



# Haverhill

Paul J. Jessel, Collection System Supervisor  
Water/Wastewater Division  
Phone: 978-374-2382 Fax: 978-521-4083  
pjessel@haverhillwater.com

April 9, 2010

Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 1  
One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (SEW)  
Boston, MA 02114-2023  
Attn: Joy Hilton

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection  
Northeast Regional Office  
Bureau of Resource Protection  
205B Lowell Street  
Wilmington, MA 01887  
Attn: Nihar Mohanty

Subject: City of Haverhill NPDES Permit # MA0101621  
Infiltration Inflow Report 2009

Dear Ms. Hilton and Mr. Mohanty:

In accordance with the City of Haverhill's NPDES Permit # **MA0101621**, we are providing this status report as required in Part I.F.3 of the Permit. Please note the items in *italic* are taken directly from the Permit followed by a response.

---

*The permittee shall implement a plan to control infiltration and inflow (I/I) to the separate sewer system. The plan shall be kept onsite and shall be made available upon request by EPA or MassDEP. The plan shall describe the permittee's program for preventing infiltration/inflow related effluent limit violations, and all unauthorized discharges of wastewater, including overflows and by-passes due to infiltration/inflow.*

---

The plan shall include:

- 
- An ongoing program to identify and remove sources of infiltration and inflow. The program shall include the necessary funding level and the source(s) of funding.*
-



# Haverhill

Paul J. Jessel, Collection System Supervisor  
Water/Wastewater Division  
Phone: 978-374-2382 Fax: 978-521-4083  
pjessel@haverhillwater.com

- 
- *An inflow identification and control program that focuses on the disconnection and redirection of illegal sump pumps and roof down spouts. Priority should be given to removal of public and private inflow sources that are upstream from, and potentially contribute to, known areas of sewer system backups and/or overflows.*
- 

- 
- *Identification and prioritization of areas that will provide increase aquifer recharge as the results of reduction/elimination of infiltration and inflow to the system.*
- 

- 
- *An educational outreach program for all aspects of I/I control, particularly private inflow.*
- 

## Reporting Requirements:

---

*A summary report of all actions taken to minimize I/I during the previous calendar year shall be submitted to EPA and the MassDEP annually, by April 30<sup>th</sup> of each year. The summary report shall, at a minimum, include:*

---

- *A map and a description of inspection and maintenance activities conducted and corrective actions taken during the previous year.*
- 
- *Expenditures for any infiltration/inflow related maintenance activities and corrective actions taken during the previous year.*
- 
- *A map with areas identified for I/I-related investigation/action in the coming year.*
- 
- *A report of any infiltration/inflow related corrective actions taken as a result of unauthorized discharges reported pursuant to 314 CMR 3.19(20) and reported pursuant to the Unauthorized Discharges section of this permit.*
- 

The enclosed document follows a similar methodology as the 2008 submission, which documents that the Infiltration/ Inflow for 2009 was **1,807 gpdidm**, far less than the allowable 4,000 gpdidm.

After your review of the enclosed document the City has demonstrated, by the submittal of this report, that we are not experiencing excessive infiltration/inflow. Therefore, we respectfully request a waiver of Part I.F.3 of the Permit



# Haverhill

Paul J. Jessel, Collection System Supervisor  
Water/Wastewater Division  
Phone: 978-374-2382 Fax: 978-521-4083  
pjessel@haverhillwater.com

Your attention in this matter is greatly appreciated.

If you require additional information, please call me at 978-374-2382.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Jessel  
Collection System Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Mike Stankovich, DPW Director  
Robert Ward, Deputy DPW Director  
Fred Haffty WWTP Facility Manager

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Haverhill calculated the City Wide Annual Infiltration/Inflow rates using two methods. Method 1 was to breakout the wet days and dry days to arrive at I/I rate 2,789 gpdidm for the wet weather days and 2,328 gpdidm for dry days. Method 2 was a calculation for the entire year with a citywide annual infiltration/inflow rates 1,807 gpdidm.

Furthermore, the minimum rehabilitation cost is \$48.4 Million and the maximum rehabilitation is \$186 Million. The loan payment for 20 years at 2% interest on \$48 Million is \$2,962,040 per year. This far exceeds the annual \$78,301 transportation and treatment costs.

Analysis of the City of Haverhill collection system flows for 2009 clearly indicates the non-existence of excessive infiltration/inflow. All design literature and case studies show that Haverhill's collection system is operating within acceptable quantities for infiltration/inflow.

The City of Haverhill has a Geographic Informational System, GIS, completed in 2006. GIS has been updated to include all new subdivisions sewer segments. All sewer segments were exported from GIS and summarize by sewer diameter. In 2008, the total number of sewer miles was 173; in 2009, this figure is now 176 miles. GIS is continually updated. Each year GIS shall be exported and summarize base upon sewer diameter.

The findings of the analysis clearly demonstrate that excessive infiltration/inflow does not exist in the City of Haverhill's collection system. Therefore, the evaluation phase of the study has not been undertaken.

# SECTION 1: COLLECTION SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

## 1.1. Description of Wastewater Collection System

The City of Haverhill owns and operates a wastewater collection system that conveys wastewater to the City's wastewater treatment plant, which is located on the southern shore of the Merrimack River. Portions of this collection system have been in service since the late 1800s and portions convey both stormwater and wastewater.

The piping network consists of gravity pipe ranging in size from 8 to 72-inches in diameter and force mains ranging in size from 4 to 42-inches. Approximately 37 percent of the service area has combined sewers. The majority of the combined portion of the collection system is located in the older, more densely populated downtown area, along the Merrimack River. Areas further north or south of the Merrimack River tend to be newer and generally include separate sanitary and storm sewers.

## 1.2. Wastewater Treatment Plant

### 1.2.1. CSO Phase I Upgrades

Completed in June 2006 comprise the following major components:

- **Main Wastewater Pump Station Upgrades Now Capable of Pumping 60 Mgd.**

A pump station conveys all flow from the terminus of the Bradford interceptor to the treatment plant. This station is designed for a peak flow of 60 mgd with 3 pumps in operation and a fourth pump is available as a standby pump. Connecting the pump station to the WWTP is a 42-inch force main with a length of approximately 3000 feet.

- **Modulating Influent Gate to Control Flow to the Main Wastewater Pump Station**

The potential exists that during extreme high flow and high river elevations the main pump station could become flooded. The modulating gate was installed to prevent flooding from occurring.

- **Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition, (SCADA)**

SCADA provides computer monitoring and control of critical wastewater systems from the main control room and computer terminals throughout the treatment plant. System components are monitored and can be queried through Microsoft Excel Historian. Treatment plant influent flows are monitored at the Parshall flume and were queried for this Infiltration/Inflow report.

- **CSO Wet Weather Upgrades**

Throughout the mid 1990's to 2008, the City of Haverhill implemented on a program of raising CSO weirs throughout the City, which captured 92 percent of the wet weather events.

Phase I CSO required the City to further treat CSO by upgrading the treatment plant's main pumping station to pump 60 million gallon a day, (MGD); wet weather by-pass for 40 MGD maximum; aerated grit facility to capture excessive grit and protect treatment plant equipment; modified five CSO

regulators along the South side of the Merrimack River (Bradford side). With these upgrades, the City now captures over 97 percent of the wet weather events in Haverhill.

**Table 1.1: Wastewater Plant Design Parameters**

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Value</b>
Influent Flow (mgd)	
Average	18.1
Maximum Day	39.2
Peak Rate (mgd)	60
Biochemical oxygen demand (lb/d)	17,650
Total Suspended Solids (lb/d)	18,560

## SECTION 2: FLOW COMPONENTS

Sanitary sewer system flow has three components: Base Flow, Infiltration and Inflow.

### 2.1. BASE FLOW

Base flow can be determined in several ways with varying degrees of accuracy. Water consumption data adjusted for seasonal peaks, irrigation, unmetered connections, and water meter inaccuracies are often used. Also, minimum flow rates can be measured to estimate infiltration rates, which then can be subtracted from metered flow during dry weather conditions.

#### 2.1.1. DATA SUMMARY WASTEWATER

The City's of Haverhill has recently completed a Geographic Information System, (GIS), which was used to obtain the sewer diameters and lengths. **TABLE 2-1: CITY OF HAVERHILL SUMMARY SEWERS WITH CALCULATED INFILTRATION**, gives a summary for the different sewer diameters and sewer lengths with calculated infiltration rates for the entire City.

Sewer services are estimated to be a 6-inch diameter with an average length of 80 feet. The following is the calculation use to arrive at the sewer service:

**Equation 2-1:** (Sewer service length) \*(Number of sewer account) = Total footage

**Example 2-1:** 80\*17,298 =1,383,840 feet

TABLE 2-1: CITY OF HAVERHILL SUMMARY SEWERS WITH CALCULATED INFILTRATION INFLOW

**CITY OF HAVERHILL SUMMARY CALCULATED  
INFILTRATION RATES**

<b>Diameter</b>	<b>Total Footage</b>	<b>Miles</b>	<b>Total I/I (gpdidm)</b>
8	446,898	84.64	1,223,855
10	77,397	14.66	264,946
12	187,612	35.53	180
14	2,403	0.46	230
15	50,571	9.58	259,673
16	114	0.02	622
18	32,647	6.18	201,163
20	6,754	1.28	46,239
21	12,566	2.38	90,335
22	2,007	0.38	15,111
24	30,179	5.72	247,944
26	459	0.09	3,767
30	24,433	4.63	250,922
32	2,061	0.39	22,581
36	10,823	2.05	133,383
42	2,884	0.55	41,461
48	11,101	2.10	182,405
50	5,251	0.99	89,870
54	4,978	0.94	92,016
60	6,246	1.18	128,285
66	7,167	1.36	161,917
72	1,611	0.31	39,707
84	588	0.11	16,906
6	1,383,840	262.09	2,842,290

**Totals                      926,750                      176                      6,355,807**

Haverhill's annual I/I rate for 2009 (gpdidm)	<u>1,807</u>
Average sewer service diam. (in.)	6
Estimate sewer service length (ft)	80

## **2.1.2 CITY OF HAVERHILL WATER/WASTEWATER ACCOUNTS**

Water and Wastewater meter readings were obtained from the Water and Wastewater Billing Office. These records were broken out into Residential and Commercial accounts that have City water and City sewerage. In addition Commercial and Residential accounts that have City water but **no** City sewerage. This analysis revealed that currently the City of Haverhill has 17,298 Commercial and Residential sewer accounts.

## **2.1.3. CSO PHASE I STUDY**

Phase I of the Combine Sewer Overflow study required the City to developed a Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA), system, completed in June 2006. The SCADA system was queried to obtain daily flows to the Haverhill Water Pollution Control Facility (HWPCF) for the entire calendar year of 2009.

## **2.1.4. WASTEWATER ACCOUNTS NOT INCLUDED**

HWPCF receives flows from the Town of Groveland, which is pumped into the HWPCF's force main. HWPCF no longer receives flows from HPB and has been eliminated from the calculation. Table 2.2 shows the daily flow rate for Groveland. These flows are subtracted from the HWPCF daily flow rates.

## Table 2.2 Groveland Daily Flows

### GROVELAND FLOWS: 2009

MONTH		MGD	Daily Gals.
JAN.	31	11.3021	364,584
FEB.	28	6.4247	229,454
MAR.	31	8.7828	283,316
APRIL	30	7.2838	242,793
MAY	31	6.2786	202,535
JUNE	30	5.4931	183,103
JULY	31	8.4816	273,600
AUG.	31	6.5216	210,374
SEPT.	30	5.9580	198,600
OCT.	31	6.4576	208,310
NOV.	30	5.2177	173,923
DEC.	31	9.1399	294,835
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>87.3415</b>	<b>MG</b>

## 2.1.5. WASTEWATER FLOW SUMMARY

**Table 2-3: Wastewater Flows After Groveland Flow Is Subtracted**

Date	WWTP TOTAL MGD	Groveland Flows	WWTP FINAL MGD
1/1/2009	15.66	364,584	<b>15.30</b>
1/2/2009	15.01	364,584	<b>14.65</b>
1/3/2009	14.38	364,584	<b>14.02</b>
1/4/2009	13.84	364,584	<b>13.48</b>
1/5/2009	13.47	364,584	<b>13.11</b>
1/6/2009	12.76	364,584	<b>12.40</b>
1/7/2009	16.74	364,584	<b>16.38</b>
1/8/2009	14.9	364,584	<b>14.54</b>
1/9/2009	13.04	364,584	<b>12.68</b>
1/10/2009	12.57	364,584	<b>12.21</b>
1/11/2009	12.71	364,584	<b>12.35</b>
1/12/2009	12.11	364,584	<b>11.75</b>
1/13/2009	12	364,584	<b>11.64</b>
1/14/2009	11.62	364,584	<b>11.26</b>
1/15/2009	11.19	364,584	<b>10.83</b>
1/16/2009	11.03	364,584	<b>10.67</b>
1/17/2009	10.81	364,584	<b>10.45</b>
1/18/2009	10.7	364,584	<b>10.34</b>
1/19/2009	11.06	364,584	<b>10.70</b>
1/20/2009	10.74	364,584	<b>10.38</b>
1/21/2009	10.57	364,584	<b>10.21</b>
1/22/2009	10.48	364,584	<b>10.12</b>
1/23/2009	10.27	364,584	<b>9.91</b>
1/24/2009	10.25	364,584	<b>9.89</b>
1/25/2009	9.8	364,584	<b>9.44</b>
1/26/2009	9.52	364,584	<b>9.16</b>
1/27/2009	9.59	364,584	<b>9.23</b>
1/28/2009	11.29	364,584	<b>10.93</b>
1/29/2009	11.72	364,584	<b>11.36</b>
1/30/2009	10.35	364,584	<b>9.99</b>
1/31/2009	10.22	364,584	<b>9.86</b>

Table 2.4 below summarizes the entire flow distribution for the City of Haverhill.

**Table 2-4: Wastewater Flow Summary 2009**

Annual HWPCF Total Flow, (MG)	<u>4,512.05</u>
Average Flow (MGD)	<u>12.36</u>
HWPCF Base flow (MGD)	<u>5.224</u>
I/I Est. Rate(MGD)	<u>7.138</u>

## 2.2. DATA SUMMARY WATER TREATMENT PLANT

Water pumped from the Water Treatment Plant was captured utilizing SCADA. Daily consumption data was queried with the following equation:

**Equation 2-2:** Daily Finished Water Flow pump daily **minus** storage tank level increasing **plus** storage tank decreases. This equation was used to develop the daily total water consumption rate for all residents regardless if the resident was on city sewerage.

To derive water consumption flows, which are connected to the City's sewerage system, **Table 2-5** and **Equation 2-3** were developed.

**Equation: 2-3:** Total Actual Water Demand **minus** (Total Actual Water Demand **multiplied by** Variance applied to each day for unaccounted water flows) **multiplied by** (Percentage, base upon flow data, on City sewer).

**Example 2-2: January 1, 2009:**  $[6.26 - (6.26 * .0004)] * 8790 = 5.996$  MGD water flow consumed and on city sewerage.

This equation was used for each day, which is the City's **BASE FLOW** to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. From this **BASE FLOW** infiltration and inflow amounts can be calculated. The Average Base flow for Calendar year 2009 is 5.224 MGD.

**Table 2-5: Total Water Flow Distribution Gallons For 2009**

<b>Total Water Flow Distributions Gallons for 2009</b>			
	<b>Gallons</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Daily MG</b>
Total Gallons pump from Water Treatment	<b>1,989,604,228</b>		5.45
Unaccounted water usage gallons	270,586,175		0.74
Unaccounted water from ASR 2008 report		<b>13.60%</b>	
Total gallon use after unaccounted water is subtracted	<b>1,719,018,053</b>		4.71
Total Gallons Commercial <b>Not</b> on Sewer	83,252,400		0.23
Total Gallons Residential <b>Not</b> on Sewer	138,737,544		0.38
<b>Total Not on Sewer</b>	<b>221,989,944</b>		0.61
Total Gallons Commercial on Sewer	703,200,036		1.93
Total Gallons Residential On Sewer	870,806,640		2.39
Total Public Property on sewer not billed	73,747,564		0.20
<b>Total Gallons on Sewer</b>	<b>1,647,754,240</b>		4.51
Percentage, base upon flow data, on City sewer		<b>95.85%</b>	
Percentage Not on City Sewer system		12.91%	
Variance applied to each day for water accounts not on sewer		0.04%	
Water flow data was obtained from John D'Aoust Water Treatment Facility Manager.			

In order to calculate population served, which is on City sewerage, Table: 2-6 was developed.

**Table 2-6: Population Served On City's Sewerage System**

Type of Residential Service Connection (single-family, two-family, etc.)	Total # of service connections to each Type	# Of households per service connection (1 for single family, 2 for two-family, etc.)	# of households
Single- Family: 13123	15033	1	15033
Two-Family: 1910	1897	2	3794
Three Family: 458	466	3	1398
Four or More Family 358	353	4	1412
		<b>Totals</b>	<b>21,637</b>
Wastewater bills 17,298 household out of 20,226		% on sewer	85.35%
		<b>Total on sewer</b>	<b>18,468</b>
<b># of Households</b>	<b>Average Household Size from DHCD website</b>		<b>Population Served</b>
	2.51		<b>46,355</b>
<b>Per Captia Flow Rate</b>	<b>gal./per captia</b>	<b>Population Served</b>	
	<b>112.69</b>	<b>46,355</b>	

This calculation follows a similar calculation taken from Haverhill's 2008 **Public Water Supply Annual Statistical Report, ASR 2008, (PWSID # 312800)** and is adjusted base upon of water pumped from the Water Treatment Plant to buildings that are connected to City sewerage system. This table reveals that 46,355 residents are connected to the City sewer system

**2.3. INFILTRATION**

Infiltration is the water entering a collection system from groundwater sources, through defective pipes, leaking pipe joints, connections and manhole bases and walls. Water entering the system through this route is usually very clean and pollution free.

### 2.3.1 DRY WEATHER

The City defines dry weather as a **Minimum 72 Hours No Rainfall Over 0.1 Inches**. Utilizing this definition, the annual wet days were recorded. The City of Haverhill records rainfall utilizing a Rainwise Rain Gage, which is recorded in 15-minute intervals. This gage is used for the City's annual CSO report, Haverhill experienced 166 wet days, and 199 dry weather days for the 2009 calendar year.

**Equation 2-4:** WWTP Flow MGD minus WWTP Base Flow, (BASE FLOW from Equation 2-2).

**Example 2-3:** 1/1/2009 15.30 MGD - 5.996 MGD = 9.30 MGD

Based upon **Equation 2-4** infiltration was calculated for all days which dry weather occurred, 220-days of dry weather. Dry weather is defined as minimum 72 hours no rainfall over 0.1-inches.

**Table 2-7: Dry Weather Conditions 2009**

<b>Total Dry Weather (MGD):</b>	<b>2,192.14</b>
<b>2009 Average base upon 199 days dry weather (MGD):</b>	<b>11.02</b>
<b>2009 Annual average base upon 365 days (MGD):</b>	<b>6.01</b>
<b>Citywide I/I rate using for 199 days 11.02 MGD (gpdidm):</b>	<b>2.969</b>
<b>Number of Dry Weather (days):</b>	<b>199</b>

### 2.4. INFLOW

Inflow is water discharged to a collection system from roof leaders, cellars, yard drains, combined sewer overflows, catch basins, manhole covers, storm water and/or surface runoff.

#### 2.4.1. INFLOW CALCULATION

Based upon **Equation 2-2** inflow was calculated for all days which wet weather occurred, 166-days for calendar year 2009.

**Equation 2-5:** WWTP Flow MGD - WWTP Base Flow, (BASE FLOW from Equation 2-3).

**Example 2-4:** 1/3/2009 14.02 MGD - 4.919 MGD = 9.10 MGD

**Table 2-8: Wet Weather Conditions 2009**

<b>SWMM CSO 2009 (MG):</b>	<b>62.35</b>
<b>Total Wet Weather (MGD):</b>	<b>1,526.53</b>
<b>2009 Average base upon 166 days wet weather (MGD):</b>	<b>9.20</b>
<b>2009 Annual average base upon 365 days (MGD):</b>	<b>4.18</b>
<b>Citywide I/I wet weather rate using 166 days 9.16 MGD (gpdidm):</b>	<b>2,468</b>
<b>Wet Weather (days):</b>	<b>166</b>

#### **2.4.2. COMBINE SEWER OVERFLOW CSO**

The City has submitted to EPA and DEP “SWMM Model Calibration and Evaluation of Existing Conditions” report prepared by CDM dated July 1998. Total CSO flow volume for calendar year 2009 is **62.35 MG**. This CSO flow was added to the inflow section of this analysis.

#### **2.5. EXCESSIVE INFILTRATION/INFLOW**

The quantity of infiltration and inflow, which can be economically eliminated from the collection system by rehabilitation, as determined by a cost effectiveness analysis that compares the costs for transportation and treatment of the infiltration/inflow.

According to “DEP Guidelines for Performing Infiltration/Inflow Analyses and Sewer System Evaluation Survey” Revised January 1993, excessive infiltration is 4,000 gallons per day per inch-mile (gpdidm). As can be seen in Table 2.1 Haverhill’s total I/I is 1,807 **gpdidm**, which clearly demonstrates Haverhill does not have excessive infiltration/inflow.

# SECTION 3: INFILTRATION/INFLOW

## 3.1. TRANSPORTATION OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

According to EXISTING SEWER EVALUATION & REHABILITATION WEF Manual of Practice FD-6 “ To determine whether I/I is excessive, rough cost comparison between transportation and treatment or elimination of I/I through corrective action are made. If I/I is excessive, the next phase should be the sewer system evaluation survey.”

### 3.1.1. VEHICULAR COSTS

The City repairs Collection Division vehicles under Lift Station Account, (LSTA).

### 3.1.2. LABORER COSTS

The City of Haverhill currently has the following Job Positions, which deal directly with Collection system

Job Position	Current Staff Size
Collection System Supervisor	1
Senior Collection System operator	1
Collection System Operators	4
Highway Department	2

An analysis was conducted for calendar year for all positions mention above, which included any overtime. Base upon this analysis total labor for 2009 equals  
**\$319,502.94**

### 3.1.3. GASOLINE

Gasoline usage summary was obtain for each vehicle for Wastewater and broken out to services for Collection Division. The following vehicles are use for the collection division S-10 range pick-up Truck; S-12 F250 Utility Truck; S-13 F350 Utility Truck; S-5 Diesel Mack catch Basin Cleaner, and S-11 diesel Sewer Jet Machine. These records revealed total gasoline usage to be **\$10,532.16**.

### 3.1.4. POWER COSTS

National Grid bills for the City main pumping station located at 40 South Mill Street revealed a total power requirement of **\$152,651.32**. To pump the City sewerage it was estimates that 75% of the power was allocated to pumping.

### 3.1.5. COLLECTION SYSTEM MAINTENANCE

The City of Haverhill has one account devoted to the collections system called Lift Station Account, (LSTA). Review for calendar year 2008 revealed **\$60,000** was spent on Collection System Maintenance.

### 3.1.6. DEBT SERVICE

The City has committed to the CSO Phase I and associated treatment plant upgrades, which costs \$20.1- million. The annual debt service equals \$1,307,000.

### 3.2. TRANSPORTATION OPERATION & MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR INFILTRATION/INFLOW

Table 3-1: shows the transportation costs to pump infiltration and inflow to the HWPCF base upon energy and operation and maintenance of the collection system.

**Table 3-1: Infiltration/Inflow O & M Costs**

#### TOTAL WASTEWATER TRANSPORTATION O& M COSTS

ITEM	2009	COMMENTS
VECHICULAR	\$29,329	base cost, independent of flow
LABOR	\$484,431	base cost, independent of flow
Gasoline	\$10,532	
ENERGY	\$180,808	75% of cost is flow driven
CS Maint	\$60,000	
Interest on CS Capital	\$1,307,274	Capital Projects for Collection System and CSO phase I
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b><u>\$2,072,374</u></b>	
days/year	365	
avg. Q, gpd.	12,361,777	average daily plant flow includes inflow
factor	1000	
cost/1000gals/day	<b><u>\$0.459</u></b>	wastewater transportation costs per 1000gals/day

#### ACTUAL COSTS TO PUMP WASTEWATER

ENERGY	\$180,808	75% of cost is flow driven
	\$135,606	annual cost to actually pump wastewater
days/year	365	
avg. Q, gpd.	12,361,777	average daily plant flow
factor	1000	
cost/1000gals/day	<b><u>\$0.030</u></b>	wastewater transportation costs per 1000gals/day

#### COST TO PUMP INFILTRATION/INFLOW

cost/1000gals/day	<b><u>\$0.030</u></b>	wastewater transportation costs per 1000gals/day
I/I in 1000gals/day	7,137.904	Avg. annual I/I in 1000gals/day
days/year	365	
cost to pump I/I	<b><u>\$78,301</u></b>	annual cost to pump I/I wastewater

### 3.3. REHABILITATION COSTS

According to “*EPA Handbook Sewer System Infrastructure Analysis and Rehabilitation*” 1991, Chapter 6 provides sewer rehabilitation costs for the following type of sewer rehabilitation: Excavation; Grouting; Sliplining using HDPE; Sliplining using PE pipe; Sliplining using Thermosetting Resin; Cured-in-Place.

Table 3-2 lists these rehabilitation costs for 1991 costs. The City of Haverhill has different sewer diameters that were not included in EPA’s Handbook. Those sewer diameters (in blue) are estimated costs to further refine the City’s expected rehabilitation costs. Not included are manhole rehabilitation costs. The minimum rehabilitation cost is \$48.4 Million and the maximum rehabilitation is \$186 Million. The loan payment for 20 years at 2% interest on \$48 Million is \$2,962,040 per year. This far exceeds the **\$78,301** transportation and treatment costs.

TABLE 3-2: CITY OF HAVERHILLSEWER REHABILITATION COSTS

Dia.	Total Footage	Excavation Costs		Grouting Costs		Sliplining with HDPE		Sliplining with PE Pipe		Sliplining Thermosetting Resin		Cured in Place		Min (\$/LF)	MAX (\$/LF)	Min Costs	MAX Costs
		Low (\$/LF)	High (\$/LF)	Low (\$/LF)	High (\$/LF)	Low (\$/LF)	High (\$/LF)	Low (\$/LF)	High (\$/LF)	Low (\$/LF)	High (\$/LF)	Low (\$/LF)	High (\$/LF)				
8	437,336	\$ 50	\$ 75	\$ 24	\$ 36	\$ 17	\$ 33	\$ 40	\$ 60	\$ 25	\$ 30	\$ 45	\$ 60	\$ 9	\$ 75	\$3,936,020	\$32,800,167
10	78,774	\$ 55	\$ 85	\$ 28	\$ 42	\$ 25	\$ 45	\$ 45	\$ 70	\$ 33	\$ 43	\$ 60	\$ 75	\$ 17	\$ 85	\$1,339,166	\$6,695,831
12	185,079	\$ 65	\$ 95	\$ 32	\$ 48	\$ 27	\$ 48	\$ 50	\$ 80	\$ 40	\$ 55	\$ 68	\$ 100	\$ 25	\$ 100	\$4,626,969	\$18,507,877
14	2,336	\$ 70	\$ 105	\$ 34	\$ 51	\$ 27	\$ 51	\$ 55	\$ 80	\$ 45	\$ 58	\$ 75	\$ 125	\$ 27	\$ 125	\$61,914	\$292,045
15	49,808	\$ 73	\$ 108	\$ 36	\$ 54	\$ 28	\$ 51	\$ 58	\$ 83	\$ 50	\$ 62	\$ 80	\$ 131	\$ 28	\$ 131	\$1,394,619	\$6,524,823
16	418	\$ 75	\$ 110	\$ 38	\$ 57	\$ 30	\$ 55	\$ 60	\$ 95	\$ 55	\$ 65	\$ 85	\$ 138	\$ 30	\$ 138	\$12,536	\$57,668
18	32,907	\$ 80	\$ 120	\$ 40	\$ 60	\$ 33	\$ 68	\$ 65	\$ 80	\$ 63	\$ 75	\$ 90	\$ 145	\$ 33	\$ 145	\$1,069,469	\$4,771,475
20	7,118	\$ 95	\$ 145	\$ 49	\$ 81	\$ 35	\$ 70	\$ 69	\$ 92	\$ 70	\$ 85	\$ 95	\$ 153	\$ 35	\$ 153	\$249,146	\$1,085,564
21	12,441	\$ 105	\$ 160	\$ 68	\$ 102	\$ 42	\$ 82	\$ 72	\$ 103	\$ 75	\$ 87	\$ 100	\$ 160	\$ 42	\$ 160	\$522,502	\$1,990,484
22	2,007	\$ 115	\$ 175	\$ 72	\$ 90	\$ 49	\$ 94	\$ 75	\$ 115	\$ 80	\$ 88	\$ 105	\$ 175	\$ 49	\$ 175	\$98,321	\$351,146
24	30,477	\$ 125	\$ 190	\$ 76	\$ 95	\$ 56	\$ 106	\$ 95	\$ 135	\$ 85	\$ 90	\$ 110	\$ 190	\$ 56	\$ 190	\$1,706,706	\$5,790,610
30	23,950	\$ 135	\$ 205	\$ 96	\$ 144	\$ 63	\$ 118	\$ 115	\$ 155	\$ 100	\$ 130	\$ 135	\$ 220	\$ 63	\$ 220	\$1,508,843	\$5,268,975
32	1,538	\$ 160	\$ 225	\$ 110	\$ 165	\$ 70	\$ 130	\$ 135	\$ 175	\$ 115	\$ 140	\$ 140	\$ 250	\$ 70	\$ 250	\$107,680	\$384,571
36	10,993	\$ 185	\$ 245	\$ 124	\$ 186	\$ 80	\$ 155	\$ 155	\$ 190	\$ 130	\$ 150	\$ 155	\$ 270	\$ 80	\$ 270	\$879,464	\$2,968,190
42	2,884	\$ 210	\$ 265	NA	NA	\$ 93	\$ 193	\$ 190	\$ 230	\$ 145	\$ 175	\$ 165	\$ 305	\$ 93	\$ 305	\$266,746	\$879,541
48	11,060	\$ 235	\$ 285	NA	NA	\$ 105	\$ 230	\$ 220	\$ 275	\$ 170	\$ 200	\$ 185	\$ 350	\$ 105	\$ 350	\$1,161,324	\$3,871,079
50	5,251	\$ 238	\$ 288	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 240	\$ 302	\$ 180	\$ 208	\$ 195	\$ 370	\$ 180	\$ 370	\$945,113	\$1,942,733
54	4,950	\$ 240	\$ 295	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 265	\$ 329	\$ 190	\$ 215	\$ 205	\$ 390	\$ 190	\$ 390	\$940,522	\$1,930,545
60	6,248	\$ 275	\$ 340	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 290	\$ 355	\$ 215	\$ 255	NA	NA	\$ 215	\$ 355	\$1,343,375	\$2,218,131
66	7,058	\$ 310	\$ 395	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 333	\$ 403	\$ 215	\$ 275	NA	NA	\$ 215	\$ 403	\$1,517,372	\$2,844,189
72	1,419	\$ 365	\$ 450	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 375	\$ 460	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 365	\$ 460	\$517,809	\$652,582
84	588	\$ 415	\$ 505	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 457	\$ 494	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$ 415	\$ 505	\$244,000	\$296,915
6	1,199,200	\$ 45	\$ 70	\$ 20	\$ 30	NA	NA	\$ 35	\$ 60	NA	NA	\$ 30	\$ 45	\$ 20	\$ 70	\$23,984,000	\$83,944,000
<b>Totals:</b>															\$48,433,614	\$186,069,140	

Minimum Rehab finance annual costs: (\$2,962,040.89)

### 3.4. CONCLUSIONS

The City of Haverhill has clearly demonstrated that there is no infiltration/inflow problem. DEP states that excessive I/I is greater than **4,000 gpdidm**, the I/I rate for the City of Haverhill is **1,807 gpdidm** for 2009 calendar year.

Analysis of the City's collection system for 2009 clearly indicates the non-existence of excessive infiltration/inflow. All design literature and case studies shows that the City's collection system to be operating within acceptable quantities for infiltration/inflow. Therefore, the evaluation phase of the study has not been undertaken.

Transportation and treatment costs are **\$78,301** compared to the rehabilitation costs of **\$2,292,040** per year.

### 3.5. WAIVER REQUEST

Since, we have demonstrated by the submittal of this report, that we are not experiencing excessive infiltration/inflow, we respectfully request a waiver of Part 1.F.3 of the City's NPDES Permit.

### 3.6. REFERENCES

"Sewer System Infrastructure Analysis and Rehabilitation" United States Environmental Protection Agency EPA/625/6-91/030 October 1991 Chapter 6 Sewer System Rehabilitation

"DEP Guidelines for Performing Infiltration/Inflow Analyses and Sewer System Evaluation Survey" Revised January, 1993

"Manual of Practice FD-6; *Existing Sewer Evaluation & Rehabilitation*. Water Pollution Control Federation (1983)