UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 1
5 POST OFFICE SQUARE, SUITE 100
BOSTON, MA 02109-3912

Memorandum

Date: June 7, 2012

Subject: Nashua WWTF – Comments on Information/Data sent in response to April 24, 2012 information request

From: Meridith Timony

Figure 1 (Flow Schematic)

Wet Weather Flow Treatment Facility (WFTF) – are influent and effluent flows monitored at the "influent and effluent sampling locations"?

Where is the flow which bypasses secondary monitored? On diagram it looks like the flow monitoring site is after the primary clarifiers, but before the bypass diversion structure.

Effluent flow monitoring location looks like it would only capture the flow through secondary, not bypassed flow (or is it at the point where the flows blend?) Are flows through the secondary and primary only (bypass) monitored separately?

Bypass and Wet Weather Flow Treatment Facility (WWFTF) Data

Bypasses of Secondary Treatment – data suggests that bypasses occur before flow through secondary treatment is maximized per the HFMP (HFMP indicates flow through secondary is to be maintained through 32 MGD. (peak flow capacity is 38 MGD, why do they bypass at 32 MGD?)). Is this done as on a case-by-case basis to preserve the integrity of the treatment system?

Wet weather flow treatment facility (WWFTF) data sheets indicate that the facility was activated on days for which no corresponding bypass data exists. Is there a reason for this (start up time of WWFTF, effluent quality of WWFTF is better than blended/bypassed effluent, etc.). What is the order of operations during wet weather (maximize flow through secondary, maximize flow bypassing secondary, then have flows in excess of primary capacity go through the WWFTF?).

Values reported for the bypassed flow in Nashua's response (Table 1, bypass data) differs from that reported on DMRS (ex., January 2009, bypassed flow = 5.7 MGD. The value reported for bypassed flow per even reported in Table 1 of Nashua's response is 19.5)

It appears as though there are bottlenecks within the collection system, upstream from the POTW (ex., CSO discharges occurring on days when there were no bypasses of secondary treatment/activation of the WWFTF).

I reviewed Monthly Operating Reports which were attached to DMRs submitted for the 2009-2010 reporting period. It appears as though there are discrepancies between the maximum daily flows on the MORs and the maximum daily flows reported on the DMRs (ex., Jan 2010, Feb 2010, March 2010).

CSO/Rainfall Data

This data looks ok.