

---

Water



# **A Methodological Approach to an Economic Analysis of the Beneficial Outcomes of Water Quality Improvements from Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrading and Combined Sewer Overflow Controls**

## **Environmental Benefits Analysis Series**

A Methodological Approach to an Economic Analysis of the  
Beneficial Outcomes of Water Quality Improvements from  
Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrading and Combined Sewer  
Overflow Controls

Summary

September 1985  
Economic Studies Branch, ERAD  
Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The purpose of this report is to demonstrate the feasibility and usefulness of an economic analysis of the beneficial outcomes of water quality improvements from implementing controls on multiple sources of pollution. This case study on Boston Harbor serves to (1) demonstrate the application of a variety of economic benefit estimation techniques and (2) to assess the reliability and limitations of each. It is intended as an example of how to perform benefit analysis. The pollution abatement considered in this report results from upgrading two sewage treatment plants (STPs) on Deer and Nut Islands and controlling combined sewer overflows (CSOs) in Dorchester Bay, the Neponset and Charles Rivers, Quincy Bay and the Inner Harbor.

### I. Findings

#### A. Monetizable Benefits

1. Swimming benefits and all kinds of recreational benefits are the largest source of monetizable benefits. In the commercial fishing category, we could only estimate shellfishing benefits. Nonetheless, the recreational categories appear to be especially important for urbanized areas such as Boston Harbor, where local population density and demand for scarce nearby recreation rates are high.
2. Recreational fishing and boating benefits are substantial but are limited by the present and future availability of marinas and facilities, a constraint on increased participation not related to pollution control.
3. Intrinsic benefits include aesthetic benefits and benefits such as existence and option value, which are not necessarily related to direct use of the water resource. While difficult to accurately measure, these benefits can be substantial.
4. The geographic location of the pollution sources, in relation to the recreation sites, is an important factor in determining the type and level of benefits that would be generated by controlling the different point sources of pollution. Swimming and shellfishing benefits are the most sensitive to the geographic location of the pollution loadings.

B. Non-monetizable benefits

1. Commercial fishing benefits include shellfishing only. Although up to 2.6 million pounds of lobster and 28.4 million pounds of fish are landed annually in the port of Boston, benefits related to this activity were not calculated on account of the difficulty in assessing how these migratory species would be affected by the improved water quality.
2. Health benefits include only the reduction in risks of swimming in water contaminated with fecal coliforms and the consumption of shellfish similarly contaminated. The risks from the consumption of fish and lobster that have bioaccumulated toxics in their tissues could not be estimated given the lack of adequate data.
3. A potentially large category of benefits not captured in this economic analysis is ecological benefits (benefits related to preservation and restoration of the harbor and bay habitats). Since the volume of loadings from the STPs is over 30 times greater than that for the CSOs, the omission of the benefits that could result from the restoration of these highly productive habitats, is a serious limitation in the economic evaluation of controlling the two STPs' loadings.

C. CSO Benefits and Costs

1. This economic analysis clearly indicates that in addition to the legally required secondary treatment for the two STPs {or a federally approved ocean outfall in lieu of secondary treatment}, the CSO problem must be addressed if full use restoration and health benefits are to be realized in Boston Harbor.
2. The CSO Planning Areas have the following benefits and costs:
  - a. The estimated annual use restoration and health benefits for Dorchester Bay, Neponset River, Constitution Beach (\$7.2 - \$11.1 million) clearly exceed the annualized costs (6.1 million).
  - b. The estimated annual use restoration and health benefits for controlling Quincy's storm sewers' effluent (\$5.4 - 9.2 million) most likely exceeds the annualized costs (\$.2 -\$6.0 million).
  - c. The estimated annual use restoration and intrinsic benefits for the Charles River Basin are

significant (\$3.2 - \$7.2 million) but are less than the annualized costs (\$10.4 million).

- d. The Inner Harbor CSO plan (without Constitution Beach) provides the least benefits (aesthetic and commercial use benefits from reduced odor and elimination of floatables, which were not monetizable) and the highest annualized costs (\$16.6 million). Furthermore, there exists uncertainty regarding the impacts, if any, that these discharges have on the other planning areas' uses.

D. STPs

The economic assessment of bringing the Deer and Nut Island STPs into compliance with the CWA (either upgrading to full secondary treatment or upgrading with an ocean outfall in lieu of secondary treatment) is limited due to an inability to quantify and monetize potentially significant beneficial impacts (ecological, health, and commercial fishing benefits) that could result from the implementation of such controls.

II. Recommendations

1. In addition to the legally required secondary treatment for the two STPs (or a federally approved ocean outfall in lieu of full secondary treatment), the CSO problem must be addressed if full use restoration and health benefits are to be realized in Boston Harbor.
2. In determining the funding priorities for CSO projects, decision-makers should include the consideration of net benefits as one criteria in evaluating and ranking project proposals. Since CSO controls provide heterogeneous beneficial impacts (swimming, boating, recreational, and commercial fishing, and health), net benefits analysis provides a useful tool for evaluating projects with different costs and different bundles of beneficial impacts. Such information would assist decision-makers in allocating scarce funds to those projects that would maximize use restoration and health benefits.

A Methodological Approach to  
an Economic Analysis of the Beneficial Outcomes  
of Water Quality Improvements from Sewage  
Treatment Plant Upgrading and Combined Sewer  
Overflow Controls

Prepared for

Office of Policy Analysis  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Washington, D.C.

by

Meta Systems Inc  
10 Holworthy Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

## Preface

This report is submitted by Meta Systems Inc in fulfillment of EPA contract #68-01-6596 700-E. This report estimates the benefits and costs of upgrading two sewage treatment plants and of constructing combined sewer overflow controls in the Boston Harbor area.

We are grateful for the review and comments of Clark Binkley, Yale University; A. Myrick Freeman, Bowdoin College; and Leon Abbas, North Carolina State University. We wish to give special thanks to the following people who provided technical assistance and/or data for the study:

Peter Harrington--Massachusetts Department of Environmental Quality Engineering;

Michael Hickey and David Chadwick--Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries;

Jean M. Haggerty, Al Ferullo, and Paul DiPetro--Metropolitan District Commission;

F. Williams Sieling, Mark M. Bundy, and Christopher Bonzack--Maryland Department of Natural Resources;

Dana Wallace--Maine Department of Marine Resources:

While we are indebted to all of the above for their contributions, final responsibility for the analysis, results and conclusions rests solely with the authors.

## Table of Contents

<u>Section Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
1. Summary and Conclusions		
1.1	Pollution Sources . . . . .	1-3
1.2	Water Quality . . . . .	1-12
1.3	Benefit Categories and Receptors . . . . .	1-15
1.4	Summary of Study Findings . . . . .	1-17
1.5	Specific Benefit Estimates . . . . .	1-24
1.5.1	Recreation. . . . .	1-24
1.5.2	Health. . . . .	1-26
1.5.3	Commercial Fisheries . . . . .	1-26
1.5.4	Intrinsic Benefits . . . . .	1-27
1.5.5	Ecological Impacts . . . . .	1-27
1.5.6	Secondary Effects . . . . .	1-28
1.5.7	Charles River Basin . . . . .	1-29
1.6	Guide to the Report. . . . .	1-29
2. Municipal Sewage Treatment Plant Operations, Options and Water Quality Impacts		
2.1	Current STP Performance . . . . .	2-3
2.2	STP Options and Costs . . . . .	2-9
2.3	Areas Impacted by STP Discharges . . . . .	2-11
	References . . . . .	2-19
3. Combined Sewer Overflow Control in Boston Harbor		
3.1	Scope of the Combined Sewer Overflow Problem . . . . .	3-1
3.2	Neponset River Estuary . . . . .	3-6
3.3	Dorchester Bay . . . . .	3-10
3.4	Inner Harbor . . . . .	3-13
3.5	Charles River Basin . . . . .	3-15
3.6	Quincy Storm Sewers . . . . .	3-16
3.7	Summary of Options . . . . .	3-19
	References . . . . .	3-23
4. Water Quality Impacts		
4.1	Water Quality Impacts of STP Dischargers . . . . .	4-1
4.2	Water Quality Impacts of Combined Sewer Overflows . . .	4-4
4.3	Estimated Water Quality Impacts of the STP and CS Treatment Options . . . . .	4-6
	References . . . . .	4-9
5. Approaches to Measuring Benefits from Water Quality Improvement		
5.1	Theoretical Concepts . . . . .	5-1
5.2	Study Methodology. . . . .	5-9
	References . . . . .	5-11

Table of Contents  
(continued)

<u>Section Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
6. Recreation Benefits		
6.1	Data Needs and Data Bases . . . . .	6-4
6.1.1	Swimming Attendance . . . . .	6-4
6.1.2	Recreation Studies . . . . .	6-8
6.1.3	Water Quality Data for Logit Model . . . . .	6-9
6.1.4	User (Unit) Day Value . . . . .	6-10
6.1.5	Water Quality Impact . . . . .	6-11
6.2	Benefits . . . . .	6-12
6.2.1	Swimming--Increase in Participation . . . . .	6-13
6.2.1.1	Regional Participation Model . . . . .	6-14
6.2.1.2	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	6-17
6.2.1.3	Higher Valued Experience . . . . .	6-18
6.2.1.4	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	6-19
6.2.2	Travel Cost Model--Conditional Logit Analysis . .	6-20
6.2.2.1	Methodology . . . . .	6-21
6.2.2.2	The Conditional Multinomial Logit Model .	6-25
6.2.2.3	Model Results . . . . .	6-30
6.2.2.4	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	6-32
6.2.2.5	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	6-36
6.2.3	Swimming--Beach Closings . . . . .	6-39
6.2.3.1	Boston Harbor Beaches . . . . .	6-40
6.2.3.2	Nantasket Beach . . . . .	6-41
6.2.3.3	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	6-44
6.2.3.4	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	6-44
6.3	Recreational Boating . . . . .	6-45
6.3.1	Increased Participation . . . . .	6-46
6.3.2	Benefits Estimates . . . . .	6-48
6.3.3	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	6-48
- 6.4	Recreational Fishing . . . . .	6-50
6.4.1	Components of Recreational Fishing . . . . .	6-51
6.4.2	Benefits Estimates . . . . .	6-53
6.4.3	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	6-55
6.5	Boston Harbor Islands . . . . .	6-55
6.5.1	Increased Participation . . . . .	6-56
6.5.2	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	6-57
6.6	Summary of Recreation Benefits . . . . .	6-57
References	. . . . .	6-61

Table of Contents  
(continued)

<u>Section Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
7. Health Benefits		
7.1	Swimming-related Health Benefits . . . . .	7-2
7.1.1	Benefit Measurement Approach . . . . .	7-2
7.1.2	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	7-6
7.1.3	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	7-6
7.2	Shellfish Consumption . . . . .	7-8
References	. . . . .	7-11
8. Commercial Fisheries Benefits		
8.1	Lobstering and Finfinishing . . . . .	8-2
8.2	Commercial Shellfishing Industry . . . . .	8-7
8.2.1	Pollution Abatement Impacts . . . . .	8-10
8.2.2	Benefit Assessment Methodology . . . . .	8-14
8.2.3	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	8-17
8.2.4	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	8-25
References	. . . . .	8-27
9. Intrinsic Benefits		
9.1	Methodology . . . . .	9-3
9.2	Benefits Estimates . . . . .	9-4
9.3	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	9-5
References	. . . . .	9-6
10. Ecological Effects		
10.1	CSO and Secondary Treatment Options . . . . .	10-1
10.2	Ocean Outfall Option . . . . .	10-5
10.2.1	Plankton . . . . .	10-6
10.2.2	Benthos . . . . .	10-7
10.2.3	Finfish/Lobsters . . . . .	10-7
10.2.4	Endangered or Threatened Species . . . . .	10-10
References	. . . . .	10-12
11. Secondary Effects		
11.1	Methodology . . . . .	11-2
11.2	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	11-4
11.3	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	11-12
References	. . . . .	11-13

Table of Contents  
(continued)

<u>Section Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
12. Charles River Basin Benefits		
12.1	The Charles River . . . . .	12-1
12.2	Boating . . . . .	12-4
12.2.1	Methodology . . . . .	12-5
12.2.2	Benefit Estimates . . . . .	12-7
12.2.3	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	12-8
12.3	Intrinsic (Non-User) and User Benefits . . . . .	12-10
12.3.1	Benefit Methodology and Estimates . . . . .	12-11
12.3.2	Limits of Analysis . . . . .	12-12
12.4	Summary . . . . .	12-13
	References . . . . .	12-14

**Appendices:**

A.	Correlating STP Performance and Operation to Boston Harbor Water Quality	
A.1	Influent, Effluent, and Sludge Characteristics . . . . .	A-2
A.2.	Pollutant Transport from STP Outfalls . . . . .	A-4
	References . . . . .	A-11
B.	Recreation Benefit Computations	
B.1	Seasonal Swimming--Increased Participation . . . . .	B-1
B.2	Seasonal Beach Capacity and Current Attendance . . . . .	B-3
B.3	Lower Bound Estimate for Increased Participation . . . . .	B-5
B.4	The Conditional Multinomial Logit Model, in Brief . . . . .	B-7
B.5	Beach Closings . . . . .	B-12
B.6	User Day Values . . . . .	B-13
B.7	Sources of Recreation Data . . . . .	B-17
	References . . . . .	B-27
C.	Swimming Health Benefit Calculations	
C.1	Number of Cases of Gastrointestinal Illness . . . . .	C-1
C.2	Reduced Cases of Gastrointestinal Illness . . . . .	C-2
C.3	Population at Risk . . . . .	C-4
	References . . . . .	C-8
D.	Commercial Fisheries Benefit Computations	
D.1	Demand Function Estimation . . . . .	D-1
D.2	Demand Function Computations . . . . .	D-2
D.3	Supply Cost Data and Computations and Producer Surplus Computation Example . . . . .	D-5
	References . . . . .	D-20
E.	Charles River Boating Benefits. . . . .	E-1

List of Tables and Figures

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
1-1	Costs and Potential Reduction in STP Effluent Pollutants for the STP Options . . . . .	1-10
1-2	Incremental Costs and Potential Reductions in Pollutant Loadings for the CSO Options . . . . .	1-13
1-3	Estimated Water Quality Impacts of the STP and CSO Treatment Options . . . . .	1-16
1-4	Pollution Control Program and Receptors . . . . .	1-18
1-5	Annual Benefits and Costs of Combined Sewer Overflow Controls . . . . .	1-19
1-6	Annual Benefits and Costs of Combined Sewer Overflow Controls and Ocean Outfall Control Option . . . . .	1-20
1-7	Annual Benefits and Costs of Combined Sewer Overflow Controls and Secondary Treatment Option . . . . .	1-21
2-1	Comparison of STP Loading for Deer and Nut Islands Combined . . . . .	2-6
2-2	Costs of the Two STP Options . . . . .	2-12
2-3	Pollutant Concentrations in Effluent for STP Options . . . . .	2-13
3-1	CSO Planning Area Characteristics . . . . .	3-7
3-2	Combined Sewer Overflow Project Costs: <u>Neponset River Estuary</u> . . . . .	3-9
3-3	Combined Sewer Overflow Project Costs: <u>Dorchester Bay</u> . . . . .	3-12
3-4	Combined Sewer Overflow Project Costs: <u>Inner Harbor Planning Area</u> . . . . .	3-14
3-5	Combined Sewer Overflow Project Costs: <u>Charles River Basin</u> . . . . .	3-17
3-6	Potential Storm Sewer and Infiltration/Inflow Project Costs for City of Quincy . . . . .	3-20
3-7	Incremental Costs and Potential Reductions in Pollutant Loadings for the CSO Options . . . . .	3-22
4-1	Effluent Concentrations and Dilution Ratios Used in the Water Quality Impact Analysis . . . . .	4-5
4-2	Estimated Water Quality Impacts of the CSO and STP Treatment Options . . . . .	4-7
4-3	Estimates of Pollution Reduction at Receptor Sites in Study Area . . . . .	4-8

List of Tables and Figures  
(continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
5-1	A Spectrum of Water Quality Benefits . . . . .	5-2
5-2	Economic Benefit Categories . . . . .	5-4
5-3	Benefit Categories and Methodologies for Boston Harbor Study Area . . . . .	5-10
6-1	Seasonal Swimming Supply . . . . .	6-5
6-2	Increased Swimming Participation--Regional Participation Model . . . . .	6-16
6-3	Annual Benefit of Increased Swimming Participation for all Boston Harbor Beaches . . . . .	6-17
6-4	Conditional Logit Model Estimates . . . . .	6-31
6-5	Per Capita Annual Benefit Estimates from Conditional Logit Model . . . . .	6-34
6-6	Increased Participation Estimates from Conditional Logit Model . . . . .	6-35
6-7	Annual Benefit Estimates from Conditional Logit Model . . .	6-37
6-8	Annual Benefit of Averted Beach Closings at 200 MPN/100 ml .	6-42
6-9	Annual Value of Averted Beach Closings at 500 MPN/100 ml .	6-43
6-10	Annual Saltwater Boating Benefits . . . . .	6-49
6-11	Annual Recreational Fishing Benefits . . . . .	6-54
6-12	Annual Benefits for Recreation on Boston Harbor Islands . .	6-58
6-13	Annual Recreation Benefits . . . . .	6-60
7-1	Annual Reduction in Cases of Gastrointestinal Illnesses . .	7-5
7-2	Swimming Health Benefits . . . . .	7-7
8-1	Characteristics of Boston Harbor Shellfish Areas. . . . .	8-9
8-2	Estimated Potential Impacts of Pollution Abatement Options on Boston Harbor Shellfish Areas . . . . .	8-11
8-3	Estimated Changes in Price of Soft Shelled Clams Associated with Alternative Abatement Options and with Assumed Price Elasticities of Demand . . . . .	8-21
8-4	Estimated Total Benefits Associated with Alternative Abatement Options and with Assumed Price Elasticities of Demand . . . . .	8-22
9-1	Annual Intrinsic Benefits . . . . .	9-5
11-1	Multipliers Showing Direct, Indirect, and Induced Effects Per \$1 Change in Output . . . . .	11-5
11-2	Secondary Effects Estimates . . . . .	11-7
11-3	Comparison of Multipliers with and without Direct Effects per \$1 Change in Output . . . . .	11-10
12-1	Annual Recreation Boating Benefits . . . . .	12-8
12-2	Annual Estimated Willingness to Pay for Fishable Charles River . . . . .	12-12

List of Tables and Figures  
(continued)

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
A-1	MDC Treatment Facilities Current Pollutant Removals for Wastewater Effluents . . . . .	A-3
B-1	Current Seasonal Attendance Figures . . . . .	B-4
B-2	Sites Included in the Logit Model . . . . .	B-11
B-3	User Day Values . . . . .	B-14
C-1	Water Quality Fecal Coliform Levels . . . . .	C-3
C-2	Calculation of Number of Highly Credible Gastrointestinal Cases for Tenean Beach . . . . .	C-5
D-1	Cost Data for a Typical Maine Clam Digging Firm . . . . .	D-9
D-2	Costs for a Typical Massachusetts Shellfishing Firm Operating in Unrestricted Areas . . . . .	D-10
D-3	Per Bushel Nonlabor Harvest Costs for Boston Harbor Restricted Areas . . . . .	D-11
D-4	Per Bushel Costs for Nonspecialized Items . . . . .	D-12
D-5	Per Bushel Specialized Costs for Subordinate Diggers . . . . .	D-13
D-6	Per Bushel Specialized Costs for Master Diggers . . . . .	D-14
D-7	Changes in Per Bushel Nonlabor Costs for Boston Harbor Restricted Areas Due to Pollution Abatement . . . . .	D-16
D-8	Comparison of Nonlabor Costs and Prices . . . . .	D-17

List of Tables and Figures  
(continued)

<u>Figure Number</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
1-1	Boston Harbor Study Area . . . . .	1-4
1-2	Schematic of Sources of Pollutant Loadings to Boston Harbor . . . . .	1-6
1-3	Area Served by the MDC Sewerage System . . . . .	1-8
1-4	Location of Combined Sewers Overflow and Storm Sewer Outlets within the Study Area . . . . .	1-11
1-5	Current STP Dispersion Patterns and CSO Outlets . . . . .	1-14
2-1	Area Served by the MDC Sewerage System . . . . .	2-2
2-2	Schematic of Sources of Pollutant Loadings to Boston Harbor . . . . .	2-4
2-3	Location of Sewage Treatment Plants in Boston Harbor Study Area . . . . .	2-7
2-4	Dispersion of Current STP Discharges . . . . .	2-14
2-5	Dispersion of Proposed Ocean Outfall Discharges . . . . .	2-16
2-6	Dispersion of Proposed Secondary Treatment Discharges . . . . .	2-18
3-1	Combined Sewer Overflow and Storm Sewer Project Planning Areas . . . . .	3-2
3-2	Water Quality Standard Classifications in Boston Harbor . . .	3-4
4-1	Receptor Areas for the Boston Harbor Study . . . . .	4-2
5-1	The Demand Function and the Consumer Surplus Welfare Measure . . . . .	5-5
6-1	Receptor Areas for Boston Harbor Study Area . . . . .	6-2
6-2	Effects and Responses to STP, CSO and Sewer Controls . . . .	6-52
8-1	Commercial Finfishing and Shellfishing Resources in Boston Harbor . . . . .	8-8
8-2	Typical Demand and Supply Curves for the Shellfish Industry . . . . .	8-15
12-1	Map of Charles River Basin . . . . .	12-2
A-1	Example of DISPER Output . . . . .	A-8
D-1	Assumed Shape of Supply Curve for Boston Area Soft Shelled Clam Market . . . . .	D-7