date of 2. Does your MS4/Coalition have a SWPPP review 3. How many Construction Stormwater Pollution reviewed in this reporting period? | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY of equivalent NYS Sample Lo O 09/2004 w procedure in place? Prevention Plans (SWPPP | ed that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. • 03/2006 • Yes s) have been | wis and ONT ONT ON0 |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contributinequivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law for Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? If Yes, Towns, Cities and Villages provide date of 2. Does your MS4/Coalition have a SWPPP review? 3. How many Construction Stormwater Pollution reviewed in this reporting period? 4. Does your MS4/Coalition have a mechanism for the storm of the storm | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY of equivalent NYS Sample Lo O 09/2004 w procedure in place? I Prevention Plans (SWPPP or receipt and consideration | ed that the la and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. • 03/2006 • Yes s) have been of public | wis and ONT ONT ON0 |
| 1b. Has each Town, City and/or Village contributin equivalent to a NYSDEC Sample Local Law fo Sediment Control through either an attorney of Analysis Workbook? If Yes, Towns, Cities and Villages provide date of 2. Does your MS4/Coalition have a SWPPP review 3. How many Construction Stormwater Pollution reviewed in this reporting period? | ng to this report documente or Stormwater Management erfification or using the NY of equivalent NYS Sample Lo 0 09/2004 w procedure in place? I Prevention Plans (SWPPP or receipt and consideration | ed that the la t and Erosion SDEC Gap Yes O No cal Law. • 03/2006 • Yes s) have been of public Yes O No | wis and ONT ONT ON0 |

3951056357

6. Identify which of the following types of enforcement actions you used during the reporting period for construction activities, indicate the number of actions, or note those for which you do not have authority:



Illicit Discharges.....They're Out There

Andy Sansone Monroe County Environmental Services 585-753-7684 asansone@monroecounty.gov

