EPA/600/R-09/016
February 2009

Arsenic and Antimony Removal from Drinking Water by Adsorptive Media U.S. EPA Demonstration Project at South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID), NV Final Performance Evaluation Report

by

Lydia J. Cumming
Abraham S.C. Chen
Lili Wang

Battelle
Columbus, OH 43201-2693

Contract No. 68-C-00-185
Task Order No. 0019

for

Thomas J. Sorg
Task Order Manager

Water Supply and Water Resources Division
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268

National Risk Management Research Laboratory
Office of Research and Development
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268

DISCLAIMER

The work reported in this document was funded by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under Task Order (TO) 0019 and TO 0029 of Contract No. 68-C-00-185 to Battelle. It has been subjected to the Agency's peer and administrative reviews and has been approved for publication as an EPA document. Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not, necessarily, reflect the official positions and policies of the EPA. Any mention of products or trade names does not constitute recommendation for use by the EPA.

FOREWORD

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is charged by Congress with protecting the Nation's land, air, and water resources. Under a mandate of national environmental laws, the Agency strives to formulate and implement actions leading to a compatible balance between human activities and the ability of natural systems to support and nurture life. To meet this mandate, EPA's research program is providing data and technical support for solving environmental problems today and building a science knowledge base necessary to manage our ecological resources wisely, understand how pollutants affect our health, and prevent or reduce environmental risks in the future.

The National Risk Management Research Laboratory (NRMRL) is the Agency's center for investigation of technological and management approaches for preventing and reducing risks from pollution that threaten human health and the environment. The focus of the Laboratory's research program is on methods and their cost-effectiveness for prevention and control of pollution to air, land, water, and subsurface resources; protection of water quality in public water systems; remediation of contaminated sites, sediments and ground water; prevention and control of indoor air pollution; and restoration of ecosystems. NRMRL collaborates with both public and private sector partners to foster technologies that reduce the cost of compliance and to anticipate emerging problems. NRMRL's research provides solutions to environmental problems by: developing and promoting technologies that protect and improve the environment; advancing scientific and engineering information to support regulatory and policy decisions; and providing the technical support and information transfer to ensure implementation of environmental regulations and strategies at the national, state, and community levels.

This publication has been produced as part of the Laboratory's strategic long-term research plan. It is published and made available by EPA's Office of Research and Development to assist the user community and to link researchers with their clients.

Sally Gutierrez, Director
National Risk Management Research Laboratory

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to extend their sincere appreciation to the staff of Washoe County Department of Water Resources (WCDWR) in Nevada. The WCDWR staff monitored the treatment system daily and collected samples from the treatment and distribution systems on a regular schedule throughout this reporting period. This performance evaluation would not have been possible without their efforts.

ABSTRACT

This report documents the activities performed during and the results obtained from the operation of an arsenic and antimony removal technology demonstrated at the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID) in Washoe County, NV. The objectives of the project were to evaluate (1) the effectiveness of a Siemens granular ferric hydroxide (GFH) adsorptive media system in removing arsenic and antimony to meet the respective maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) of 10 and 6 µg/L, (2) the reliability of the treatment system, (3) the required system operation and maintenance (O&M) and operator's skills, and 4) the capital and O&M cost of the technology. The project also characterizes the water in the distribution system and process residuals produced by the treatment system.

The GFH system was a fixed-bed adsorption system that used GFH, an iron-based media, to adsorb dissolved arsenic and antimony in drinking water supplies. When the media reached its adsorption capacity, it was removed from the vessels and replaced with new media. Spent media was disposed of at a sanitary landfill after passing the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) test. GFH was produced by GEH Wasserchemie Gmbh and marketed by Siemens under an exclusive agreement. Designed to treat up to 350 gal/min (gpm) of water, the GFH system at the STMGID site consisted of three 66-in diameter, 72-in tall vertical carbon steel pressure vessels configured in parallel. Based on the total media volume of 240 ft^3, the empty bed contact time (EBCT) in each vessel (and the entire system) was 5.1 min and the hydraulic loading rate was 4.9 gpm/ft^2.

During Run 1 extending from September 27, 2005 through May 3, 2006, the GFH system operated for a total of 943 hr. After it began normal daily operation on November 18, 2005, the system operated an average of 3.8 hr/day. The average flowrate during the 32-week study period was 275 gpm, which was 21% lower than the design flowrate. The lower average flowrate resulted in a higher average EBCT, i.e., 6.5 min. The system experienced little pressure buildup during operation. Major operational difficulties involved the system control and data acquisition (SCADA) and programmable logic controller (PLC) interface and a mechanical problem with the pneumatic butterfly valves for the backwash discharge line. Otherwise the system was relatively simple to operate, requiring little attention from the operator. The daily demand on the operator was typically 30 min for routine activities, including visual inspection of the system and recording of operational parameters.

Breakthrough of arsenic at 10 µg/L from the GFH system occurred at approximately 7,200 bed volumes (BV). Breakthrough of antimony at 6 µg/L occurred at approximately 3,000 BV. The media run length for arsenic was much shorter than the vendor-projected working capacity of 38,000 BV. The unexpectedly short run length was probably caused by the presence of competing anions, such as silica and phosphorous. Silica concentrations in raw water ranged from 51.5 to 95.1 mg/L (as SiO_2) and averaged 72.6 mg/L (as SiO_2). Total phosphorous (as P) concentrations ranged from 89 to 150 µg/L and averaged 115 µg/L with some phosphorous existing as orthophosphate. Both silica and phosphorous were removed effectively by GFH, with silica reaching complete breakthrough about halfway through the 32-week study period and phosphorous never reaching complete breakthrough.

Because of the short run lengths experienced, another adsorptive media, CFH-0818, a dry iron-based media supplied by Kemira Water Solutions, Inc., was selected, in conjunction with GFH, for a follow-on study in Run 2. The selection of the media was based on the results of a series of rapid small-scale column tests (RSSCT) performed under two separate projects. Prior to Run 2, one of the three vessels was replaced with GFH while the other two were replaced with CFH-0818. Run 2 took place from April 5, 2007, through July 3, 2007, during which time the system operated for a total of 1,166 hr. The system was operated at similar flowrates, which averaged 276 gpm. The system daily operating time was longer than that in Run 1, with an average of 13 hr/day.

In Run 2, breakthrough of arsenic at 10 µg/L occurred at approximately 3,700 BV; breakthrough of antimony at 6 µg/L occurred at approximately 1,225 BV. The media run length for arsenic was shorter than the RSSCT projected working capacity of 9,000 to 16,000 BV. Significantly lower arsenic concentrations in source water (i.e., 48.9 µg/L on average) might have contributed, in part, to the longer run length observed during the RSSCT tests. However, the RSSCT was useful to help predict the performance of a full-scale system by indicating the water was challenging to all adsorptive media tested.

Treated water was blended with water from four other STMGID wells about one mile downstream of the adsorption system. During Run 1, water samples were collected at three locations in the distribution system, including one non-residential location prior to the blending point and two residences after the blending point, to evaluate the impact of the adsorption system on water chemistry in the distribution system. As a combined result of treatment by the GFH system and blending with other source water, arsenic and antimony concentrations in the distribution system were significantly reduced to below the respective MCLs (except for one exceedance). There were no noticeable changes in lead or copper concentrations measured in the first draw samples from two residences. The lead concentrations remained low (i.e., 1.5 µg/L or less) in all samples; copper concentrations fluctuated from <1 to 176 µg/L, far below the action level of 1.3 mg/L.

The capital investment cost of $232,147 included $157,647 for equipment, $16,000 for site engineering, and $58,500 for installation. Using the system's rated capacity of 350 gpm (or 504,000 gpd), the capital cost was $663/gpm (or $0.46/gpd) of design capacity. The O&M cost evaluated in this report included only the incremental costs associated with media replacement and disposal, electricity consumption, and labor. The actual cost to change out the media in all three adsorption tanks was $58,188, including replacement media, shipping, spent media analysis and disposal, and labor. At the time this report was prepared, the CFH-0818 was taken off the market indefinitely for making improvements. The unit O&M cost curve per 1,000 gal of water treated was developed based on the unit cost of GFH and as a function of the media run length to 10-µg/L arsenic or 6-µg/L antimony breakthrough in the combined effluent.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv
ABSTRACT v
APPENDICES viii
FIGURES viii
TABLES viii
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS x

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Background 1
1.2 Treatment Technologies for Arsenic Removal 1
1.3 Project Objectives 2

2.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 3

3.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS 4
3.1 General Project Approach 4
3.2 System O&M and Cost Data Collection 4
3.3 Sample Collection Procedures and Schedules 6
3.3.1 Source Water 6
3.3.2 Treatment Plant Water 6
3.3.3 Backwash Wsatewater and Residual Solids 9
3.3.4 Distribution System Water 9
3.4 Sampling Logistics 11
3.4.1 Preparation of Arsenic Speciation Kits 11
3.4.2 Preparation of Sampling Coolers 11
3.4.3 Sample Shipping and Handling 11
3.5 Analytical Procedures 11

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 13
4.1 Facility Description 13
4.1.1 Source Water Quality 14
4.1.2 Distribution System 15
4.2 Treatment Process Description 17
4.3 Permitting and System Installation 23
4.3.1 Permitting 23
4.3.2 Building Construction 23
4.3.3 Installation, Shakedown, and Startup 24
4.4 System Operation 25
4.4.1 Operational Parameters 25
4.4.2 Backwash 27
4.4.3 RSSCT 28
4.4.4 Media Loading and Removal 28
4.4.5 Residuals Management 29
4.4.6 System Operation, Reliability and Simplicity 29
4.5 System Performance 30
4.5.1 Treatment Plant 30
4.5.2 Backwash Wastewater Sampling 41

4.5.3 Spent Media Sampling 44
4.5.4 Distribution System Water Sampling 46
4.6 System Cost 46
4.6.1 Capital Cost 46
4.6.2 Operation and Maintenance Cost 49

5.0 REFERENCES 52

APPENDICES

Appendix A: OPERATIONAL DATA
Appendix B: ANALYTICAL DATA TABLES

FIGURES

Figure 3-1. Process Flow Diagram and Sampling Locations 8
Figure 3-2. Distribution Sampling Map 10
Figure 4-1. Preexisting Well No. 9 Pump House 13
Figure 4-2. Preexisting Wellhead Chlorination System 14
Figure 4-3. A Photograph of GFH Media 17
Figure 4-4. Siemens GFH Arsenic/Antimony Removal System 20
Figure 4-5. A New Booster Pump Station 20
Figure 4-6. Backwash Discharge 21
Figure 4-7. Programmable Logic Controller 22
Figure 4-8. Third Pressure Vessel and Associated Plumbing and Monitoring Components 22
Figure 4-9. New Treatment Building and Preexisting Well Pump House 23
Figure 4-10. Delivery of One Adsorption Vessel 24
Figure 4-11. Photographs of Media Replacement 29
Figure 4-12. Concentrations of Various Arsenic Species in Influent and Effluent during Run 1 33
Figure 4-13. Arsenic Breakthrough Curves 34
Figure 4-14. Antimony Breakthrough Curves 36
Figure 4-15. Silica Breakthrough Curves 38
Figure 4-16. Phosphorous Breakthrough Curves 39
Figure 4-17. Total As and Sb Concentrations in Distribution System after System Startup 48
Figure 4-18. Media Replacement and Total O&M Curves for GFH System 51

TABLES

Table 1-1. Summary of Round 1 Arsenic Removal Demonstration Sites 2
Table 3-1. Predemonstration and Interim Activities[a] and Completion Dates 5
Table 3-2. Evaluation Objectives and Supporting Data Collection Activities 5
Table 3-3. Sampling Schedule and Analyses 7
Table 4-1. Well No. 9 Source Water Quality Data 15
Table 4-2. Summary of Historic Well No. 9 Water Quality Data 16
Table 4-3. Physical and Chemical Properties of GFH and CFH-0818 Adsorptive Media 18
Table 4-4. Design Specifications of Siemens System 19
Table 4-5. Summary of Siemens Adsorptive System Operations 26
Table 4-6. Number of Bed Volumes until Arsenic Breakthrough at 10 µg/L 28

Table 4-7. Summary of Run 1 Analytical Results for Arsenic, Antimony, and Competing Anions 31
Table 4-8. Summary of Run 2 Analytical Results for Arsenic, Antimony and Competing Anions 32
Table 4-9. Summary of Run 1 Other Water Quality Parameter Measurements 40
Table 4-10. Summary of Run 2 Other Water Quality Parameter Measurements 42
Table 4-11. Backwash Wastewater Sampling Results 42
Table 4-12. Backwash Solid Total Metal Results 43
Table 4-13. TCLP and Other Waste Characterization Results for Spent Media 44
Table 4-14. Total Metals Analysis Results for Spent Media* 45
Table 4-15. Summary of Arsenic Loading Calculations for Run 1 and Run 2 45
Table 4-16. Distribution System Sampling Results 47
Table 4-17. Summary of Capital Investment Cost of GFH System 49
Table 4-18. Summary of O&M Cost 50

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Δp	differential pressure
AAL	American Analytical Laboratories
Al	aluminum
AM	adsorptive media
As	arsenic
BV	bed volume(s)
Ca	calcium
Cl_2	chlorine
C/F	coagulation/filtration
CMU	concrete masonry unit
Cu	copper
DO	dissolved oxygen
EBCT	empty bed contact time
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
F	fluoride
Fe	iron
GFH	granular ferric hydroxide
gpd	gallons per day
gpm	gallons per minute
HDPE	high-density polyethylene
hp	horsepower
ICP-MS	inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry
ID	identification
IX	ion exchange
kwh	kilowatt-hour(s)
LCR	(EPA) Lead and Copper Rule
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MDL	method detection limit
MDWCA	Mutual Domestic Water Consumers Association
Mg	magnesium
Mn	manganese
mV	millivolts
Na	sodium
NA	not available
NaOCl	sodium hypochlorite

ND	not detected
NRMRL	National Risk Management Research Laboratory
NTU	nephlemetric turbidity units
O&M	operation and maintenance
ORD	Office of Research and Development
ORP	oxidation-reduction potential
P&IDs	piping and instrumentation diagrams
Pb	lead
PE	professional engineer
PO_4	orthophosphate
PLC	programmable logic controller
PM	process modification
psi	pounds per square inch
psig	pounds per square inch (gauge)
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
QA/QC	quality assurance/quality control
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
RCRA	Resources Conservation and Recovery Act
RPD	relative percent difference
RSSCT	rapid small-scale column test
Sb	antimony
SCADA	system control and data acquisition
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SiO_2	silica
SO_4	sulfate
STMGID	South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District
STS	Severn Trent Services
TCLP	Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure
TOC	total organic carbon
VOC	volatile organic compound
WCDWR	Washoe County Department of Water Resources
WRWC	White Rock Water Company

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) mandates that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) identify and regulate drinking water contaminants that may have adverse human health effects and that are known or anticipated to occur in public water supply systems. In 1975 under the SDWA, EPA established a maximum contaminant level (MCL) for arsenic at 0.05 mg/L. Amended in 1996, the SDWA required that EPA develop an arsenic research strategy and publish a proposal to revise the arsenic MCL by January 2000. On January 18, 2001, EPA finalized the arsenic MCL at 0.01 mg/L (EPA, 2001). In order to clarify the implementation of the original rule, EPA revised the rule text on March 25, 2003, to express the MCL as 0.010 mg/L (10 µg/L) (EPA, 2003). The final rule requires all community and non-transient, non-community water systems to comply with the new standard by January 23, 2006.

In October 2001, EPA announced an initiative for additional research and development of cost-effective technologies to help small community water systems (<10,000 customers) meet the new arsenic standard, and to provide technical assistance to operators of small systems in order to reduce compliance costs. As part of this Arsenic Rule Implementation Research Program, EPA's Office of Research and Development (ORD) proposed a project to conduct a series of full-scale, on-site demonstrations of arsenic removal technologies, process modifications, and engineering approaches applicable to small systems. Shortly thereafter, an announcement was published in the *Federal Register* requesting water utilities interested in participating in Round of this EPA-sponsored demonstration program to provide information on their water systems. In June 2002, EPA selected 17 out of 115 sites to host the demonstration studies. The water system at South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID) in Washoe County, NV was selected to participate in this demonstration project.

In September 2002, EPA solicited proposals from engineering firms and vendors for cost-effective arsenic removal treatment technologies for the 17 host sites. EPA received 70 technical proposals for the 17 host sites, with each site receiving from one to six proposals. In April 2003, an independent technical panel reviewed the proposals and provided its recommendations to EPA on the technologies that it determined were acceptable for demonstration at each site. Because of funding limitations and other technical reasons, only 12 of the 17 sites were selected for the Round 1 demonstration program. Using the information provided by the review panel, EPA, in cooperation with the host sites and the drinking water programs of the respective states, selected one technical proposal for each site. A granular ferric hydroxide (GFH) adsorptive media system proposed by Siemens (formerly known as USFilter) was selected for demonstration at the STMGID site in Washoe County, NV, for the removal of arsenic and antimony from drinking water supplies.

Two test runs were conducted during the demonstration at STMGID. Run 1 utilized Siemens' GFH adsorptive media in all three adsorption vessels. Because of the short run length experienced, both GFH (in one vessel) and a Kemira CFH-0818 iron-based adsorptive media (in two vessels) were used in Run 2. The Kemira media was selected based on the results of a series of rapid small-scale column tests (RSSCTs) and media cost.

1.2 Treatment Technologies for Arsenic Removal

The technologies selected for the Round 1 EPA Arsenic Removal demonstration include nine adsorptive media systems, one ion exchange system, one coagulation/filtration system, and one process modification with iron addition. Table 1-1 summarizes the locations, technologies, vendors, and key source water quality parameters of the 12 demonstration sites.

An overview of the technology selection and system design (Wang et al., 2004) and the associated capital cost (Chen et al., 2004) is provided on the EPA Arsenic Treatment Technology site at http://www.epa.gov/ORD/NRMRL/wswrd/dw/arsenic/tech/research.html. As of November 2008, all of the systems have been operational and 11 performance evaluations have been completed.

Table 1-1. Summary of Round 1 Arsenic Removal Demonstration Sites

Demonstration Site	Technology (Media)	Vendor	Design Flowrate (gpm)	Source Water Quality		
				As (µg/L)	Fe (µg/L)	pH (S.U.)
WRWC (Bow), NH	AM (G2)	ADI	70[a]	39	<25	7.7
Rollinsford, NH	AM (E33)	AdEdge	100	36[b]	46	8.2
Queen Anne's County, MD	AM (E33)	STS	300	19[b]	270[c]	7.3
Brown City, MI	AM (E33)	STS	640	14[b]	127[c]	7.3
Climax, MN	C/F (Macrolite)	Kinetico	140	39[b]	546[c]	7.4
Lidgerwood, ND	PM	Kinetico	250	146[b]	1,325[c]	7.2
Desert Sands MDWCA, NM	AM (E33)	STS	320	23[b]	39	7.7
Nambe Pueblo Tribe, NM	AM (E33)	AdEdge	145	33	<25	8.5
Rimrock, AZ	AM (E33)	AdEdge	90[d]	50	170	7.2
Valley Vista, AZ	AM (AAFS50)	Kinetico	37	41	<25	7.8
Fruitland, ID	IX (A-300E)	Kinetico	250	44	<25	7.4
STMGID, NV	AM (GFH)	Siemens	350	39	<25	7.4

AM = adsorptive media; C/F = coagulation/filtration; IX = ion exchange; PM = process modification; MDWCA = Mutual Domestic Water Consumers Association; STMGID = South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District; WRWC = White Rock Water Company; STS = Severn Trent Services

(a) System reconfigured from parallel to series operation due to reduced flowrate of 40 gpm.
(b) Arsenic existing mostly as As(III).
(c) Iron existing mostly as soluble Fe(II).
(d) System reconfigured from parallel to series operation due to reduced flowrate of 30 gpm.

1.3 Project Objectives

The objective of the Round 1 arsenic demonstration program is to conduct full-scale arsenic removal technology demonstration studies on the removal of arsenic from drinking water supplies. The specific objectives of the demonstration study at STMGID are to:

- Evaluate the performance of the GFH arsenic and antimony removal technology for small systems such as STMGID.
- Determine the required system operation and maintenance (O&M) and operator skill levels.
- Characterize process residuals produced by the technology.
- Determine the capital and O&M cost of the technology.

This report summarizes the results obtained during the demonstration study at STMGID in Washoe County, NV, from September 27, 2005, through May 3, 2006, for Run 1 and from April 5, 2007, through July 3, 2007, for Run 2. The types of data collected included system operation, water quality (both across the treatment train and in the distribution system), residuals characterization, and capital and O&M cost.

2.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the information collected during Run 1 and Run 2, the following observations were summarized and conclusions made relating to the overall objectives of the treatment technology demonstration study.

Performance of the arsenics and antimony removal technology for use on small systems:

- GFH media can remove arsenic and antimony to below their respective MCLs. However, the media run length for either contaminant was short, with a maximum of 7,200 bed volumes (BV) for arsenic and 3,000 BV for antimony. The unexpectedly short media life might have been caused by the presence of high concentrations of silica and phosphorous, which averaged 72.6 mg/L (as SiO_2) and 115.2 µg/L (as P), respectively, in raw water.
- Results of a laboratory rapid small-scale column test (RSSCT) confirmed the short run lengths of the full-scale GFH system.
- Significant reductions in pH (i.e., from 7.1 to <4.5), alkalinity (i.e., from 92 to <1.0 mg/L [as $CaCO_3$]), and chlorine residuals (i.e., from 0.8 to 0.2 mg/L [as Cl_2]) were observed in the system effluent during the first several days of system operation of Run 1, indicating removal of bicarbonate ions and consumption of chlorine by the GFH media.

Required system operation and maintenance and operator skill levels:

- Under normal operating conditions, the system requires little attention from the operator. The daily demand on the operator is typically 30 min for routine activities including visual inspection of the system and recording of operational parameters.
- Operation of the adsorption system does not require additional skills beyond those necessary to operate the existing water supply equipment. The system is operated by a State of Nevada certified Level 3 operator.

Process residuals produced by the technology:

- The spent GFH media passed the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) test and can be disposed of at a local landfill for non-hazardous wastes.
- Backwash was not required when operating the adsorption system.

Cost of the technology:

- Using the system's rated capacity of 350 gal/min (gpm) (or 504,000 gal/day [gpd]), the capital cost is $663/gpm (or $0.46/gpd).
- The cost of media replacement is the most significant add-on operational cost. The cost of replacing 240 ft^3 of GFH media in all three adsorption tanks is estimated to be $71,158, equivalent to a unit cost of $5.51/1,000 gal to $15.51/1,000 gal if the changeout is governed by the 10-µg/L arsenic breakthrough curve. If the changeout is governed by the 6-µg/L antimony breakthrough curves, the unit cost equivalent is even higher, ranging from $13.21/1,000 gal to $32.36/1,000 gal.

3.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 General Project Approach

Following the predemonstration activities summarized in Table 3-1, the performance evaluation study of the Siemens adsorptive media system began on September 27, 2005. Table 3-2 summarizes the types of data collected as part of the technology evaluation process.

The overall system performance was evaluated based on its ability to consistently remove arsenic and antimony (a co-contaminant) to below the respective target MCLs of 10 and 6 μg/L through the collection of weekly and monthly water samples across the treatment train. The study was initially intended to take place over a one-year period. However, because of short run length issues encountered during the first run, the performance monitoring was temporarily halted on May 3, 2006, with the exception of collecting a set of backwash wastewater/solids samples on September 12, 2006. In the interim, the system was operated, when needed, with blending to meet the MCLs. The performance monitoring resumed after rebedding of the three adsorption vessels on April 5, 2007, with media selected based on the results of a series of RSSCT tests performed under a separate project (Westerhoff et al., 2008). The interim period between the two test runs was longer than desired because of difficulties with obtaining an acceptable quote for performing media changeout.

The reliability of the system was evaluated by tracking the unscheduled system downtime and frequency and extent of repairs and replacement. The unscheduled downtime and repair information were recorded by the plant operator on a Repair and Maintenance Log Sheet.

The O&M and operator skill requirements were evaluated based on a combination of quantitative data and qualitative considerations, including the need for pre- and/or post-treatment, level of system automation, extent of the preventive maintenance activities, frequency of chemical and/or media handling and inventory, and general knowledge needed for relevant chemical processes and related health and safety practices. The staffing requirements for the system operation were recorded on an Operator Labor Hour Log Sheet.

The cost of the system was evaluated based on the capital cost per gpm (or gpd) of design capacity and the O&M cost per 1,000 gal of water treated. This task required tracking of the capital cost for equipment, engineering, and installation, as well as the O&M cost for media replacement and disposal, chemical usage, electricity consumption, and labor.

3.2 System O&M and Cost Data Collection

The plant operator performed daily, weekly, and monthly system O&M and data collection following the instructions provided by the vendor and Battelle. During every site visit, the plant operator recorded system operational data, such as pressure, flowrate, totalizer and hour meter readings on a Daily System Operation Log Sheet; checked the sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) solution level; and conducted visual inspections to ensure normal system operations. If any problems occurred, the plant operator contacted the Battelle Study Lead, who determined if the vendor should be contacted for troubleshooting. The plant operator recorded all relevant information, including the problem encountered, course of actions taken, materials and supplies used, and associated cost and labor, on the Repair and Maintenance Log Sheet. On a weekly basis, the plant operator measured pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), oxidation-reduction potential (ORP), and residual chlorine onsite, and recorded the data on a Weekly On-Site Water Quality Parameters Log Sheet.

Table 3-1. Predemonstration and Interim Activities[a] and Completion Dates

Activity	Date
Introductory Meeting Held	08/20/03
Request for Quotation Issued to Vendor	08/25/03
Draft Letter of Understanding Issued	09/03/03
Final Letter of Understanding Issued	09/19/03
Vendor Quotation Received by Battelle	10/01/03
Purchase Order Completed and Signed	05/13/04
Engineering Package Submitted to Washoe County Health Department	07/26/04
Final Study Plan Issued	09/09/04
Permit Issued by Washoe County Health Department	10/20/04
Building Permit Issued	11/19/04
Building Construction Initiated	11/22/04
Building Construction Completed	03/18/05
Siemens Equipment Shipped to Demonstration Site	03/21/05
Plumbing of Siemens GFH System Completed	04/18/05
Hydraulic Test Suspended due to High Wellhead Pressure that Exceeded Pressure Rating of Adsorption Tanks	04/25/05
Well Pump Reconfiguration Completed	09/06/05
Hydraulic Test and Media Loading Completed	09/14/05
Run 1 Performance Evaluation Commenced	09/27/05
Laboratory RSSCT Completed[a]	02/27/06
Field RSSCT Analysis Completed/Media Selected[a]	07/07/06
Media Replacement Completed[a]	04/05/07
Run 2 Performance Evaluation Commenced	04/05/07

(a) Interim activities taking place between Runs 1 and 2.

Table 3-2. Evaluation Objectives and Supporting Data Collection Activities

Evaluation Objectives	Data Collection
Performance	-Ability to consistently remove arsenic and antimony to below 10 and 6 μg/L, respectively, in treated water
Reliability	-Unscheduled system downtime -Frequency and extent of repairs including a description of problems encountered, materials and supplies needed, and labor and cost incurred
System O&M and Operator Skill Requirements	-Pre- and post-treatment requirements -Level of system automation for system operation and data collection -Staffing requirements including number of operators and laborers -Task analysis of preventative maintenance including number, frequency, and complexity of tasks -Chemical handling and inventory requirements -General knowledge needed of relevant chemical processes and health and safety practices
Residual Management	-Quantity and characteristics of aqueous and solid residuals generated by process
System Cost	-Capital cost for equipment, engineering, and installation -O&M cost for chemical and/or media usage, electricity, and labor

The capital cost for the arsenic removal system consisted of the cost for equipment, site engineering, and system installation. The O&M cost consisted of the cost for media replacement and spent media disposal, chemical and electricity consumption, and labor. Labor for various activities, such as the routine system O&M, troubleshooting and repair, and demonstration-related work, were tracked using an Operator Labor Hour Log Sheet. The routine system O&M included activities such as completing field logs, replenishing the NaOCl solution, ordering supplies, performing system inspections, and others as recommended by the vendor. The labor for demonstration-related work including activities such as performing field measurements, collecting and shipping samples, and communicating with the Battelle Study Lead and the vendor was recorded, but not used for the cost analysis.

3.3 Sample Collection Procedures and Schedules

To evaluate the system performance, samples were collected routinely by the operator from the wellhead, across the treatment plant, and from the distribution system. Table 3-3 provides the sampling schedules and analytes measured during each sampling event. Specific sampling requirements for analytical methods, sample volumes, containers, preservation, and holding times are presented in Table 4-1 of the EPA-endorsed Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) (Battelle, 2003). The procedure for arsenic speciation is described in Appendix A of the QAPP.

3.3.1 Source Water. During the initial site visit on August 20, 2003, one set of source water samples was collected and speciated using arsenic speciation kits described in Section 3.4.1. The sample tap was flushed for several minutes before sampling; special care was taken to avoid agitation, which might cause unwanted oxidation. Analyses for the source water samples are listed in Table 3-3.

3.3.2 Treatment Plant Water. During the first run of the system performance evaluation study, samples were collected by the plant operator weekly, on a four-week cycle, for on- and off-site analyses. For the first week of each four-week cycle, samples taken at the wellhead (IN) and after Vessels A, B, and C combined (TT) were speciated onsite and analyzed for the analytes listed in Table 3-3 for monthly treatment plant water. For the next three weeks, samples collected at IN and after each adsorption vessel (i.e., TA, TB, and TC) were analyzed for the analytes listed in Table 3-3 for the weekly treatment plant water. A few exceptions include:

- Weekly sampling during the weeks of October 17, November 21, December 19, and December 26, 2005, was not performed.
- Weekly sampling during February 7 through March 21, 2006, was reduced to biweekly.
- Monthly sampling after March 31, 2006, was reduced to bimonthly.
- Orthophosphate was replaced with phosphorus after January 10, 2006, due to difficulties of meeting the 48-hr holding time requirement for orthophosphate.

Figure 3-1 presents a flow diagram of the treatment system along with the analytes and schedules at each sampling location.

During Run 2 of the study, the weekly sampling was reduced to once every three to four weeks and monthly speciation sampling was discontinued. Samples were collected at IN, TA, TB, TC for total P, SiO_2, As (total), Fe (total), Mn (total), and Sb (total). On-site measurements for pH, temperature, DO, and ORP were performed during each sampling event. Samples also were analyzed for free and total chlorine at the after prechlorination (AC) and the TT locations.

Table 3-3. Sampling Schedule and Analyses

Sample Type	Samplin Locations[a]	No. of Samples	Frequency	Analytes	No. of Sampling Events
Source Water	IN	1	Once (during initial site visit)	Off-site: As (total and soluble), As(III), As(V), Sb (total and soluble), Fe (total and soluble), Mn (total and soluble), Al (total and soluble), V (total and soluble), Mo (total and soluble), Na, Ca, Mg, Cl, F, SO_4, SiO_2, PO_4, TOC, alkalinity, and pH	**Pre-Run 1:** 1
Treatment Plant Water	IN, TA, TB, and TC	4	**Run 1:** Weekly[b] **Run 2:** once every three to four weeks[d]	On-Site: pH, temperature, DO, ORP, and chlorine[c] Off-Site: As (total), Sb (total), Fe (total), Mn (total), P (total), SiO_2, alkalinity, and turbidity	**Run 1:** 18 **Run 2:** 3
	IN, and TT	2	**Run 1:** Monthly[b] **Run 2:** None	On-Site: pH, temperature, DO, ORP, and chlorine[c] Off-Site: As (total and soluble), As(III), As(V), Sb (total and soluble), Fe (total and soluble), Mn (total and soluble), Ca, Mg, F, NO_3, SO_4, SiO_2, PO_4[f], P (total), alkalinity, and turbidity	**Run 1:** 6[e] **Run 2:** 0
Distribution Water	Three LCR Locations	3	Monthly	Total As, Sb, Fe, Mn, Cu, and Pb, pH, and alkalinity	**Pre-Run 1**: 4 **Run 1:** 7 **Run 2:** 0
Backwash Water	Backwash Discharge Line	3	Once	As (total and soluble), Sb (total and soluble), Fe (total and soluble), Mn (total and soluble) TDS, TSS, and pH	**Run 1:** 1 **Run 2:** 0
Backwash Solids	Backwash Discharge Line	3	Once	Mg, Al, Si, P, Ca, V, Mn, Fe, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Cd, Sb, Ba, and Pb	**Run 1:** 1 **Run 2:** 0
Spent Media	One to Three Vessels per Media	1 to 3 per media	Once	TCLP metals Mg, Al, Si, P, Ca, V, Mn, Fe, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Cd, Sb, Ba, and Pb	**Run 1:** 1 **Run 2:** 1

(a) IN = at wellhead; TA = after Vessel A; TB = after Vessel B; TC = after Vessel C; TT = after effluent from Vessels A, B, and C combined; abbreviations corresponding to sampling locations shown in Figure 3-1.
(b) Run 1 weekly sampling skipped during weeks of 10/17/05, 11/21/05, 12/19/05, and 12/26/05; sampling frequency reduced from weekly to biweekly during 02/07/06 through 03/21/06 and from monthly to bimonthly after 03/31/06.
(c) Chlorine measured at AC and TT only.
(d) Alkalinity and turbidity analyses discontinued.
(e) Samples also collected at TA, TB, and TC locations.
(f) PO_4 replaced with P (total) analysis beginning 01/10/06.



Figure 3-1. Process Flow Diagram and Sampling Locations

3.3.3 Backwash Wastewater and Residual Solids. Backwash wastewater samples were collected during the September 12, 2006, backwash event. A sidestream of backwash water was directed into a clean, 32-gal container over the duration of backwash for each vessel. After the content in the container was thoroughly mixed, composite samples were collected and/or filtered onsite with 0.45-µm filters. Analytes for the backwash samples are listed in Table 3-3. The solids in the 32-gal plastic container were allowed to settle and the supernatant was carefully siphoned using a piece of plastic tubing to avoid agitation of settled solids in the container. The remaining solids/water mixture was then transferred to a 1-gal plastic jar. After solids in the jar were settled and the supernatant was carefully decanted, one aliquot of the solids/water mixture was air-dried before being acid-digested and analyzed for the metals listed in Table 3-3.

The other residual solid produced by the treatment process was spent media. Spent GFH media samples were collected on March 27, 2007, using a long-handled scoop, while the spent media was being removed from the vessels. Grab samples were collected from the top (0 to 6 in depth), middle (17 to 23 in), and bottom layers (34 to 40 in). The media collected from each layer was well-mixed in a clean 5-gal pail prior to being filled in an unpreserved 1-gal wide-mouth high-density polyethylene (HDPE) bottle. One aliquot of each sample was tested for TCLP and another aliquot air dried for metal analyses.

Composite samples of the spent GFH media were collected on February 2, 2007, prior to the media replacement for site-specific waste characterization required by the local landfill: TCLP regulated metals (i.e., Ag, As, Ba, Cd, Cr, Fe, Hg, Pb, and Se), TCLP regulated volatile organic compounds (VOCs), paint filter test, and pH. These samples were collected by the operator under direction of the contractor responsible for rebedding the media.

At the end of Run 2 on July 3, 2007, one spent sample each of GFH and CFH-0818 was collected approximately 2 in beneath the bed surface and transferred to an unpreserved 1-gal wide-mouth HDPE bottle. These samples were analyzed for the metals listed in Table 3-3.

3.3.4 Distribution System Water. During the first run of the demonstration, samples were collected from the distribution system to determine the impact of the arsenic treatment system on the water chemistry in the distribution system, specifically, the arsenic, antimony, lead, and copper levels. Prior to the system startup from June to September 2004, four sets of baseline distribution water samples were collected from three locations within the distribution system. Following system startup, distribution system sampling continued monthly at the same locations. Distribution system water sampling was not performed during the second run of the demonstration because the treated water was blended and it would not be possible to differentiate the impact caused by the two different media.

The three sampling locations included two residences, which are part of the current STMGID Lead and Copper Rule (LCR) sampling locations, and one newly-installed sampling station, which was located 4,700 ft downstream from Well No. 9 and 500 ft upstream from a blending point where Well No. 9 water blended with water from other wells. The two LCR residences selected were located after the blending point. Figure 3-2 shows a distribution system map and the three distribution system sampling locations.

Homeowners assisted by the Washoe County Department of Water Resources (WCDWR) staff collected samples following an instruction sheet developed according to the *Lead and Copper Rule Monitoring and Reporting Guidance for Public Water Systems* (EPA, 2002). First-draw samples were collected from cold-water faucets that had not been used for at least 6 hr to ensure that stagnant water was sampled. The sampler recorded the date and time of last water usage before sampling and the date and time of sample collection for calculation of the stagnation time. Arsenic speciation was not performed on these samples.



Figure 3-2. Distribution Sampling Map (Source: WCDWR)

3.4 Sampling Logistics

All sampling logistics including arsenic speciation kit preparation, sample cooler preparation, and sample shipping and handling are discussed below.

3.4.1 Preparation of Arsenic Speciation Kits. The arsenic field speciation method uses an anion exchange resin column to separate the soluble arsenic species, As(V) and As(III) (Edwards et al., 1998). Resin columns were prepared in batches at Battelle laboratories according to the procedures detailed in Appendix A of the EPA-endorsed QAPP (Battelle, 2003).

3.4.2 Preparation of Sampling Coolers. For each sampling event, a sample cooler was prepared with the appropriate number and type of sample bottles, disc filters, and/or speciation kits. All sample bottles were new and contained appropriate preservatives. Each sample bottle was affixed with a pre-printed, colored-coded, waterproof label consisting of the sample identification (ID), date and time of sample collection, collector's name, site location, sample destination, analysis required, and preservative. The sample ID consisted of a two-letter code for the specific water facility, sampling date, a two-letter code for a specific sampling location, and a one-letter code for designating the arsenic speciation bottle (if necessary). The sampling locations at the treatment plant were color-coded for easy identification. For example, red, orange, yellow, green, and blue were used for IN, TA, TB, TC, and TT sampling locations. The labeled bottles for each sampling location were placed in a ziplock bag (each corresponding to a specific sample location) in the cooler. On a monthly basis, the sample cooler also included bottles for the distribution system sampling.

In addition, all sampling and shipping-related supplies, such as disposable gloves, sampling instructions, chain-of-custody forms, prepaid/pre-addressed FedEx air bills, and bubble wrap, were placed in each cooler. The chain-of-custody forms and air bills were completed except for the operator's signature and the sample date and time. After preparation, the sample cooler was sent to the site via FedEx for the following week's sampling event.

3.4.3 Sample Shipping and Handling. After sample collection, samples for off-site analyses were packed carefully in the original coolers with wet ice and shipped to Battelle. Upon receipt, the sample custodian verified that all samples indicated on the chain-of-custody forms were included and intact. Sample IDs were checked against the chain-of-custody forms, and the samples were logged into the laboratory sample receipt log. Discrepancies noted by the sample custodian were addressed with the plant operator by the Battelle Study Lead.

Samples for metal analyses were stored at Battelle's Inductively Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) Laboratory. Samples for other water quality analyses were packed in separate coolers and picked up by couriers from American Analytical Laboratories (AAL) in Columbus, OH and Belmont Labs in Englewood, OH, both of which were under contract with Battelle for this demonstration study. The chain-of-custody forms remained with the samples from the time of preparation through analysis and final disposition. All samples were archived by the appropriate laboratories for the respective duration of the required hold time and disposed of properly thereafter.

3.5 Analytical Procedures

The analytical procedures described in Section 4.0 of the EPA-endorsed QAPP (Battelle, 2003) were followed by Battelle ICP-MS, AAL, and Belmont Labs. Laboratory quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) of all methods followed the prescribed guidelines. Data quality in terms of precision, accuracy, method detection limits (MDL), and completeness met the criteria established in the QAPP (i.e., relative percent difference [RPD] of 20%, percent recovery of 80 to 120%, and completeness of 80%). The QA data

associated with each analyte will be presented and evaluated in a QA/QC Summary Report to be prepared under separate cover upon completion of the Arsenic Demonstration Project.

Field measurements of pH, temperature, DO, and ORP were conducted by the plant operator using a WTW Multi 340i handheld meter, which was calibrated for pH and DO prior to use following the procedures provided in the user's manual. The ORP probe also was checked for accuracy by measuring the ORP of a standard solution and comparing it to the expected value. The plant operator collected a water sample in a clean, plastic beaker and placed the WTW probe in the beaker until a stable value was obtained. The plant operator also performed free and total chlorine measurements using Hach chlorine test kits following the user's manual.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Facility Description

Established in 1981, STMGID provides water, sanitary sewer, and storm drainage services to a portion of the South Truckee Meadows in southern Washoe County, NV. The water systems are operated by WCDWR. A total of five supply wells (i.e., Wells No. 1, 2, 3, 9, and 11) were used to supply water to approximately 8,300 customers (see map of service area in Figure 3-2). Well No. 9 on South Virginia Street and Damonte Parkway was designated for this demonstration study. Drilled in October 1994, Well No. 9 was constructed of 12-in-diameter casing with a 50-ft slotted screen to a total depth of 130 ft. The well was equipped with a Hays Model 400T-6GP 10-stage submersible pump with a 50-horsepower (hp) three-phase motor set at an approximate depth of 60 ft. The well was capable of yielding up to 350 gpm flow. Figure 4-1 shows the Well No. 9 wellhead and pump house.



Figure 4-1. Preexisting Well No. 9 Pump House

Figure 4-2 shows the preexisting system housed within the pump house. Water treatment consisted of only chlorination using a gas feed system to reach a target free chlorine residual level of 1.0 mg/L (as Cl_2). Chlorine gas cylinders were kept in a room partitioned from the rest of the pump house for safety and connected to the system piping via underground conduit. The chlorine gas feed rate was regulated at 3.5 lb/day using a panel-mounted automatic switchover rotometer. A dual-cylinder scale was used to monitor the chlorine gas consumption. Chlorine gas was injected to a side stream where a Baldor 1¼- in centrifugal pump with a 2-hp motor was used to create a venturi effect to mix chlorine gas with carrier water. Chlorinated water then was blended with source water prior to entering a one-mile-long transmission main. After reaching the blending station, the treated water was blended with water from four other wells, i.e., Wells No. 11, 1, 2, and 3, before entering the distribution system.



Figure 4-2. Preexisting Wellhead Chlorination System

4.1.1 Source Water Quality. Source water samples from Well No. 9 were collected at the wellhead on August 20, 2003, and analyzed for the analytes shown in Table 3-3. The analytical results, along with those provided by the facility to EPA for the demonstration site selection and those obtained by EPA on October 3, 2002, and by the technology vendor in August 2003 in response to EPA's technology solicitation, are presented in Table 4-1. Additional historic source water quality data, including historical high and low results for the parameters monitored by the facility between 1992 and 2003, are presented in Table 4-2.

Total arsenic and antimony concentrations of the samples obtained by Battelle on August 20, 2003 were 87.9 and 15.8 µg/L, respectively, which were close to the historic high concentrations of 93 and 18 µg/L for these elements. Based on the speciation results, arsenic existed almost entirely as soluble As(V), with only a trace amount, i.e., 0.3 µg/L, existing as soluble As(III). Antimony existed entirely in the soluble form. The data obtained/provided by the facility, EPA, and/or the vendor showed somewhat lower arsenic concentrations, ranging from 45 to 79 µg/L. The facility arsenic speciation data were in agreement with Battelle's data, with soluble As (V) being the only species detected. Therefore, the purpose of prechlorination was only to provide chlorine residuals through the treatment train (to prevent biological growth) and to the distribution system.

pH values of source water ranged from 7.4 to 7.5 based on the samples provided/collected by the facility, EPA, the vendor, and Battelle for this demonstration study. The values fell within the range of the historic high and low values, i.e., 7.9 and 6.9, respectively. The GFH adsorptive media selected for this study adsorbs arsenic and, perhaps, antimony more effectively at the lower end of a pH range extending from 5.5 to 8.5. With source water pH values ranging from 6.9 to 7.9 historically and 7.4 to 7.5 within the last several years, no pH adjustment was used at this site.

Competing ions such as silica and phosphate in source water can be adsorbed onto the GFH media, thus reducing its arsenic and antimony removal capacities. Data obtained by Battelle showed 68.6 mg/L of silica (as SiO_2) and <0.1 mg/L of orthophosphate, comparable to the levels reported by others. Silica concentrations were high and most likely will impact arsenic and antimony adsorption. Published data

Table 4-1. Well No. 9 Source Water Quality Data

Parameter	Unit	STMGID [(a)]	EPA	Siemens	Battelle
Sampling Date	–	Not specified	10/03/02	08/03	08/20/03
pH	–	7.4	NS	7.5	7.4
Total Alkalinity (as $CaCO_3$)	mg/L	85.0	96.0	NS	100.0
Total Hardness (as $CaCO_3$)	mg/L	32.0	23.0	20	17.1
Chloride	mg/L	5.0	9.4	14	10.0
Fluoride	mg/L	NS	NS	NS	0.1
Sulfate	mg/L	28.0	8.4	23	8.0
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	NS	66.0	52.5	68.6
Orthophosphate (as PO_4)	mg/L	0.16[(b)]	NS	NS	<0.10
TOC	mg/L	NS	NS	NS	<1.0
As (total)	µg/L	45.0	79.0	>70	87.9
As (total soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	89.4
As (particulate)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	<0.1
As(III)	µg/L	<2.0	NS	NS	0.3
As(V)	µg/L	45.0	NS	NS	89.1
Sb (total)	µg/L	NS	<25	NS	15.8
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	15.8
Fe (total)	µg/L	20.0	5.0	6	<30
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	<30
Al (total)	µg/L	NS	<25	NS	<10
Al (soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	<10
Mn (total)	µg/L	<10.0	<0.4	3	0.1
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	< .1
V (total)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	3.0
V (soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	3.0
Mo (total)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	< .1
Mo (soluble)	µg/L	NS	NS	NS	< .1
Na (total)	mg/L	30.0	37.2	113	36.4
Ca (total)	mg/L	8.0	6.0	16	5.1
Mg (total)	mg/L	3.0	1.9	4	1.7

(a) Data to EPA for demonstration site selection.
(b) Data provided by EPA.
NS = not sampled

have shown that silica reduced arsenic adsorptive capacity of ferric oxides/hydroxides and activated alumina (Smith and Edwards, 2005; Meng et al., 2000; Meng et al., 2002) and that the effect of silica was most noticeable at pH 8 or above. As such, the effect of silica was carefully monitored during this study.

Source water from Well No. 9 had low or less than detectable concentrations of iron, manganese, aluminum, vanadium, molybdenum, sodium, calcium, magnesium, chloride, fluoride, sulfate, and total organic carbon (TOC).

4.1.2 Distribution System. As shown on the distribution map in Figure 3-2, the distribution system at the eastern half of STMGID was supplied by five wells, including Wells No. 1, 2, 3, 9, and 11. (Note that there were five other independently-operated wells, i.e., Well No. 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, in the western half of STMGID.) Water feeding the GFH system was supplied by Well No. 9 only. Water from Well No. 9 was transported through a 6-in diameter, 1-mile long polyvinyl chloride (PVC) transmission

Table 4-2. Summary of Historic Well No. 9 Water Quality Data

Constitute	Unit	Year 2003	Historic High (1992–2003)	Historic Low (1992–2003)
Primary Standards				
Antimony	µg/L	17	18	6
Arsenic	µg/L	80	93	18
Barium	mg/L	0.05	0.06	0.01
Beryllium	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
Cadmium	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
Chromium	µg/L	1	2	<1
Cyanide	µg/L	<5	<5	<5
Fluoride	mg/L	0.04	0.17	0.02
Mercury	µg/L	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
Nickel	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	0.9	2.3	0.6
Nitrite (as N)	mg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Selenium	µg/L	<1	<1	<1
Thallium	µg/L	<0.5	<0.5	<0.5
Secondary Standards				
Chloride	mg/L	8	9	3
Color	–	3	5	3
Copper	mg/L	0	0.04	<0.01
Fluoride	mg/L	0.04	0.17	0.02
Iron	mg/L	0.02	0.07	<0.01
Magnesium	mg/L	2	3	0
Manganese	mg/L	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
pH	–	7.2	7.9	6.9
Sulfate	mg/L	8	9	6
Zinc	mg/L	0.01	0.03	<0.01
TDS	mg/L	177	195	160
Additional Constituents				
Lead	µg/L	<5	<5	<5
Hardness	mg/L	37	37	21
Calcium	mg/L	10	10	5
Potassium	mg/L	5	6	2
Sodium	mg/L	27	45	26
Silica	mg/L	70	81	65

Data Source: Washoe County Department of Water Resources

line to a blending station where it was blended with water from the other four wells (i.e., Wells No. 11, 1, 2, and 3) at a combined flowrate of approximately 1,400 to 1,500 gpm. Due to elevated arsenic and antimony concentrations, Well No. 9 was operated under a bilateral compliance agreement with local regulators. According to the agreement, WCDWR had to collect water quality samples weekly from the wellhead for arsenic and antimony analyses when the well was in operation. Prior to the demonstration study, to save analytical and data reporting costs, the well was not operated during periods of low demand, which normally extended from the beginning of November through the end of February the following year.

After the blending point, water flows through a 16-in ductile iron transmission main to connect to the distribution system and then to one 500,000- and one 750,000-gal storage tank. The distribution system

consists of 8- to 12-in ductile iron, PVC, and asbestos cement pipe. The residential service lines are constructed of ¾-in HDPE with some commercial and irrigation service lines using 1- to 2-in copper pipe.

4.2 Treatment Process Description

The Siemens arsenic treatment system used GFH, a granular ferric hydroxide media, for arsenic and antimony removal from drinking water supplies (Figure 4-3). Produced by GEH Wasserchemie Gmbh, the media was imported from Germany and marketed by Siemens under an exclusive marketing agreement. Because of short run length issues, another media, i.e., CFH-0818, also was tested after rebedding. CFH-0818 was a dry granular mixture of ferric oxides and hydroxides supplied by Kemira Water Solutions, Inc. Both GFH and CFH-0818 have received NSF International (NSF) Standard 61 listing for use in drinking water applications. The physical and chemical properties of each media are presented in Table 4-3.

Source: Siemens

Figure 4-3. A Photograph of GFH Media

Both adsorptive media can remove both As(V) and As(III), but the capacity for As(III) is much less than that for As(V). The media life for arsenic and antimony removal relies on factors, such arsenic and antimony concentrations, raw water pH, and the presence of other competing anions. Both media have a pH operating range of 5.5 to 8.5 with the removal capacity increasing with decreasing pH. Competing anions such as silica and phosphate are known to adsorb onto ferric hydroxides and reduce arsenic removal capacity of the media (Meng et al., 2000; Meng et al., 2002).

Once exhausted, spent media are removed from the adsorption vessels and replaced with virgin media. The spent media can be disposed of as a non-hazardous waste after passing the TCLP test. This single use media approach eliminates the need for onsite storage of regeneration chemicals and issues related to the handling, storage, and disposal of concentrated regeneration wastes.

A standard Siemens adsorption system consists of two or more downflow pressure vessels with factory installed internals for distribution and collection of effluent and backwash flows. The media vessels can be placed in either parallel or series configuration. According to the vendor, if a consistent 90% reduction is needed across the system, the series design is used. The parallel design is typically used if the percent reduction needed is less than 90%. The treatment system at the STMGID site consists of three vertical pressure vessels configured in parallel with each vessel treating one-third of the incoming flow.

Table 4-3. Physical and Chemical Properties of GFH and CFH-0818 Adsorptive Media

Physical Properties		
Parameter	**GFH**	**CFH-0818**
Matrix	β-ferric oxyhydroxide and ferric hydroxide	Ferric oxide and ferric hydroxide
Physical Form	Granular	Granular
Color	Dark-brown to black	Brown or reddish-brown
Bulk Density (kg/L)	1.15	1.20
Bulk Density (lb/ft^3)	71.8	74.9
Moisture Content (%)	47	16
Grain Size (mm)	0.3–2.0	0.8–1.8
Adsorption Density (g/kg)	>8 based on wet weight	Not listed
Chemical Properties		
Constituent	**GFH**	**CFH-0818**
Fe (%)	61	44
As (mg/kg)	<10	<1
Cd (mg/kg)	<5	<2
Pb (mg/kg)	<10	3
Cu (mg/kg)	30	<5
Cr (mg/kg)	100	10
Ni (mg/kg)	100	140
Zn (mg/kg)	100	400
Mn (mg/kg)	1,500	1,000

Sources: Siemens and Kemira Water Solutions

The site-specific design features of the arsenic removal system are summarized in Table 4-4. Key process steps and major system components are discussed as follows:

- **Intake**. Raw water pumped from Well No. 9 was prechlorinated before being fed into the arsenic removal system. The peak flow rate was estimated to be 350 gpm. The existing wellhead pressure was approximately 180 pounds per square inch (psi), which was higher than the 100-psi pressure rating of the adsorption vessels. Therefore, the well pump had to be reconfigured to produce a pressure of less than 100 psi at the system inlet. The well pump reconfiguration is further discussed in Section 4.3.3.
- **Prechlorination**. Prechlorination with chlorine gas was used to provide chlorine residuals through the treatment train (to prevent biological growth) and in the distribution system. Figure 4-2 presents photographs of the prechlorination system, which was located in the preexisting pump house. The chlorine gas feed rate was 3.5 lb/day and controlled by a panel-mounted automatic switchover rotometer. A dual-cylinder scale was used to monitor the chlorine gas consumption. The chlorine gas was injected to a side stream where it was mixed with carrier water prior to being drawn into the main line. Chlorinated water was then flown to the adsorption vessels in a nearby building constructed to house the treatment system. A sample tap was installed ("AC") on a common feed line to the adsorption vessels to collect chlorinated water prior to treatment by the adsorptive media.
- **Adsorption System**. The skid-mounted adsorption system consisted of three 66-in × 72-in carbon steel vessels configured in parallel and rated for 100 psi of working pressure (Figure 4-4). During Run 1, each vessel was loaded with 80 ft^3 of GFH media supported by a 2 to 3 mm (with a 1.6 uniformity coefficient) underbedding gravel. During Run 2, one vessel was

loaded with 80 ft^3 of GFH media and the other two with 80 ft^3 each of CFH-0818 media. Based on the peak flowrate of 350 gpm, the empty bed contact time (EBCT) was 5.1 min and the hydraulic loading rate was 4.9 gpm/ft^2. The system included a header lateral underdrain with media retaining strainers, front piping, fittings, valves, and meters. A 20-hp booster pump was installed to boost the effluent pressure back to the preexisting levels of approximately 180 psi (Figure 4-5).

Table 4-4. Design Specifications of Siemens System

Parameter	Value	Remarks
Pretreatment		
Chlorine Dosage (lb/day [as Cl_2])	3.5	For 1.0 mg/L (as Cl_2) of target free chlorine residual
Adsorbers		
Number of Vessels	3	
Configuration	Parallel	
Vessel Size (in)	66 D × 72 H	Vessel height at straight side shell
Cross-sectional Area (ft^2)	23.8	
Type of Media	GFH/CFH	
Quantity of Media (ft^3/vessel)	80	240 ft^3 total
Media Depth (in)	40	
Backwash		
Flowrate (gpm)	285	Through each vessel
Hydraulic Loading Rate (gpm/ft^2)	12	
Duration (min)	15–20	
Frequency (times/month)	1–2	
Adsorption System		
Peak Flowrate (gpm)	350	
Flowrate through Each Vessel (gpm)	117	
EBCT (min/vessel)	5.1	Based on peak flow
Hydraulic Loading Rate (gpm/ft^2)	4.9	
Average Use Rate (gpd)	336,000	Based on 16 hr of daily operation at 350 gpm
Daily Throughput (BV/day)	187	1 BV = 240 ft^3 = 1,795 gal
Estimated Working Capacity (BV)	38,000	
Estimated Volume to Breakthrough (gal $\times 10^6$)	68.2	Based on 10-µg/L As breakthrough
Estimated Media Life (day)	203	Estimated frequency of changeout at 75% utilization

- **Backwash.** The adsorption vessels were taken offline one at a time for upflow backwash using treated water to remove particulates and media fines and prevent media compaction. Backwashing could be initiated manually, semi-automatically, and automatically. Semi-automatic backwash was set for the system at STMGID, i.e., the programmable logic controller (PLC) sounds an alarm when it receives a high differential pressure signal across the adsorption vessels or a time elapsed signal from the adjustable clock and the operator acknowledges the alarm and initiates the backwash cycle. During a backwash event, all vessels are backwashed sequentially, using the treated water from the two vessels in service to backwash the third. Backwash wastewater

Figure 4-4. Siemens GFH Arsenic/Antimony Removal System

Figure 4-5. A New Booster Pump Station

produced was discharged to the sanitary sewer (Figure 4-6). A backwash flowrate and a loss of head gauges were installed in the front piping. The backwash flowrate gauge was provided with a 6-in-diameter standard weight pipe flange and installed to the end of the GFH system backwash waste header piping with standard flange gasket and mounting bolts.

Figure 4-6. Backwash Discharge

- **Programmable Logic Controller.** A control panel was provided for automated system control (Figure 4-7). This panel was interfaced with the local system control and data acquisition (SCADA) enclosure as a means for remote communication. The filter system could be operated locally from the operator interface terminal. Each adsorption vessel had two electronically actuated butterfly valves and one manual butterfly valve with handwheel actuator for the process flow control. The electronically actuated valves were the influent valve and the backwash waste valve. The manual valve was the effluent valve, which remained open. Pressure gauges were used to monitor the system pressure and pressure drop across each vessel and the treatment train. In addition, a flowmeter/totalizer was installed in the effluent line of each adsorption vessel to monitor the flowrate and track the volume throughput through each vessel (Figure 4-8).

Figure 4-7. Programmable Logic Controller

Figure 4-8. Third Pressure Vessel and Associated Plumbing and Monitoring Components

- **Media Replacement**. When the adsorptive capacity of the GFH media was exhausted, the spent media was taken out of the vessels for disposal and replaced with virgin media. According to Siemens, the media changeout was to take place once every 203 days based on the water analysis and a 75% water usage rate. The actual run length of the media was determined based on the results of the performance evaluation study as discussed in Section 4.5.

4.3 Permitting and System Installation

4.3.1 Permitting. WCDWR prepared engineering plans and permit submittals for the project using input from Siemens, such as system specifications and process and instrumentation diagrams (P&IDs). The plans included site engineering drawings, equipment tie-ins, and site plans. After certified by a State of Nevada-registered professional engineer (PE), the submittal package was sent to the Washoe County Department of Health for review and approval on July 26, 2004. The approval was granted on October 20, 2004.

4.3.2 Building Construction. A building was constructed by STMGID to house the treatment system. A photograph of the treatment building and pump house is shown in Figure 4-9. The construction bid for the building was awarded on September 28, 2004. Construction of the building was delayed because the building contractor did not submit the adequate bonding paperwork for building permit application. Siemens stored the equipment at its Ames, IA facility until the construction was completed and delivery of the equipment could be scheduled. Upon payment of building permit fees on October 25, 2004, the building permit was granted. Building construction began on November 22, 2004, and was completed the week of March 14, 2005. The free-standing building constructed of concrete masonry unit (CMU) blocks measured 32 ft × 18 ft, with an interior wall height of 14 ft and a three tab asphalt shingle roof. Due to the close proximity to a commercial shopping center, the pump house and treatment building had stone/stucco exterior and/or a stone water table to match the architectural style of the neighborhood. The building had one walk-through door and an 8-ft × 12-ft rollup door.

Figure 4-9. New Treatment Building and Preexisting Well Pump House

4.3.3 Installation, Shakedown, and Startup. The equipment for the treatment system arrived at the site on March 21, 2005, and installation began immediately after the system off-loading (Figure 4-10). Because the well riser pipe and the system inlet piping did not match, a custom piece had to be constructed to connect the system and the well. Plumbing of the system was completed on April 18, 2005, by Siemens's subcontractor, Christman Construction. The system was originally scheduled for hydraulic testing before the media loading; however, the hydraulic testing and media loading had to be put off because it was discovered that the wellhead pressure exceeded the 100-psi pressure rating of the adsorption vessels. As a result, the wellhead pressure had to be reduced before the adsorption vessels could be hydraulically tested and subsequently operated. Meanwhile, Siemens collected 1 gal of the media that had been stored at the site since October 2004 for precautionary testing and determined that the moisture content of the media was not impacted due to the long term storage.

Figure 4-10. Delivery of One Adsorption Vessel

Reduction of the wellhead pressure was achieved by well pump reconfiguration, which was undertaken by WCDWR with partial funding provided by EPA. From April to July 2005, WCDWR pursued required funding and contractors to perform the well pump modification. The well pump reconfiguration work extended from August 29, 2005, through September 6, 2005. The work involved removing the existing submersible well pump and motor and associated piping and electrical wiring from the well casing, removing four stages from the pump, trimming one or more impellers to achieve a new pump design operating point of 285 ft total dynamic head at 305 gpm, and reinstalling the pump and appurtenances into the well. The reconfigured well pump produced a maximum pressure of 100 pounds per square inch (gauge) (psig). A Goulds 4-in booster pump with a Baldor 20-hp motor and a check valve was installed on the filter discharge piping to boost the pressure back to 180 psi. The booster pump and associated electrical work was completed by September 6, 2005. The existing SCADA system was modified to control the well and booster pump. In addition to the initial engineering design, WCDWR also performed final construction inspections.

Following the modification, Siemens's subcontractor returned to the site on September 12, 2005, to perform hydraulic testing and media loading. The hydraulic testing was conducted by initiating the flow through each vessel, partially closing the discharge valve, adjusting the flow to approximately 100 gpm, and measuring the inlet, outlet, and differential pressure across each vessel and the system. The results of the hydraulic testing on the empty vessels indicated minimal pressure drop across each vessel and the system at a combined flowrate of 300 gpm, and an evenly balanced flow across each of the three vessels.

The media was loaded following the hydraulic testing. The underbedding support was first installed to a depth of 12 in. Water was added to the vessel to a depth of approximately 3 ft above the top of the underbedding support and the GFH media was then loaded to a depth of about 40 in. Due to lack of a roof hatch, the media loading was conducted manually and took three days to complete. The media loading was followed by initial backwash that was performed at half of the normal backwash flowrate for 30 to 45 min. The loading of GFH media was completed on September 14, 2005. The system was subsequently disinfected with a 5.25% NaOCl solution on September 15, 2005, and bacterial samples were collected on September 16, 2005. The bacterial results passed; however, the PLC did not function properly so the system could not be put into service. A Siemens technician returned to the site on September 19, 2005, to complete the startup and perform O&M training. The technician reprogrammed the PLC to interface with the SCADA system so that the well pump, treatment system, and booster pump might work together in the service mode.

Battelle made a site visit on September 23, 2005, to conduct system inspections and operator training for sampling and data collection. Upon careful inspections of the system, a punch list was developed and summarized as follows:

- Revise PLC program to enable automatic backwash.
- Replace six 0 to 100 psig pressure gauges with 0 to 150 psig gauges to enable measurements of the system pressure, which was slightly above 100 psig.
- Adjust the PLC totalizer screen to display throughput readings properly.
- Increase the pressure set point for automatic backwash from 3 to 7 psi.

The Siemens technician returned to the site during the week of September 26, 2005. The first set of water samples was collected on September 27, 2005, marking the commencement of the performance evaluation study at the STMGID site. The items on the punch list were addressed during a site visit by the Siemens technician on October 11 to 12, 2005. One exception was that the backwash totalizer did not display properly on the PLC screen. The backwash totalizers were connected to the PLC by the Siemens technician during a later site visit, which took place on December 22, 2005.

4.4 System Operation

4.4.1 Operational Parameters. The operational parameters recorded during Run 1 and Run 2 system operations are tabulated and attached as Appendix A. Key parameters are summarized in Table 4-5. The operating parameters (e.g., flowrate, EBCT, and pressure) recorded during Run 1 were similar to those recorded during Run 2 except that the system maintained a longer daily operating time and thus a higher daily use rate during Run 2.

Run 1. From September 27, 2005, through May 3, 2006, the treatment system operated for approximately 943 hr based on hour meter readings of the well pump. The system operating schedule varied during this 32-week study period. In the first three weeks, the system ran for 18 days, with daily operating hours ranging from 4.0 to 22.1 hr/day and averaging 13.8 hr/day. The system was operated for

longer periods of time during startup, but the daily operating time was decreased following a decrease in water demand. During the following four and a half weeks, the system ran for 16 days, with daily operating times ranging from 1.2 to 6.8 hr/day and averaging 3.6 hr/day. Starting from November 18, 2005 (except for the three-week duration from December 17, 2005, through January 6, 2006, when the system was shut down to make repairs as described in Section 4.4.4), the system began operating daily (including weekends), with daily operating times ranging from 1.7 to 9.7 hr/day and averaging 3.8 hr/day.

The total system throughput during this 32-week period was 15,567,000 gal, equivalent to 8,677 BV of water processed through the entire system. The BV for the system was calculated based on a total of 240 ft^3 (or 1,795 gal) of media in the three adsorption vessels. The total flow processed through the system was based on the sum of the throughputs through each of the three vessels measured with individual totalizers. Individually, the number of BV processed through each vessel was slightly different (i.e., 9,033, 8,390, and 8,609 BV for Vessels A, B, and C, respectively) due to uneven flow distributed through each vessel. The total system throughput thus obtained was 1.2% lower than that from the master totalizer at the wellhead.

Table 4-5. Summary of Siemens Adsorptive System Operations

Test Run (Test Duration)	**Run 1 (9/27/05–05/03/06)**			**Run 2 (04/05/07–07/03/07)**		
Adsorption Vessel	A	B	C	A	B	C
Adsorptive Media	GFH	GFH	GFH	GFH	CFH	CFH
Total Operating Time (hr)	943	943	943	1166	1166	1166
Throughput Based on Individual Totalizers (kgal)	5,402	5,017	5,148	6,401	6,265	6,246
Throughput (BV)[(a)]	9,033	8,390	8,609	10,703	10,476	10,444
Range of Flowrate (gpm)	93–107	87–95	89–97	66–148[(d)]	64–104	48–104
Average Flowrate (gpm)	95	89	91	92	92	92
Range of EBCT (min)[(a)]	5.6–6.4	6.3–6.9	6.2–6.7	4–9.1	5.8–9.3	5.8–12.5
Average EBCT (min)[(a)]	6.2	6.7	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5
Average Inlet Pressure (psi)	103.6	103.2	102.6	103.8	103.1	102.7
Average Outlet Pressure (psi)	102.5	102.1	102.0	102.4	102.6	102.7
Average Pressure Loss across Vessel (psi)	1.1	1.4	1.1	1.4	0.5	0
Range of Daily Operating Time (hr/day)	1–20			6–17		
Average Daily Operating Time (hr/day)	3.8[(b)]			13		
Throughput Based on Master Flow Totalizer (gal)	15,753,000			18,848,000		
Throughput Based on Individual Totalizers (gal)	15,567,000			18,910,000		
Throughput (BV)[(c)]	8,677			10,541		
Range of Combined Flowrate (gpm)	205–333			260–287		
Average Combined Flowrate (gpm)	275			276		
Range of Daily Use Rate (gpd)	46,740–75,924[(b)]			91,556–278,098		
Average Daily Use Rate (gpd)	62,700[(b)]			215,280		
Inlet Pressure (psi)	102.8			103.8		
Outlet Pressure (psi)	100.8			101.1		
Average Pressure Loss across System (psi)	2			2.7		

(a) Calculated based on throughput from individual totalizers and 80 ft^3 of media in each vessel.
(b) Calculated based on operational data collected during normal system operations starting from November 18, 2005 through May 2, 2006 (except for a three-week duration when system was shut down for repairs).
(c) Calculated based on combined throughput from individual totalizers and 240 ft^3 (or 1,795 gal) of media in three vessels.
(d) Operator adjusted valves to maintain balanced flow during second run to account for different flow through vessels. One day imbalanced flow of 148 gpm observed; typically evenly balanced flow achieved, as indicated by average flowrate.

The average flowrates measured by individual flowmeters installed on Vessels A, B, and C were 95, 89, and 91 gpm, respectively. These values were comparable to calculated average flowrates of 96, 88, and 90 gpm from readings generated by the individual totalizers and well-pump hour meter. Thus, the flowmeters/totalizers installed on the adsorption vessels appeared to be calibrated accurately. The range of flowrates through the entire system was 205 to 333 gpm, with an average of 275 gpm (compared to the design flowrate of 350 gpm). These resulted in EBCTs ranging from 5.6 to 6.7 min with an average of 6.5 min (compared to the design EBCT of 5.1 min). Based on the average flowrate and average daily operating time, the average volume of water treated each day under normal system operations was 62,700 gpd (Table 4-5).

The average pressure loss across each tank ranged from 1.1 to 1.4 psi. The average influent pressure reading at the head of the system was 102.8 psi, and the average pressure reading at the combined effluent was 100.8 psi. Thus, the pressure loss across the system averaged 2.0 psi.

Run 2. From April 5, 2007, through July 3, 2007, the treatment system operated for approximately 1,166 hr based on hour meter readings of the well pump. The system operating schedule varied during this 14-week study period, increasing in daily operating times from 6 to 13 hr during the first half of the run and from 14 to 17 hr during the second half, with an overall average of 13 hr/day. The total system throughput was 18,848,000 gal, equivalent to 10,541 BV of water processed through the entire system. Again, the total flow processed through the system was based on the sum of the throughputs through each of the three vessels measured with individual totalizers. The operator made a special effort to adjust relevant valves to create a balanced flow through the three vessels. Without adjustment, the flow between the vessels would have been notably imbalanced between the GFH media (Vessel A) and the CFH-0818 media (Vessels B and C). The number of BV processed through each vessel was very similar, i.e., 10,703, 10,476, and 10,444 BV for Vessels A, B, and C, respectively.

The average flowrates measured by individual flowmeters installed on Vessels A, B, and C were 92 gpm each. These values were comparable to calculated average flowrates (i.e., 89, 90, and 90 gpm, respectively) from readings generated by the individual totalizers and well-pump hour meter. The range of flowrates through the entire system was 260 to 287 gpm, with an average of 276 gpm. This resulted in an overall average EBCT of 6.5 min. Based on the average flowrate and average daily operating time, the average volume of water treated each day under normal system operations was 215,280 gpd.

The average pressure loss across Tank A, which contained the GFH, was 1.4 psi. The average pressure loss across Tank B and Tank C was slightly lower at 0 and 0.5 psi. The average influent pressure reading at the head of the system was 103.8 psi, and the average pressure reading at the combined effluent was 101.1 psi. Thus, the total pressure loss across the system averaged 2.7 psi.

4.4.2 Backwash. Siemens recommended that the media beds be backwashed, either manually or automatically, approximately once every 2 to 6 weeks. Automatic backwash could be initiated either by a timer setting or by a differential pressure (Δp) setting across the vessels. The timer set point was set at the maximum time allowable, which was 630 hr. Due to the steady pressure in the vessels, the system did not require backwashing. However, the system was backwashed to test the automatic backwash system about one month after the system startup with only 219 hr of operating time. Also, although the differential pressure remained low, the system was backwashed once in September 2006 during the interim period between the end of performance monitoring for Run 1 and start of performance monitoring for Run 2 and once during Run 2 in an attempt to improve media run length. As discussed in Section 4.5.1, backwashing the media had little or no affect on media run length.

4.4.3 RSSCT. In an attempt to find an adsorptive media that possessed more adsorptive capacities for arsenic and antimony, a series of RSSCT tests was performed in the laboratory and field using Well No. 9 water under two separate projects (Westerhoff et al., 2007). The media tested included four iron-based media (i.e., GFH, E33, ARM 200, and CFH-12 [similar to CFH-0818 except for a larger granular size]), two titanium-based media (i.e., Metsorb™ and Adsorbsia GTO), and one hybrid iron oxide/ion exchange resin-based media (i.e., ArsenX^{np}). The number of bed volumes until arsenic breakthrough at 10 µg/L for both laboratory and field tests are summarized in Table 4-6. The results of these studies indicated that all seven media tested had rather short run lengths for arsenic, thereby, confirming the full-scale GFH data. In fact, GFH had the longest run length in both tests, followed by Kemira CFH-12. Because CFH-0818 media was less expensive than GFH, it was selected along with GFH for the second test run.

Table 4-6. Number of Bed Volumes until Arsenic Breakthrough at 10 µg/L

Media	Media Type	Manufacturer	Laboratory RSCCT	Field RSCCT
GFH[(a)]	Iron-based	GEH Wasserchemie	11,000	16,200
E33	Iron-based	Bayer AG	NA	8,700
ARM200	Iron-based	BASF	7,900	NA
CFH-12	Iron-based	Kemira	NA	12,400
CFH-12[(b)]	Iron-based	Kemira	NA	9,400
Metsorb	Titanium-based	HydroGlobe	NA	5,200
Adsorbsia GTO	Titanium-based	Dow Chemcial	4,500	NA
ArsenX^{np}	Iron/IX resin-based	Purolite	7,900	NA

(a) Selected to simulate full-scale run length.
(b) Air became entrained in column and a second test was conducted using a new column.

4.4.4 Media Loading and Removal. Upon selecting the CFH-0818 media, the process of procuring the media and installation services began. One difficulty encountered was finding installation services within the project budget. The cost for spent media removal and disposal and virgin media reloading as included in the original media replacement quote provided by the vendor in October 2003 was $7,500. However, the cost of services provided by Siemens had risen significantly to $38,500, which included 75 man-days for manual media loading. Repeated negotiations with Siemens and its local subcontractor failed to bring the cost down. After contacting several other vendors, installation services were procured at a more obtainable price of $12,950 in December 22, 2006. The spent media replacement began on March 26, 2007 (a long lead time was required because of contractor's busy schedule) and completed in approximately four days. Before the removal of spent media, the heights of the freeboard were measured from the flange at the top of the vessel to the top of the media bed. No difference was noted between the initial (before commencement of Run 1) and final measurements (after completion of Run 1), indicating no media loss. The spent media then was sampled and removed from each vessel as described in Section 4.5.3.

Media installation is typically accomplished by either bulk placement or slurry transfer. In the bulk placement method, bulk media containers (i.e., Supersacs) are positioned above a top-mounted access hatch to a vessel and a bottom bag opening allows the media to flow through a chute into the vessel. This method may be performed if the vessel is located outdoors or if there is a hatch in the roof to allow access to the top of the vessel. Because the treatment building at STMGID lacked a roof hatch, Siemens proposed the slurry transfer method, which uses a portable eductor system to slurry the media into the vessel (Figure 4-11). However, just before media installation, a Kemira representative who was onsite

expressed concern that the high operating pressure (between 50 to 100 psi) could damage the media and requested that the media be loaded by hand in small increments. With the assistance of the Kemira representative and WCDWR staff, media loading was completed in two days. A portion of the CFH-0818 was missing from the initial delivery; consequently, the Kemira representative returned on April 5, 2007 to complete the installation. Following installation, the system was backwashed and disinfected. Upon notification that treated water samples passed the bacteria test, the system was put into operation.

Figure 4-11. Photographs of Media Replacement

4.4.5 Residuals Management. The only residuals produced by the operation of the GFH treatment system were backwash wastewater and spent media. The backwash wastewater was discharged to the sewer directly. The spent media was disposed of as nonhazardous waste in the local landfill.

4.4.6 System Operation, Reliability and Simplicity. In general, operation of the GFH system did not require additional skills beyond those necessary to operate the existing water system. However, several problems related to the PLC and system components arose during the first 32-week study period. Additional discussions regarding system operation and operator skill requirement follow.

Pre- and Post-Treatment Requirements. The majority of arsenic at this site existed as As(V), therefore, a preoxidation step was not required. However, prechlorination was provided to prevent biological growth in the treatment system and maintain chlorine residuals in the distribution system.

System Controls. The treatment system was fitted with automated controls to allow for automatic backwash. During system startup, the system was tested, but failed to perform automatic backwash because the PLC did not interface with the SCADA system properly. When the system initiated a backwash cycle, the backwash valves would completely close for 5 to 10 sec as the system attempted to backwash the next vessel in line. The closed valves caused the system pressure to spike, which, in turn, caused the well pump to shut off, resulting in an aborted backwash. The SCADA design included a high pressure well shutoff when a pressure of 125 psi was maintained for more than 5 sec. The PLC program was revised to eliminate the time delay between valves closing and opening in order to prevent the spike in the system pressure. The vendor instructed the facility operator to exercise the valves on a routine basis to prevent sticking. A subsequent site visit also was required to ensure the backwash totalizer reading would be displayed on the PLC screen during backwash.

Another problem encountered was that the pneumatic butterfly valves associated with the backwash discharge line were not resting properly, causing the vessels to bleed off pressure as they sat idle. The existing chlorine gas system had a check valve that was held closed by the pressure in the inlet piping to the vessels. When the pressure was lost, the check valve opened, allowing water to enter the chlorine gas lines. The system was turned off for three weeks during December 17, 2005, through January 6, 2006, while Siemens serviced the butterfly valves and replaced the chlorine gas lines.

Operator Skill Requirements. The State of Nevada has an operator certification program that applies to all persons who operate community or non-transient, non-community public water systems and to persons who operate transient non-community systems that utilize surface water as a source. Grade levels of operator certification start at Grade 1 and progress to Grade 4. The grade level required is determined by the complexity of the system, such as the population served, type of source water, disinfection method, treatment for contaminants, and other factors.

Prior to system installation, the preexisting plant required a Grade 2 distribution system operator (i.e., D-2). The Siemens treatment system was operated by a Grade 3 operator in both treatment and distribution systems (i.e., D-3 and T-3). A Grade 3 operator requires several post secondary courses of instruction, such as successful completion of 36 hr college level courses related to drinking water.

Under normal operating conditions, no additional skills were required beyond those necessary to operate the existing water supply equipment. However, as described above, some initial adjustments to the PLC made by the Siemens technician were required to achieve the desired interface with the SCADA and correct readings on the display screen.

Preventative Maintenance Activities. The only regularly scheduled preventative maintenance activity recommended by the vendor was to exercise the backwash valves occasionally so that they might function properly in case backwash was needed. The treatment system operator visited the site about five times per week and stayed for about 30 min each time to check the system for leaks, and record flow, volume, and pressure readings.

4.5 System Performance

The system performance was evaluated based on analyses of samples collected from the treatment and distribution systems.

4.5.1 Treatment Plant. Tables 4-7 and 4-8 summarize the results of arsenic, antimony, and three competing anions for samples collected across the treatment train during Run 1 and Run 2. Appendix B contains a complete set of analytical results through the 32- week Run 1 and the 14-week Run 2 performance monitoring. The results of the treatment plant sampling are discussed as follows.

Table 4-7. Summary of Run 1 Analytical Results for Arsenic, Antimony, and Competing Anions

Parameter	Sampling Location	Unit	Number of Samples	Concentration			Standard Deviation[a]
				Minimum	Maximum	Average[a]	
As (total)	IN	µg/L	25	35.0	88.0	67.2	13.0
	TA	µg/L	25	0.2	25.1	-	-
	TB	µg/L	25	0.1	20.0	-	-
	TC	µg/L	25	<0.1	19.8	-	-
	TT	µg/L	10	0.2	21.6	-	-
As (soluble)	IN	µg/L	6	29.5	79.7	60.0	17.4
	TA	µg/L	3	0.7	1.4	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	0.2	0.7	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	0.3	0.8	-	-
	TT	µg/L	6	0.1	8.4	-	-
As (particulate)	IN	µg/L	6	<0.1	5.5	1.2	2.2
	TA	µg/L	3	<0.1	1.1	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	<0.1	0.9	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	0.2	1.1	-	-
	TT	µg/L	6	<0.1	0.5	-	-
As (III)	IN	µg/L	6	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.1
	TA	µg/L	3	0.2	0.3	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	0.2	0.3	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	<0.1	0.3	-	-
	TT	µg/L	6	<0.1	0.3	-	-
As (V)	IN	µg/L	6	29.1	79.4	59.7	17.4
	TA	µg/L	3	0.3	1.1	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	<0.1	0.5	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	<0.1	0.6	-	-
	TT	µg/L	6	<0.1	8.3	-	-
Sb (total)	IN	µg/L	25	10.2	21.0	14.6	2.1
	TA	µg/L	23	0.2	14.5	-	-
	TB	µg/L	23	0.1	14.6	-	-
	TC	µg/L	23	0.1	14.5	-	-
	TT	µg/L	10	0.5	14.0	-	-
Sb (soluble)	IN	µg/L	5	11.1	15.4	13.6	1.7
	TA	µg/L	3	0.1	9.9	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	0.1	9.4	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	0.1	9.3	-	-
	TT	µg/L	6	0.3	13.9	-	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	IN	mg/L	25	51.5	95.1	72.6	6.7
	TA	mg/L	23	5.0	75.2	-	-
	TB	mg/L	23	4.9	76.0	-	-
	TC	mg/L	23	4.4	75.6	-	-
	TT	mg/L	6	9.1	72.4	-	-
Total P (as P)	IN	µg/L	23	89.0	150.4	115.2	15.6
	TA	µg/L	21	<10.0	90.8	-	-
	TB	µg/L	21	<10.0	87.3	-	-
	TC	µg/L	21	<10.0	85.5	-	-
	TT	µg/L	7	<10.0	203.9	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	IN	mg/L	7	<0.05	0.13	0.08	0.03
	TA	mg/L	7	<0.05	<0.05	-	-
	TB	mg/L	7	<0.05	<0.05	-	-
	TC	mg/L	7	<0.05	<0.05	-	-
	TT	mg/L	4	<0.05	<0.05	-	-

(a) Average and standard deviation only provided for inlet samples; not meaningful for effluent data with breakthrough curves. One-half of detection limit used for less than detection calculations. Duplicate samples included in calculations.

Table 4-8. Summary of Run 2 Analytical Results for Arsenic, Antimony and Competing Anions

Parameter	Sampling Location	Unit	Number of Samples	Concentration			Standard Deviation[(a)]
				Minimum	Maximum	Average[(a)]	
As (total)	IN	µg/L	3	59.4	109.6	90.1	26.9
	TA	µg/L	3	0.5	55.4	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	0.3	46.2	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	0.2	44.9	-	-
	TT	µg/L	0	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	IN	µg/L	3	10.0	15.7	13.7	3.2
	TA	µg/L	3	5.3	14.7	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	4.3	14.5	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	4.4	14.5	-	-
	TT	µg/L	0	-	-	-	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	IN	mg/L	2	73.7	75.5	74.6	1.3
	TA	mg/L	2	61.3	75.5	-	-
	TB	mg/L	2	49.0	74.0	-	-
	TC	mg/L	2	48.8	74.0	-	-
	TT	mg/L	0	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	IN	µg/L	3	105.9	118.6	111.8	6.4
	TA	µg/L	3	<10.0	91.6	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	<10.0	57.6	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	<10.0	57.3	-	-
	TT	µg/L	0	-	-	-	-

(a) Average and standard deviation only provided for inlet samples; not meaningful for effluent data with breakthrough curves. One-half of detection limit used for less than detection calculations. Duplicate samples included in calculations.

Arsenic. The key parameter for evaluating the effectiveness of the adsorption system was the concentration of arsenic in the treated water. The treatment plant water was sampled on 25 occasions during the first 32 weeks of system operation (including one event with duplicate samples taken), with field speciation performed on six occasions. The treatment plant water was sampled on three occasions during the 14-week Run 2 test; no speciation sample was taken during this run.

Total arsenic concentrations in raw water ranged from 35.0 to 88.0 µg/L and averaged 67.2 µg/L during the Run 1 (Table 4-7) and ranged from 59.4 to 110 µg/L and averaged 90.1 µg/L during Run 2 (Table 4-8). Arsenic existed primarily as soluble As(V), with trace amounts present as soluble As(III) (i.e., 0.3 µg/L on average) and particulate (1.2 µg/L on average). Arsenic speciation results for samples taken on three occasions at TA, TB, and TC and six occasions at TT during Run 1 are presented in bar charts shown in Figure 4-12. Except for three occasions, As(V) was the predominating species in the treated water. As(III) in raw water remained essentially unchanged, with 0.3 µg/L (on average) entering the system and 0.2 to 0.3 µg/L coming out of the system. It was possible that the 0.2 to 0.3 µg/L of As(III) observed was an artifact of the arsenic speciation method because the chlorine applied to raw water should have completely oxidized As(III) to As(V).

Figure 4-13 shows the influent and effluent total arsenic concentrations plotted against the number of bed volumes processed through each vessel and the entire system at the time of sampling for both runs. (Note that one BV equals to the combined volume of three parallel adsorptive media beds at 240 ft^3 or 1,795 gal.) The influent arsenic concentrations measured during this period showed a steadily increasing trend, rising from 35.0 µg/L at the system startup to 88.0 µg/L by the end of this Run 1. During Run 2, influent arsenic concentrations increased even higher, up to 110 µg/L, exceeding the historic high concentration of 93 µg/L. It is not clear why the arsenic concentrations continued to rise as observed.



Figure 4-12. Concentrations of Various Arsenic Species in Influent and Effluent during Run 1





Figure 4-13. Arsenic Breakthrough Curves (Run 1, top; Run 2, bottom)

Figure 4-13 also plots the total arsenic concentration measured after each vessel at TA, TB, and TC and after the entire system at TT. WCDWR took TT samples for arsenic analysis by Sierra Environmental Monitoring Laboratory (Reno, NV) and the results also are plotted in the graphs. In general, WCDWR's data matched closely with Battelle's data, except for two high data points observed just before and after the 2,000-BV mark. As shown in the top graph, all three adsorption vessels removed arsenic to <0.5 µg/L initially and below 10 µg/L until approximately 7,200 BV of water had been treated. The system continued to operate until about 8,700 BV of water because, to meet the MCLs, the treated water could be blended downstream with low-arsenic and low-antimony water from other source wells supplying the distribution system. The system was shut down in May 2006 when the effluent arsenic concentrations had exceeded 20 µg/L. During the interim between the shutdown of Run 1 in May 2006 and the startup of Run 2 in April 2007, the system was operated for a brief period from September 12, 2006, through October 13, 2006 to meet water demand. Before restarting the system, the operator performed backwash for the three adsorption vessels. After the extended shutdown, the influent concentrations were much lower upon startup. As a result, the treated effluent concentrations also decreased. The influent and effluent concentrations soon approached levels observed in May 2006 and the operator shut down the system.

Run 2 results confirmed the short run length observed during Run 1, with breakthrough at 10 µg/L occurring even earlier at approximately 3,700 BV based of the facility TT data (Figure 4-13). Higher influent arsenic concentrations observed in Run 2 most likely had caused even earlier arsenic breakthrough from the GFH media in Vessel A. Similar arsenic breakthrough patterns also were observed for the CFH-0818 media in Vessels B and C. These results were significantly less than the vendor estimated capacity of 38,000 BV for GFH and the RSSCT estimated capacity of 9,400 to 12,400 BV for CFH-0818.

The short run length observed for both media was believed to be the result of competitive adsorption by competing anions, such as silica and phosphorous. The effects of these anions are further discussed in the following sections.

The 7,200 to 3,700 BV run lengths experienced in Runs 1 and 2 were significantly shorter than the RSSCT projected run lengths of 9,000 to 16,200 BV (see Table 4-6). Considerably higher arsenic concentrations in source water (i.e., 67.2 µg/L [on average] in Run 1 and 90.1 µg/L [on average] in Run 2 vs. 48.9 µg/L [on average] in RSSCT) might have contributed to the shorter run lengths observed. Nonetheless, the RSSCT results were useful in terms of helping predict the performance of a full-scale system.

Antimony. Total antimony concentrations in raw water measured during Run 1 ranged from 10.2 to 21.0 µg/L and averaged 14.6 µg/L (Table 4-7), existing almost entirely in the soluble form. Influent antimony concentrations measured during Run 2 ranged from 10.0 to 15.7 µg/L and averaged 13.7 µg/L (Table 4-8). Figure 4-14 shows antimony breakthrough curves from Vessels A, B, and C and the entire system. The test results obtained by WCDWR on treated water samples also are included in the graphs. Breakthrough at 6 µg/L occurred at approximately 2,000 (facility data) to 3,000 BV (Battelle data) during Run 1 and 1,225 BV during Run 2, indicating that both media had a limited adsorptive capacity for antimony.

One pilot study conducted by Siemens in Salt Lake County Service Area No. 3, Utah showed that GFH could remove antimony up to 50,000 BV. More information on this study can be found at http://www.canyonwater.com/antimony.htm.



Figure 4-14. Antimony Breakthrough Curves (Run 1, top; Run 2, bottom)

Silica. Silica concentrations in raw water ranged from 51.5 to 95.1 mg/L (as SiO_2) and averaged 72.6 mg/L (as SiO_2) during Run 1 (Table 4-7) and ranged from 73.7 to 75.5 mg/L (as SiO_2) during Run 2 (Table 4-8). Silica was removed until reaching complete breakthrough about halfway through the 32-week study period in Run 1 (Figure 4-15). In Run 2, only two data points were obtained and silica already had reached complete breakthrough when the second set of samples was taken. Silica adsorption on porous metal-oxide adsorptive media can be a major factor that impacts arsenic and, perhaps, antimony, removal by these media (Smith et al., 2005). Several batch and column studies document that silica reduces arsenic adsorptive capacities on ferric oxides/hydroxides and activated alumina (Meng et al., 2002; Meng et al., 2000). Mechanisms proposed to describe the role of silica in iron-silica and iron-arsenic-silica systems include: 1) adsorption of silica may change the surface properties of adsorbents by lowering the iso-electric point (or pH_{zpc}), 2) silica may compete for arsenic adsorption sites, 3) polymerization of silica may accelerate silica sorption but lower the available surface sites for arsenic adsorption, and 4) chemical reactions of silica with divalent cations such as calcium, magnesium, and barium may form precipitates. Therefore, the high level of silica in Well No. 9 might have reduced arsenic and antimony removal capacities of both media.

Phosphorous. Total phosphorous concentrations in raw water ranged from 89.0 to 150.4 µg/L (as P) and averaged 115.2 µg/L during Run 1 (Table 4-7) and ranged from 105.9 to 118.6 µg/L (as P) and averaged 111.8 µg/L (as P) during Run 2 (Table 4-8). Orthophosphate was measured on seven occasions during the first three months of Run 1 system operation, with concentrations peaking at 0.13 mg/L (as P) and averaging 0.08 mg/L. Total phosphorous was removed to below the method reporting limit of 10 µg/L (as P) until about 3,500 BV and then gradually broke through from the adsorption vessels (see breakthrough curve for Run 1 in Figure 4-16). Phosphorous did not reach 100% breakthrough by the end of either run. Phosphorous removal by iron-based adsorptive media has been observed at several EPA arsenic removal demonstration sites (McCall et al, 2006; 2008). Similar to silica, phosphorous apparently competed with arsenic and, perhaps antimony for available adsorption sites, thus significantly reducing the useful media life for arsenic and antimony.

Other Water Quality Parameters. Tables 4-9 and 4-10 provide a summary for the water quality parameters observed during normal system operation for Run 1 and Run 2, respectively. During the first day of Run 1 operation, the water quality measured was not typical of those measured thereafter. For example, an elevated iron concentration (i.e., 232 µg/L) was measured in the influent during startup on September 27, 2005, compared to <25 µg/L for all samples collected thereafter. Also, significant decreases in pH (from 7.1 to <4.5), alkalinity (from 92 to <1.0 mg/L [as $CaCO_3$]), and chlorine residuals (from 0.8 to 0.2 mg/L [as Cl_2]) were observed in the effluent of adsorption vessels shortly after the system was placed online, indicating removal of bicarbonate ions and consumption of chlorine by the GFH media. Within a week, the pH, alkalinity, and chlorine residual levels after the adsorption vessels returned to normal. Further, elevated total and dissolved manganese concentrations were measured in the effluent of the adsorption vessels on September 27, 2005, i.e., ranging from 12.4 to 16.8 µg/L as compared to an average of 0.1 mg/L for all samples collected thereafter), indicating leaching of some manganese from the GFH media during the initial operation.

As shown in Tables 4-9 and 4-10, pH values of raw water varied from 6.5 to 7.9, which fell within the desirable pH range for adsorptive media without any pH adjustment. pH values of the treated water ranged from 6.4 to 7.6. Therefore, the water pH did not change significantly after the treatment, except for shortly after the system was placed online. All other constituents in raw water did not appear to have been altered by the treatment system.



Figure 4-15. Silica Breakthrough Curves (Run 1, top; Run 2, bottom)



Figure 4-16. Phosphorous Breakthrough Curves (Run 1, top; Run 2, bottom)

Table 4-9. Summary of Run 1 Other Water Quality Parameter Measurements

Parameter	Sampling Location	Unit	Number of Samples	Concentration			Standard Deviation
				Minimum	Maximum	Average	
Fe (total)	IN	µg/L	24	<25	<25	<25	0
	TA	µg/L	22	<25	<25	-	-
	TB	µg/L	22	<25	<25	-	-
	TC	µg/L	22	<25	<25	-	-
	TT	µg/L	9	<25	873	-	-
Fe (soluble)	IN	µg/L	5	<25	<25	<25	0
	TA	µg/L	2	<25	<25	-	-
	TB	µg/L	2	<25	<25	-	-
	TC	µg/L	2	<25	<25	-	-
	TT	µg/L	5	<25	72.4	-	-
Mn (total)	IN	µg/L	24	<0.1	0.8	0.1	0.2
	TA	µg/L	22	<0.1	0.6	-	-
	TB	µg/L	22	<0.1	0.3	-	-
	TC	µg/L	22	<0.1	0.7	-	-
	TT	µg/L	9	<0.1	40.4	-	-
Mn (soluble)	IN	µg/L	5	<0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
	TA	µg/L	2	<0.1	0.4	-	-
	TB	µg/L	2	<0.1	0.2	-	-
	TC	µg/L	2	<0.1	0.2	-	-
	TT	µg/L	5	<0.1	1.9	-	-
Fluoride	IN	mg/L	5	<0.1	0.2	0.1	0.05
	TA	mg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0
	TB	mg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0
	TC	mg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0
	TT	mg/L	5	<0.1	0.2	0.1	0
Nitrate (as N)	IN	mg/L	5	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.02
	TA	mg/L	3	0.9	0.9	0.9	0
	TB	mg/L	3	0.9	0.9	0.9	0
	TC	mg/L	3	0.9	0.9	0.9	0
	TT	mg/L	5	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.5
Sulfate	IN	mg/L	5	6.7	7.4	7.0	0.3
	TA	mg/L	3	7.0	8.0	7.5	0.5
	TB	mg/L	3	7.0	8.0	7.5	0.5
	TC	mg/L	3	7.0	8.0	7.5	0.5
	TT	mg/L	5	7.0	8.0	7.4	0.4
Alkalinity (as $CaCO_3$)	IN	mg/L	24	88.0	101	93.4	3.9
	TA	mg/L	22	83.0	101	92.2	3.7
	TB	mg/L	22	79.0	101	92.3	4.8
	TC	mg/L	22	80.0	97.0	92.1	3.9
	TT	mg/L	5	83.0	185	108	43.4
Turbidity	IN	NTU	24	<0.1	2.0	0.4	0.4
	TA	NTU	22	<0.1	0.8	0.3	0.2
	TB	NTU	22	<0.1	0.8	0.3	0.2
	TC	NTU	22	<0.1	1.2	0.3	0.3
	TT	NTU	5	0.2	9.5	2.2	4.1

Table 4-9. Summary of Run 1 Other Water Quality Parameter Measurements (Continued)

Parameter	Sampling Location	Unit	Number of Samples	Concentration			Standard Deviation
				Minimum	Maximum	Average	
pH	IN	S.U.	26	6.5	7.9	7.1	0.3
	TA	S.U.	26	6.5	7.6	7.0	0.2
	TB	S.U.	26	6.5	7.6	7.0	0.2
	TC	S.U.	26	6.5	7.5	7.0	0.2
	TT	S.U.	24	6.5	7.5	7.0	0.2
Temperature	IN	°C	26	14.6	17.7	16.5	0.7
	TA	°C	26	14.6	17.7	16.4	0.8
	TB	°C	26	14.6	17.7	16.2	0.8
	TC	°C	26	10.6	17.6	15.9	1.3
	TT	°C	25	14.7	17.0	16.1	0.6
Dissolved Oxygen	IN	mg/L	26	0.8	6.2	1.9	1.4
	TA	mg/L	26	0.9	4.7	1.9	1.0
	TB	mg/L	26	0.9	4.6	1.9	1.0
	TC	mg/L	26	1.0	4.6	1.9	1.1
	TT	mg/L	25	0.8	6.0	2.0	1.3
ORP	IN	mV	26	115	381	255	52.8
	TA	mV	26	215	739	657	129
	TB	mV	26	236	744	672	129
	TC	mV	26	242	753	682	130
	TT	mV	25	264	754	699	97.8

Notes: Samples collected on first day of operation, i.e., September 27, 2006, not included because they were not representative of normal operation. See Appendix B for September 27, 2006 results. One-half of detection limit used for less than detection calculations. Duplicate samples included in calculations.

4.5.2 Backwash Wastewater Sampling. Backwash wastewater samples were collected on September 12, 2006, and the analytical results are summarized in Table 4-11.

The average pH value of backwash wastewater was 7.0, similar to the pH values of the treated water used for backwash. Soluble arsenic concentrations of the backwash wastewater averaged 15.7 µg/L, similar to those of the treated water. Soluble iron and soluble manganese concentrations of the backwash wastewater averaged 26.5 and 1.6 µg/L, respectively, also similar to those of the treated water. Soluble iron concentrations were considerably lower than the corresponding total iron concentrations, which averaged 1,984 µg/L. The presence of particulate iron most likely was associated with media fines, because little or no iron was measured in raw water. Assuming that 45 mg/L of TSS was produced in 8,850 gal of backwash wastewater from the vessels (based on totalizer readings), approximately 3.3 lb of solids would be discharged during each backwash event. Based on the total metal (or, more correctly, digested metal) data, the solids discharged would be composed of <0.001, 0.145, and 0.002 lb of arsenic, iron, and manganese, respectively, assuming 2.4 µg/L of particulate arsenic, 1,962 µg/L of particulate iron, and 34.2 µg/L of particulate manganese in the backwash wastewater.

Table 4-12 presents total metal results of three backwash solid samples (one each from Vessels A, B, and C backwash) collected on September 13, 2006 and analyzed in triplicate. Iron levels in the solids ranged from 168 to 190 mg/g (of dry media) and averaged 178 mg/g (or 18%). Arsenic levels ranged from 0.85 to 0.95 mg/g and averaged 0.90 mg/g (or 0.09%).

Table 4-10. Summary of Run 2 Other Water Quality Parameter Measurements

Parameter	Sampling Location	Unit	Number of Samples	Concentration			Standard Deviation
				Minimum	Maximum	Average	
Fe (total)	IN	µg/L	3	<25	<25	<25	0
	TA	µg/L	3	<25	<25	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	<25	<25	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	<25	<25	-	-
	TT	µg/L	0	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	IN	µg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0
	TA	µg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	-	-
	TB	µg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	-	-
	TC	µg/L	3	<0.1	<0.1	-	-
	TT	µg/L	0	-	-	-	-
pH	IN	S.U.	4	7.1	7.6	7.3	0.2
	TA	S.U.	4	6.4	7.0	-	-
	TB	S.U.	4	6.4	7.4	-	-
	TC	S.U.	4	6.5	8.0	-	-
	TT	S.U.	4	6.4	7.6	-	-
Temperature	IN	°C	4	17.2	18.3	17.9	0.5
	TA	°C	4	17.3	18.5	-	-
	TB	°C	4	17.4	18.4	-	-
	TC	°C	4	17.4	18.6	-	-
	TT	°C	4	16.7	18.4	-	-
Dissolved Oxygen	IN	mg/L	4	4.2	7.6	5.6	1.4
	TA	mg/L	4	4.1	7.4	-	-
	TB	mg/L	4	3.9	6.1	-	-
	TC	mg/L	4	3.9	6.4	-	-
	TT	mg/L	4	3.5	5.9	-	-
ORP	IN	mV	4	121	256	179	57
	TA	mV	4	388	676	-	-
	TB	mV	4	536	717	-	-
	TC	mV	4	477	720	-	-
	TT	mV	4	603	742	-	-

One-half of detection limit used for less than detection calculations.

Table 4-11. Backwash Wastewater Sampling Results

Vessel	Date	pH	TDS	TSS	As (total)	As (soluble)	Fe (total)	Fe (soluble)	Mn (total)	Mn (soluble)
		S.U.	mg/L	mg/L	µg/L	µg/L	µg/L	µg/L	µg/L	µg/L
A	9/12/2006	7.02	208	44	15.9	15.8	1,586	33.1	35.0	2.8
B	9/12/2006	6.98	154	52	19.0	15.9	2,833	34.0	49.3	0.9
C	9/12/2006	6.97	160	39	19.3	15.4	1,534	<25	23.1	1.1
	Average	7.00	174	45	18.1	15.7	1,984	26.5	35.8	1.6

Table 4-12. Backwash Solid Total Metal Results

Sample ID	Unit	Mg	Al	Si	P	Ca	V	Fe	Mn	Ni	Cu	Zn	As	Cd	Sb	Ba	Pb	Fe/As ratio
BW1-Solids-A	µg/g	5,150	29,342	1,393	1,116	18,611	509	172,665	806	46.4	1,655	400	854	1.17	3.41	373	56.8	202
BW1-Solids-B	µg/g	5,291	31,087	1,743	1,117	19,067	532	180,765	845	46.8	1,675	435	875	1.26	3.98	382	57.9	207
BW1-Solids-C	µg/g	5,159	29,240	1,602	1,097	19,087	525	178,371	831	46.7	1,740	455	883	1.35	3.08	376	58.0	202
Vessel A Average	µg/g	5,200	29,890	1,579	1,110	18,922	522	177,267	827	46.6	1,690	430	871	1.26	3.49	377	57.6	204
BW2-Solids-A	µg/g	3,993	25,329	1,495	1,096	15,243	589	189,544	761	39.3	778	252	936	0.48	4.61	347	23.7	203
BW2-Solids-B	µg/g	3,687	20,255	1,167	1,078	14,493	589	188,229	765	39.5	784	232	945	0.45	2.3	338	23.6	199
BW2-Solids-C	µg/g	3,643	21,371	1,289	1,087	15,831	591	186,038	755	39.6	770	285	926	<0.5	2.5	348	23.9	201
Vessel B Average	µg/g	3,774	22,318	1,317	1,087	15,189	590	187,937	760	39.5	778	257	936	0.46	3.14	344	23.8	201
BW3-Solids-A	µg/g	4,044	26,471	1,598	1,059	16,213	564	168,172	610	34.7	1,506	356	885	<0.5	3.1	331	71.9	190
BW3-Solids-B	µg/g	3,556	17,521	1,475	1,049	14,436	558	167,817	606	33.7	1,522	371	894	<0.5	1.67	327	73.1	188
BW3-Solids-C	µg/g	3,889	23,512	1,573	1,022	16,102	554	168,416	613	34.9	1,473	335	872	<0.5	2	324	70.7	193
Vessel C Average	µg/g	3,830	22,501	1,549	1,043	15,584	559	168,135	610	34.4	1,500	354	884	<0.5	2.26	327	71.9	190

4.5.3 Spent Media Sampling. On March 27, 2007, spent GFH media samples were collected for total digestive metals and TCLP analyses as part of the demonstration study (Section 3.3.3). The results of TCLP analysis (Table 4-13) characterized the spent media as a non-hazardous material that could be disposed of in a sanitary landfill. Among the eight Resources Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) metals analyzed, only barium was detected at 3.1 mg/L. The other RCRA metals were at concentrations less than the respective method detection limits. Spent GFH samples also were collected by WCDWR on February 2, 2007 prior to the media replacement for site specific waste characterization required by a local landfill. WCDWR shared the results of these tests, which, as also shown in Table 4-13, were very similar to those of the samples taken on March 27, 2007, with only barium detected at 3.4 mg/L.

Table 4-13. TCLP and Other Waste Characterization Results for Spent Media

Parameter	Unit	Method	Concentration	
			Collected by Battelle on 03/27/07	Collected by WCDWR on 02/02/07[(a)(b)]
TCLP Results				
Arsenic	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	<0.05	<0.1
Barium	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	3.1	3.4
Cadmium	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	<0.05	<0.1
Chrome	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	<0.05	<0.1
Lead	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	<0.1	<0.1
Mercury	mg/L	SW7470	<0.003	NA
Selenium	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	<0.3	<0.5
Silver	mg/L	SW1311/6010B	<0.05	<0.1
Iron	mg/L	SW846/6010A	NA	<0.5
Other Waste Characterization Test Results[(a)]				
Paint Filter Test	Pass/Fail	SW-846-9095	NA	Pass
pH-Saturated Test	S.U.	SW-846-9045A	NA	7.32
TCLP VOCs	mg/L	EPA SW 1311/8260B	NA	All <0.1

(a) Waste characterization test results provided by WCDWR for informational purposes.
(b) WCDWR laboratory followed SW846/6020 method for TCLP analysis for metals.

ICP-MS results of the media analysis are presented in Table 4-14. The virgin GFH media contained mostly iron at 609 mg/g (as Fe), which is consistent with the vendor reported value of 61% in Table 4-3. The spent GFH media contained an average of 440 and 324 mg/g of iron for the Run 1 and Run 2 media, respectively. The lower iron content in the spent media might have contributed to the higher levels of impurities in the spent media. The virgin CFH-0818 media was not analyzed, but reportedly contained 44% of iron (Table 4-3). The corresponding spent media contained 394 mg/g of iron.

The spent GFH media results indicated that the media removed arsenic and other elements such as P, V, Cu, Zn, Sb, and Ba as water passed through the tank as evident by the decreasing concentrations from the top to the bottom of the tank. The average arsenic concentration on the spent GFH media was 2,000 μg/g (0.2%) during Run 1. The spent GFH and CFH-0818 media collected from the top of the tanks at the end of Run 2 contained 1,655 μg/g (0.166%) and 590 μg/g (0.059%) of arsenic, respectively.

The arsenic loading on the spent media was also calculated in terms of μg As/g of dry media by dividing the arsenic mass represented by the area between the influent and effluent curves on the breakthrough curves, shown in Figure 4-13, by the amount of dry media in each tank. Table 4-15 presents a summary of the arsenic loading calculations for each media during Run 1 and Run 2. As shown in this table, the

Table 4-14. Total Metals Analysis Results for Spent Media

Location in Tank	Mg	Al	Si	P	Ca	V	Fe	Mn	Ni	Cu	Zn	As	Cd	Sb	Ba	Pb
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Virgin GFH[a]	83.3	523	399	85	228	NA	609,306	384	109	15.9	23	6.6	<0.5	NA	NA	1.8
Run 1[b]																
Top (GFH)	519	722	750	1,972	3,366	1,656	440,113	271	60.7	28.7	243	2,607	<0.5	27.7	351	0.4
Middle (GFH)	553	787	953	1,912	3,295	1,833	443,477	291	65.7	40.2	261	2,540	<0.5	30.0	361	0.4
Bottom (GFH)	447	462	980	1,366	2,699	687	435,010	249	66.2	5.4	59	852	<0.5	20.2	299	<0.5
Average	506	657	894	1750	3,120	1,392	439,533	270	64	24.8	188	2,000	<0.5	26	337	<0.5
Run 2[b]																
Top (GFH)	425	461	2,868	1,544	2,571	NA	324,048	903	36.3	14.7	26	1,655	<0.5	7.4	326	2.55
Top (CFH-0818)	5402	504	1,511	1,225	5,831	NA	394,014	922	151	6.19	380	590	<0.5	3.8	532	2.09

(a) Virgin media characterized in a separate study.
(b) Average compositions calculated from triplicate analyses.

Table 4-15. Summary of Arsenic Loading Calculations for Run 1 and Run 2

Parameter	Run 1	Run 2	Run 2
Media	GFH	GFH	CFH- 0818
Volume (ft^3)	240	80	160
Bulk Density (lb/ft^3)	71.8	71.8	74.9
Wet Weight (lb)	17,232	5,744	11,984
Moisture Content (%)	47	47	16
Dry Weight (lb)	9,133	3,044	10,067
As Removed from Raw Water (g)	4,556	1,359	2,939
Average As Loading (µg/g)	1,100	984	644
As Concentration in Spent Media (µg/g)	2,000	1,655	590

arsenic loadings on the Run 1 GFH media, Run 2 GFH media, and Run 2 CFH-0818 media were 1,100, 984 and 644 μg/g, respectively. These calculated arsenic loadings represent the average loadings on the entire volume of the media. Due to the arsenic concentration gradient from the top to the bottom of the tanks, these average loadings may or may match the results of the ICP-MS analysis of the respective media.

4.5.4 Distribution System Water Sampling. Prior to the operation of the GFH system, baseline distribution water samples were collected from three locations for four consecutive months in 2004. Following system startup in September 2005, distribution sampling continued on a monthly basis at the same three locations. The sampling results are presented in Table 4-16. Figure 4-17 plots the total arsenic and antimony concentrations measured in the distribution system after system startup.

Prior to the installation of the GFH system, total arsenic and antimony concentrations in the distribution system upstream of the blending point (i.e., at DS1) averaged 87.2 and 16.8 μg/L, respectively, representing the high concentrations in Well No. 9 water. Downstream of the blending point (i.e., at DS2 and DS3), total arsenic concentrations averaged 16.7 μg/L at DS2 and 17.4 μg/L at DS3, whereas total antimony concentrations averaged 2.6 μg/L at DS2 and 2.8 μg/L at DS3. These values were significantly lower than those in Well No. 9 water due to blending with low-arsenic and low-antimony water from other source wells supplying the distribution system. After the GFH system was put into service, both arsenic and antimony concentrations at all three locations were significantly reduced to below the respective MCLs (except for one exceedance), as shown in Figure 4-17. These concentration reductions resulted primarily from treatment by GFH system and blending with other source waters. Due to lack of records of actual blending ratios and water quality of other source wells, the exact cause of the reductions observed may not be identified.

Lead levels in the first draw samples from two residences (DS2 and DS3) were low (< 0.1 to 1.5 μg/L) and did not appear to be affected by the treatment system. Copper levels fluctuated, ranging from 17.1 to 148 μg/L before the treatment system was installed and from 0.6 to 176 μg/L afterwards, which were well below the copper action level of 1,300 μg/L. Iron and manganese concentrations in the distribution system were below the respective detection limits most of the time. The pH and alkalinity values remained fairly constant in the distribution system.

4.6 System Cost

The cost of the system was evaluated based on the capital cost per gpm (or gpd) of design capacity and the O&M cost per 1,000 gallons of water treated. This required tracking of the capital cost for the equipment, site engineering, and installation and the O&M cost for the media replacement and disposal, electricity consumption, and labor. The cost incurred for treatment building construction ($186,000 funded by STMGID) and well reconfiguration (provided by EPA with partial funding of $34,840) were not included in this cost evaluation.

4.6.1 Capital Cost. The capital investment for equipment, site engineering, and installation was $232,147 (see Table 4-17) as provided by Siemens in a cost proposal to Battelle dated October 1, 2003. The equipment cost was $157,647 (or 68% of the total capital investment), which included the cost for three skid-mounted carbon steel pressure vessels ($45,500), 240 ft^3 of GFH media ($238/$ft^3$ or $3.03/lb for a total cost of $57,000), process piping and valving ($11,000), instrumentation and controls ($9,500), and field services, labor, and travel ($27,000). The equipment cost also included a change order of $7,647 for adding three flow meters and three differential pressure gauge assemblies. The items on the change order were not standard items and were added for monitoring purposes.

Table 4-16. Distribution System Sampling Results

No. of Sampling Events	Location	DS1																	DS2									DS3								
	Sample Type	Non-Residence																	LCR									LCR								
	Flushed /1st Draw	1st Draw									Flushed[a]								1st Draw									1st Draw								
	Sampling Date	Stagnation Time (hrs)	pH	Alkalinity	As	Fe	Mn	Pb	Cu	Sb	pH	Alkalinity	As	Fe	Mn	Pb	Cu	Sb	Stagnation Time (hrs)	pH	Alkalinity	As	Fe	Mn	Pb	Cu	Sb	Stagnation Time (hrs)	pH	Alkalinity	As	Fe	Mn	Pb	Cu	Sb
BL1	06/09/04	164	6.8	116	65.3	<25	0.6	8.9	13.1	15.4	6.8	91	63.2	<25	0.1	1.4	5.2	15.5	8.8	7.1	104	13.1	<25	<0.1	0.4	110	2.4	9.5	6.9	104	12.8	<25	<0.1	0.3	121	2.6
BL2	07/08/04	740	6.9	93	87.9	212	0.7	32.6	7.6	15.6	6.9	93	81.4	<25	<0.1	2.0	5.4	15.7	NA	7.0	97	20.4	<25	<0.1	0.3	43.9	2.9	NA	7.1	97	19.9	<25	<0.1	1.0	148	2.8
BL3	08/11/04	211	7.4	94	93.5	<25	0.8	3.4	8.2	15.3	7.3	94	93.4	<25	0.5	0.6	7.0	15.2	10.8	7.3	102	15.9	<25	<0.1	<0.1	17.1	2.2	8	7.5	102	18.1	<25	<0.1	0.1	83.0	2.8
BL4	09/08/04	672	7.2	97	108	555	2.2	46.2	13.3	21.3	7.3	93	111	<25	0.4	0.7	7.6	20.9	7.0	7.2	105	17.6	<25	<0.1	0.1	74.4	2.9	8.3[b]	7.4	109	18.7	<25	<0.1	<0.1	69.4	3.0
1	10/25/05	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.3	97	3.1	106	1.5	4.5	51.2	2.0	NA	7.5	106	4.7	<25	<0.1	0.6	11.8	0.5	NA	7.5	106	4.4	<25	0.2	1.5	75.0	0.4
2	11/30/05	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.2	88	4.1	<25	2.3	2.7	4.7	2.1	8.0	7.5	97	5.5	<25	<0.1	0.1	20.9	1.0	7.5	7.5	88	5.2	<25	<0.1	0.1	64.1	1.1
3	12/14/05	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.5	101	4.0	<25	0.5	0.6	0.9	2.3	13.0	7.6	106	4.2	<25	<0.1	0.1	0.6	2.1	8.5	7.6	101	4.2	<25	<0.1	0.2	60.1	2.0
4	01/18/06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.1	92	1.2	<25	0.5	1.2	10.4	10.5	8.5	7.4	101	3.9	<25	<0.1	0.4	172	2.1	NA	7.7	101	4.2	<25	<0.1	0.3	87.2	1.7
5	02/15/06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.5	104	4.3	<25	1.0	0.7	6.5	2.2	7.3	7.5	104	4.4	<25	0.2	0.5	86.2	2.0	7.5	7.5	104	4.4	57.8	0.3	0.5	68.9	2.2
6	03/15/06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.5	100	4.1	<25	<0.1	0.5	100	2.0	7.3	7.4	100	4.0	<25	<0.1	0.3	176	2.0	7.7	7.4	100	4.2	<25	0.5	1.0	9.3	1.9
7	04/12/06	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.6	106	7.2	<25	<0.1	0.2	2.1	3.2	7.5	7.4	106	7.2	<25	<0.1	0.2	121	3.3	8.0	7.4	106	6.4	<25	0.1	0.4	107	3.1

(a) DS1 was located upstream of the Well No. 9 blending point. First draw sampling discontinued after the baseline sampling due to infrequent use of sample tap as indicated by the long stagnation time. Stagnation times not appliable for flushed samples.

(b) Resident's roommate may have used the water before the draw.

Lead action level = 15 µg/L; copper action level = 1.3 mg/L

Unit of µg/L for all anlaytes except for pH and alkalinity (mg/L as $CaCO_3$)

BL = Baseline Sampling; NA = not available



Figure 4-17. Total As and Sb Concentrations in Distribution System after System Startup

Table 4-17. Summary of Capital Investment Cost of GFH System

Description	Quantity	Cost	% of Capital Investment Cost
Equipment Costs			
GFH Media (ft^3)	240	$57,000	–
Vessels	3	$45,500	–
Process Piping and Valves	–	$11,000	–
Instrumentation and Controls	–	$9,500	–
Field Services and Miscellaneous Items	–	$12,000	–
Labor	–	$10,000	–
Travel	–	$5,000	–
Change Order for Adding Three Flow Meters and Three Differential Pressure Gauge Assembles	–	$7,647	–
Equipment Total	–	**$157,647**	**68%**
Engineering Costs			
Labor	–	$16,000	–
Engineering Total	–	**$16,000**	**7%**
Installation Costs			
Material	–	$13,500	–
Labor	–	$30,000	–
Travel	–	$10,000	–
Subcontractor	–	$5,000	–
Installation Total	–	**$58,500**	**25%**
Total Capital Investment	–	**$232,147**	**100%**

WCDWR prepared, at its own cost, the required engineering plans and permit submittals, which included the system layout and footprint, piping connections to the entry and distribution tie-in points, and system specifications and P&IDs provided by Siemens. The engineering cost charged by Siemens was $16,000, about 7% of the total capital investment. The engineering work performed by Siemens was limited to its system design information and PE-stamped P&IDs. The cost incurred by WCDWR for the plans preparation and submittals are not included in Table 4-17.

The installation cost included the cost of labor and materials to unload and install the treatment system; complete the piping installation and tie-ins; and perform the system startup and shakedown (Section 4.3.3). The installation cost was $58,500, or 25% of the total capital investment.

The capital cost of $232,147 was normalized to $663/gpm (or $0.46/gpd) of the design capacity using the system's rated capacity of 350 gpm (or 504,000 gpd). The capital cost also was converted to an annualized cost of $21,912 by applying a capital recovery factor of 0.09439 based on a 7% interest rate and a 20-yr return. Assuming that the system operated 24 hr/day, 7 day/wk at the design flowrate of 350 gpm to produce 183,960,000 gal of water per year, the unit capital cost would be $0.12/1,000 gal.

Using the 3.8 hr/day of average daily system run time and 275 gpm of average system flowrate, the system would produce only 22,885,500 gal of water per year. At this reduced rate of operation, the unit capital cost increased to $0.96/1,000 gal.

4.6.2 Operation and Maintenance Cost. The O&M cost for the Siemens GFH system included only the incremental cost associated with the system, such as media replacement and disposal, electricity consumption, and labor, as presented in Table 4-18. Additional electricity use associated with the air

compressor and PLC was minimal. The routine, non-demonstration-related labor activities consumed about 30 min/day, 5 day/wk as noted in Section 4.4.6. Therefore, the labor cost was calculated to be $0.18/1,000 gal of water treated.

Table 4-18. Summary of O&M Cost

Cost Category	Value	Assumptions
Volume Processed (1,000 gal)	15,567	Actual volume treated for 32-week period
Media Replacement and Disposal		
Volume of Media Replaced (ft^3)	240	
Replacement Media ($)	57,600	$240/$ft^3$ of media, includes shipping
Labor and Disposal($)	12,950	
Waste Characterization ($)	608	
Subtotal ($)	71,158	Estimated cost
Media Replacement and Disposal Cost ($/1,000 gal)	See Figure 4-18	As a function of media run length to 10-µg/L As or 6-µg/L Sb breakthrough
Chemical Usage		
Chemical Cost ($)	0.00	No additional chemicals required
Electricity		
Electricity Cost ($/1,000 gal)	0.001	Incremental electrical cost negligible
Labor		
Average Weekly Labor (hr)	2.5	30 min/day, 5 day/wk
Labor Cost ($)	2,800	80 hr × $35/hr for 32-wk period
Labor Cost ($/1,000 gal)	0.18	Based on 15,567,000 gal of water treated
Total O&M Cost ($/1,000 gal)	See Figure 4-18	

The unit O&M cost is driven primarily by the cost to replace the spent media and is a function of the media run length. The media run length is measured by the number of bed volumes treated by the system until reaching 10-µg/L arsenic breakthrough or 6-µg/L antimony breakthrough in the combined effluent, whichever occurs first. CFH-0818 was tested in an attempt to find a less expensive adsorptive media that would work as well as the GFH because of the short run length. However, at the time this report was prepared, the CFH-0818 was taken off the market to make improvements to the product and the reintroduction of this media is pending further evaluation of the marketplace. The cost estimate focused on the cost to operate the Siemens adsorptive system utilizing GFH. The pending media replacement cost is estimated to be $71,158, including 240 ft^3 of virgin GFH media ($57,600), labor and spent media disposal ($12,950), and waste characterization ($608). By averaging the media replacement cost over the media life, the cost per 1,000 gal of water treated was plotted as a function of the media run length in BV or the system throughput in gal (see Figure 4-18). The media run length in BV was calculated by dividing the total system throughput by the total quantity of media, i.e., 240 ft^3. As shown in this figure, the unit media replacement cost would be $5.51/1,000 gal for a media run length of 7,200 BV (or 12,925,000 gal) – if the system operation was governed by arsenic. If the system operation was governed by antimony, the media would be replaced around 3,000 BV (or 5,386,000 gal) and the unit replacement cost would be higher at $13.21/1,000 gal. Unit costs would be even higher if governed based on the faster arsenic and antimony breakthrough observed during Run 2 (i.e., $15.51/1,000 gal and $32.36/1,000 gal, respectively).



Figure 4-18. Media Replacement and Total O&M Curves for GFH System

5.0 REFERENCES

Battelle. 2003. *Quality Assurance Project Plan for Evaluation of Arsenic Removal Technology*. Prepared under Contract No. 68-C-00-185, Task Order No. 0019, for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

Chen, A.S.C., L. Wang, J.L. Oxenham, and W.E. Condit. 2004. *Capital Costs of Arsenic Removal Technologies: U.S. EPA Arsenic Removal Technology Demonstration Program Round 1.* EPA/600/R-04/201. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

Edwards, M., S. Patel, L. McNeill, H. Chen, M. Frey, A.D. Eaton, R.C. Antweiler, and H.E. Taylor. 1998. "Considerations in As Analysis and Speciation." *J. AWW*, *90(3)*: 103-113.

EPA. 2003. Minor Clarification of the National Primary Drinking Water Regulation for Arsenic. *Federal Register*, 40 CFR Part 141.

EPA. 2002. *Lead and Copper Monitoring and Reporting Guidance for Public Water Systems*. EPA/816/R-02/009. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, D.C.

EPA. 2001. National Primary Drinking Water Regulations: Arsenic and Clarifications to Compliance and New Source Contaminants Monitoring. *Federal Register*, 40 CFR Parts 9, 141, and 142.

McCall, S.E., L. A.S.C. Chen, and Wang. 2006. *Arsenic Removal from Drinking Water by Adsorptive Media, U.S. EPA Demonstration Project at Goffstown, NH, Six-Month Evaluation Report.* EPA/600/R-06/125. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

McCall, S.E., A.S.C. Chen, and L. Wang. 2008. *Arsenic Removal from Drinking Water by Adsorptive Media, U.S. EPA Demonstration Project at Bow, NH, Final Performance Evaluation Report.* EPA/600/R-08/006. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

Meng, X.G., S. Bang, and G.P. Korfiatis. 2000. "Effects of Silicate, Sulfate, and Carbonate on Arsenic Removal by Ferric Chloride." *Water Research, 34(4):* 1255-1261.

Meng, X.G., G.P. Korfiatis, S.B. Bang, and K.W. Bang. 2002. "Combined Effects of Anions on Arsenic Removal by Iron Hydroxides." *Toxicology Letters, 133(1):* 103-111.

Smith, S.D., and M. Edwards. 2005. "The Influence of Silica and Calcium on Arsenate Sorption to Oxide Surfaces." *Journal of Water Supply: Research and Technology - AQUA,54(4):* 201-211.

Wang, L., W.E. Condit, and A.S.C. Chen. 2004. *Technology Selection and System Design: U.S. EPA Arsenic Removal Technology Demonstration Program Round 1.* EPA/600/R-05/001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH.

Westerhoff, P., T. Benn, A.S.C. Chen, L. Wang, L.J. Cumming. 2007. *Assessing Arsenic Removal by Metal (Hydr)Oxide Adsorptive Media Using Rapid Small Scale Column Tests.* Prepared under Contract No. 68-C-00-185, Task Order No. 0019, for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH

APPENDIX A

OPERATIONAL DATA

EPA Arsenic Demonstration Project at STGMID in Washoe County, NV – Summary of Run 1 Daily System Operation

		Pump House				Total System Operation Data								Tank Pressure Operation Data											
														Tank A			Tank B			Tank C			Total System Pressure Data		
Week	Date	Hour Meter hr	Avg. Op Hours hr	Total Hours hr	Avg. Flowrate gpm	Master Flow Meter gal	Treated Volume Kgal	Total Treated Volume Kgal	Flow Totalizer Tank A gal	Flow Totalizer Tank B gal	Flow Totalizer Tank C gal	Cumulative Flow Kgal	Cumulative Bed Volume # of BV	◊P	Inlet	Outlet	◊P	Inlet	Outlet	◊P	Inlet	Outlet	◊P	Inlet	Outlet
1	09/27/05	6564.9		4	270	116,028,000	62	62	21,142	20,218	20,218	62	34.0	0.0	101.0	100.0	0.0	99.0	100.0	0.5	100.0	100.0	0.0	99.0	99.0
	09/28/05	6583.8	18.9	23	288	116,355,000	327	389	129,929	124,431	124,431	379	211.1	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.0	102.0	101.0	1.0	104.0	103.0
	09/29/05	6587.7	11.4	27	278	116,420,000	65	454	151,832	145,433	145,433	443	246.8	1.1	105.0	105.0	1.1	106.0	106.0	1.1	104.0	102.0	0.9	105.0	104.0
	09/30/05	6606.4	13.8	45	287	116,742,000	322	776	258,020	248,072	248,072	754	420.4	1.1	103.0	103.0	1.0	104.0	102.0	1.1	102.0	100.0	0.9	105.0	103.0
2	10/03/05	6653.3	14.7	92	286	117,548,000	806	1,582	524,876	507,150	508,370	1,540	858.6	1.3	104.0	102.0	0.5	106.0	101.0	1.0	102.0	100.0	1.0	104.0	100.0
	10/04/05	6666.5	14.5	105	287	117,775,000	227	1,809	599,420	599,420	581,426	1,780	992.3	1.1	101.0	101.0	1.0	103.0	101.0	0.6	101.0	99.0	1.0	103.0	100.0
	10/05/05	6688.6	15.5	128	287	118,156,000	381	2,190	725,650	725,650	705,298	2,157	1202.1	1.1	104.0	103.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	0.6	103.0	101.0	0.9	104.0	102.0
	10/06/05	6702.2	15.3	141	287	118,390,000	234	2,424	801,333	801,333	779,650	2,382	1327.9	1.1	103.0	103.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	0.6	102.0	100.0	1.0	104.0	101.0
	10/07/05	6716.9	15.2	156	286	118,642,000	252	2,676	884,862	884,862	861,230	2,631	1466.5	1.2	101.0	101.0	1.0	102.0	101.0	0.7	102.0	100.0	1.0	102.0	99.0
3	10/10/05	6765.0	15.4	204	287	119,469,000	827	3,503	1,157,292	1,121,250	1,128,411	3,407	1899.1	1.3	101.0	101.0	1.1	102.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	100.0	0.9	103.0	100.0
	10/11/05	6779.8	15.4	219	331	119,763,000	294	3,797	1,240,530	1,202,300	1,210,200	3,653	2036.2	1.3	101.0	101.0	1.1	101.0	101.0	1.2	101.0	99.0	0.9	102.0	100.0
	10/12/05	6788.0	14.9	227	205	119,864,000	101	3,898	1,287,858	1,246,258	1,255,442	3,790	2112.4	1.1	102.0	102.0	1.1	102.0	102.0	1.1	102.0	100.0	0.9	103.0	101.0
	10/13/05	6800.0	14.7	239	285	120,069,000	205	4,103	1,357,570	1,310,324	1,321,711	3,990	2223.9	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	103.0	1.2	104.0	101.0	0.9	104.0	103.0
4	10/17/05	6810.4	12.3	249	282	120,245,000	176	4,279	1,417,138	1,365,029	1,378,363	4,161	2319.1	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	10/18/05	6810.4	11.7	249	0	120,245,000	0	4,279	1,417,138	1,365,029	1,378,363	4,161	2319.1	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	10/19/05	6810.5	11.2	249	333	120,247,000	2	4,281	1,417,700	1,365,600	1,378,990	4,162	2320.1	0.0	104.0	103.0	0.0	104.0	104.0	0.0	104.0	104.0	0.0	104.0	102.0
	10/20/05	6816.2	10.9	255	287	120,345,000	98	4,379	1,449,942	1,395,794	1,409,061	4,255	2371.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	10/21/05	6816.2	10.5	255	0	120,345,000	0	4,379	1,450,500	1,395,700	1,409,600	4,256	2372.2	0.4	103.0	101.0	1.1	102.0	101.0	0.6	102.0	102.0	1.0	102.0	102.0
5	10/24/05	6822.3	9.5	261	279	120,447,005	102	4,481	1,485,546	1,427,875	1,442,384	4,356	2428.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	10/25/05	6822.4	9.2	261	166	120,448,000	1	4,482	1,486,127	1,428,431	1,442,971	4,358	2428.9	0.9	102.0	101.0	1.3	101.0	100.0	1.0	101.0	101.0	1.2	101.0	99.0
	10/26/05	6829.2	9.1	268	284	120,564,000	116	4,598	1,527,269	1,463,755	1,478,871	4,470	2491.6	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	24.0	24.0	0.0	24.0	25.0
	10/27/05	6832.8	8.9	272	292	120,627,000	63	4,661	1,549,712	1,483,007	1,498,466	4,531	2525.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6	10/31/05	6832.8	7.9	272	0	120,627,000	0	4,661	1,549,712	1,483,007	1,498,466	4,531	2525.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	11/01/05	6837.9	7.8	277	288	120,715,000	88	4,749	1,580,898	1,509,900	1,525,900	4,617	2573.4	0.8	102.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	101.0	1.1	101.0	101.0	1.2	100.0	99.0
	11/02/05	6839.3	7.6	278	262	120,737,000	22	4,771	1,588,801	1,516,666	1,532,747	4,638	2585.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	11/03/05	6841.9	7.5	281	282	120,781,000	44	4,815	1,604,500	1,530,200	1,546,600	4,681	2609.4	0.8	103.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	101.0	1.1	101.0	101.0	1.2	101	100
	11/04/05	6846.1	7.4	285	282	120,852,000	71	4,886	1,629,640	1,552,000	1,568,800	4,750	2648.0	0.8	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	101.0	1.1	101.0	101.0	1.2	101	100
7	11/07/05	6852.7	7.0	292	288	120,966,000	114	5,000	1,669,050	1,586,400	1,603,830	4,859	2708.6	1.0	102.0	101.0	1.3	101.0	100.0	1.00	102.0	101.0	1.0	101.0	100
	11/08/05	6853.9	6.9	293	278	120,986,000	20	5,020	1,676,500	1,593,100	1,610,700	4,880	2720.3	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.4	102.0	101.0	1.10	102.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100
	11/09/05	6859.4	6.8	298	288	121,081,000	95	5,115	1,708,705	1,622,368	1,640,596	4,972	2771.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	11/10/05	6860.9	6.7	300	278	121,106,000	25	5,140	1,717,600	1,630,500	1,648,800	4,997	2785.3	1.0	104.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.20	102.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100
8	11/14/05	6862.9	6.2	302	275	121,139,000	33	5,173	1,728,625	1,640,491	1,659,012	5,028	2802.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	11/15/05	6864.9	6.1	304	275	121,172,000	33	5,206	1,741,600	1,652,400	1,671,100	5,065	2823.4	1.0	103.0	101.0	1.4	102.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100
	11/16/05	6866.4	6.0	305	311	121,200,000	28	5,234	1,749,080	1,659,240	1,678,070	NA	NA	1.0	102.0	101.0	1.4	102.0	101.0	1.2	101.0	101.0	1.4	101.0	99
	11/17/05	6868.0	5.9	307	271	121,226,000	26	5,260	1,758,400	1,667,800	1,686,600	5,113	2849.9	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	11/18/05	6871.4	5.9	310	284	121,284,000	58	5,318	1,778,300	1,686,200	1,705,100	5,170	2881.6	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.4	102.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100
9	11/21/05	6890.1	5.9	329	283	121,602,000	318	5,636	1,885,360	1,784,250	1,804,250	5,474	3051.2	0.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0
	11/22/05	6893.4	5.9	332	278	121,657,000	55	5,691	1,904,560	1,801,850	1,821,980	5,528	3081.6	1.0	106.0	105.0	1.4	104.0	103.0	1.2	104.0	104.0	1.5	100.0	98
	11/23/05	6898.9	5.9	338	288	121,752,000	95	5,786	1,938,100	1,832,417	1,855,248	5,626	3135.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	11/28/05	6919.3	5.7	358	283	122,099,000	347	6,133	2,056,000	1,937,850	1,960,250	5,954	3318.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	11/29/05	6922.9	5.7	362	278	122,159,000	60	6,193	2,075,850	1,956,010	1,978,700	6,011	3350.4	1.1	104.0	103.0	1.4	104.0	103.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	11/30/05	6924.6	5.6	364	294	122,189,000	30	6,223	2,086,230	1,965,500	1,988,460	6,040	3366.9	1.1	104.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	12/1/05	6928.1	5.6	367	276	122,247,000	58	6,281	2,105,990	1,983,600	2,006,840	6,096	3398.2	1.1	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.4	102.0	100.0
	12/2/05	6932.5	5.6	371	284	122,322,000	75	6,356	2,131,260	2,006,720	2,030,410	6,168	3438.3	1.1	106.0	105.0	1.4	105.0	104.0	1.2	105.0	105.0	1.2	105.0	103.0

EPA Arsenic Demonstration Project at STGMID in Washoe County, NV – Summary of Run 1 Daily System Operation (Continued)

		Pump House				Total System Operation Data								Tank Pressure Operation Data											
		Hour Meter	Avg. Op Hours	Total Hours	Avg. Flowrate	Master Flow Meter	Treated Volume	Total Treated Volume	Flow Totalizer Tank A	Flow Totalizer Tank B	Flow Totalizer Tank C	Cumulative Flow	Cumulative Bed Volume	Tank A			Tank B			Tank C			Total System Pressure Data		
Week	Date	hr	hr	hr	gpm	gal	Kgal	Kgal	gal	gal	gal	Kgal	# of BV	◊P	Inlet	Outlet	◊P	Inlet	Outlet	◊P	Inlet	Outlet	◊P	Inlet	Outlet
11	12/5/05	6945.9	5.5	385	282	122,549,000	227	6,583	2,207,880	2,076,960	2,101,980	6,387	3560.1	0.0	32.0	32.00	0.0	32.0	32.0	0.0	31.0	31.0	0.0	31.0	32.0
	12/6/05	6951.0	5.5	390	353	122,657,000	108	6,691	2,237,370	2,103,970	2,129,550	6,471	3607.0	0.0	8.0	8.00	0.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	7.0	7.0	0.0	6.0	7.0
	12/7/05	6954.4	5.5	393	181	122,694,000	37	6,728	2,259,500	2,127,100	2,153,400	6,540	3645.5	1.1	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	12/8/05	6958.7	5.5	398	279	122,766,000	72	6,800	2,283,850	2,149,441	2,176,221	6,610	3684.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	12/9/05	6961.5	5.4	400	280	122,813,000	47	6,847	2,300,000	2,164,000	2,191,000	6,655	3709.6	1.1	104.0	103.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100.0
12	12/12/05	6974.9	5.4	414	284	123,041,000	228	7,075	2,377,000	2,235,000	2,263,000	6,875	3832.2	0.0	103.0	101.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	0.0	102.0	101.0	0.0	102.0	100.0
	12/13/05	6979.3	5.4	418	288	123,117,000	76	7,151	2,403,000	2,258,000	2,288,000	6,949	3873.5	1.1	102.0	101.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	103.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	12/14/05	6982.5	5.4	421	281	123,171,000	54	7,205	2,422,000	2,275,000	2,305,000	7,002	3903.0	1.1	103.0	101.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	12/15/05	6986.6	5.3	426	285	123,241,000	70	7,275	2,445,000	2,297,000	2,327,000	7,069	3940.4	1.2	104.0	102.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	100.0
	12/16/05	6991.4	5.3	430	295	123,326,000	85	7,360	2,473,000	2,322,000	2,353,000	7,148	3984.4	1.1	103.0	102.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	100.0
16	01/09/06	7006.8	5.5	446	NA	123,537,000	211	7,571	2,547,000	2,389,000	2,422,000	5,005	2789.9	0	104	104.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	0.0	103.0	103.0	1.0	104.0	102
	01/10/06	7010.5	5.5	449	288	123,601,000	64	7,635	2,568,000	2,408,000	2,441,000	7,417	4134.3	1.2	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.4	102.0	100.0
	01/11/06	7014.3	5.5	453	285	123,666,000	65	7,700	2,590,000	2,428,000	2,462,000	7,480	4169.5	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.2	103.0	103.0	0.8	103.0	101.0
	01/12/06	7018.1	5.5	457	276	123,729,000	63	7,763	2,613,000	2,449,000	2,483,000	7,545	4205.7	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.2	103.0	103.0	0.8	103.0	101.0
	01/13/06	7022.4	5.4	461	275	123,800,000	71	7,834	2,637,000	2,471,000	2,506,000	7,614	4244.1	1.1	103	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.1	102.0	100
17	01/17/06	7035.0	5.3	474	340	124,057,000	257	8,091	2,728,000	2,554,000	2,591,000	7,873	4388.5	0.0	103	102.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	0.0	103.0	102.0	0.0	103.0	101.0
	01/18/06	7042.4	5.4	481	164	124,130,000	73	8,164	2,755,000	2,579,000	2,616,000	7,950	4431.4	1.0	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.1	102.0	100.0
	01/19/06	7047.2	5.4	486	271	124,208,000	78	8,242	2,781,000	2,603,000	2,641,000	8,025	4473.2	1.1	103	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	103.0	1.3	102.0	100.0
	01/20/06	7050.6	5.3	490	279	124,265,000	57	8,299	2,801,000	2,621,000	2,659,000	8,081	4504.5	1.0	103	102.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	101.0	101.0	1.3	101.0	99.0
18	01/23/06	7064.6	5.3	504	275	124,496,000	231	8,530	2,883,000	2,696,000	2,736,000	8,315	4634.9	0.0	100	98.0	1.0	106.0	104.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	104.0	100.0
	01/24/06	7067.8	5.3	507	276	124,549,000	53	8,583	2,910,000	2,712,000	2,753,000	8,375	4668.3	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100.0
	01/25/06	7074.1	5.3	513	270	124,651,000	102	8,685	2,936,000	2,745,000	2,787,000	8,468	4720.2	1.0	104	103.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	100.0
	01/26/06	7076.4	5.3	515	275	124,689,000	38	8,723	2,950,000	2,758,000	2,800,000	8,508	4742.5	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	100.0
	01/27/06	7079.7	5.3	519	273	124,743,000	54	8,777	2,969,000	2,775,000	2,818,000	8,562	4772.6	1.0	103	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	101.0	101.0	1.2	103.0	101.0
19	01/30/06	7091.7	5.2	531	275	124,941,000	198	8,975	3,039,000	2,839,000	2,883,000	8,761	4883.5	0.0	103	102.0	0.0	103.0	102.0	0.0	102.0	102.0	0.0	103.0	101.0
	01/31/06	7095.5	5.2	534	276	125,004,000	63	9,038	3,061,000	2,859,000	2,904,000	8,824	4918.6	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.2	102.0	102.0	1.4	102.0	100.0
	02/01/06	7100.1	5.2	539	275	125,080,000	76	9,114	3,087,000	2,884,000	2,929,000	8,900	4961.0	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.2	103.0	103.0	1.2	103.0	101.0
	02/02/06	7105.5	5.2	544	272	125,168,000	88	9,202	3,118,000	2,912,000	2,958,000	8,988	5010.0	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	103.0	1.2	103.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	02/03/06	7108.9	5.2	548	275	125,224,000	56	9,258	3,137,000	2,930,000	2,977,000	9,044	5041.2	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	100.0
20	02/06/06	7120.7	5.1	560	274	125,418,000	194	9,452	3,206,000	2,993,000	3,041,000	9,240	5150.5	0.0	104	102.0	0.0	103.0	102.0	0.0	102.0	102.0	0.0	102.0	100.0
	02/07/06	7124.3	5.1	563	278	125,478,000	60	9,512	3,227,000	3,012,000	3,061,000	9,300	5183.9	1.0	106	105.0	1.5	106.0	105.0	1.3	105.0	105.0	1.3	105.0	103.0
	02/08/06	7127.9	5.1	567	269	125,536,000	58	9,570	3,247,000	3,030,000	3,080,000	9,357	5215.7	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	02/09/06	7131.0	5.1	570	274	125,587,000	51	9,621	3,265,000	3,047,000	3,097,000	9,409	5244.7	1.0	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	101.0
	02/10/06	7135.0	5.1	574	275	125,653,000	66	9,687	3,287,000	3,068,000	3,118,000	9,473	5280.4	0.9	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
21	02/13/06	7147.1	5.1	586	274	125,852,000	199	9,886	3,358,000	3,133,000	3,185,000	9,676	5393.5	1.0	103	102.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.0	102.0	102.0	1.0	102.0	100.0
	02/14/06	7152.1	5.1	591	270	125,933,000	81	9,967	3,386,000	3,159,000	3,212,000	9,757	5438.7	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.5	103.0	100.0
	02/15/06	7155.6	5.0	595	276	125,991,000	58	10,025	3,406,000	3,177,000	3,231,000	9,814	5470.5	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	101.0
	02/16/06	7159.1	5.0	598	271	126,048,000	57	10,082	3,426,000	3,195,000	3,249,000	9,870	5501.7	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
	02/17/06	7164.1	5.0	603	277	126,131,000	83	10,165	3,455,000	3,222,000	3,276,000	9,953	5547.9	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101.0
22	02/21/06	7180.9	5.0	620	273	126,406,000	275	10,440	3,553,000	3,312,000	3,369,000	10,234	5704.6	1.0	107	106.0	1.5	106.0	105.0	1.0	106.0	105.0	1.0	106.0	104.0
	02/22/06	7184.3	5.0	623	275	126,462,000	56	10,496	3,571,000	3,329,000	3,387,000	10,287	5734.1	0.9	105	104.0	1.6	105.0	104.0	1.3	104.0	104.0	1.5	105.0	103.0
	02/23/06	7187.3	5.0	626	267	126,510,000	48	10,544	3,588,000	3,345,000	3,403,000	10,336	5761.4	1.0	105	104.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0
23	02/27/06	7205.7	5.0	645	274	126,812,000	302	10,846	3,694,000	3,442,000	3,504,000	10,640	5930.9	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	101
	02/28/06	7208.6	5.0	648	282	126,861,000	49	10,895	3,711,000	3,458,000	3,520,000	10,689	5958.2	0.9	104	103.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	03/01/06	7212.1	4.9	651	271	126,918,000	57	10,952	3,731,000	3,476,000	3,539,000	10,746	5990.0	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	101.0	0.9	102.0	100
	03/02/06	7215.7	4.9	655	273	126,977,000	59	11,011	3,753,000	3,496,000	3,559,000	10,808	6024.5	1.0	104	103.0	1.6	103.0	101.0	1.4	102.0	102.0	1.7	103.0	101
	03/03/06	7221.1	4.9	660	275	127,066,000	89	11,100	3,783,000	3,523,000	3,587,000	10,893	6071.9	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101

EPA Arsenic Demonstration Project at STGMID in Washoe County, NV – Summary of Run 1 Daily System Operation (Continued)

		Pump House				Total System Operation Data								Tank Pressure Operation Data											
		Hour Meter	Avg. Op Hours	Total Hours	Avg. Flowrate	Master Flow Meter	Treated Volume	Total Treated Volume	Flow Totalizer Tank A	Flow Totalizer Tank B	Flow Totalizer Tank C	Cumulative Flow	Cumulative Bed Volume	Tank A			Tank B			Tank C			Total System Pressure Data		
Week	Date	hr	hr	hr	gpm	gal	Kgal	Kgal	gal	gal	gal	Kgal	# of BV	∆P	Inlet	Outlet	∆P	Inlet	Outlet	∆P	Inlet	Outlet	∆P	Inlet	Outlet
24	03/06/06	7232.4	4.9	671	274	127,252,000	186	11,286	3,848,000	3,584,000	3,650,000	11,082	6177.3	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	104.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	101
	03/07/06	7236.1	4.9	675	275	127,313,000	61	11,347	3,869,000	3,603,000	3,669,000	11,141	6210.1	1.0	103	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	101
	03/08/06	7239.9	4.9	679	272	127,375,000	62	11,409	3,891,000	3,623,000	3,690,000	11,204	6245.3	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	03/09/06	7244.1	4.9	683	274	127,444,000	69	11,478	3,915,000	3,643,000	3,713,000	11,271	6282.6	1.4	103	102.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	03/10/06	7248.5	4.9	687	277	127,517,000	73	11,551	3,940,000	3,668,000	3,737,000	11,345	6323.9	1.4	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
25	03/13/06	7258.7	4.9	698	271	127,683,000	166	11,717	3,999,000	3,723,000	3,793,000	11,515	6418.6	1.4	106	105.0	1.4	105.0	104.0	1.3	105.0	104.0	1.3	104.0	102
	03/14/06	7263.0	4.8	702	275	127,754,000	71	11,788	4,023,000	3,745,000	3,816,000	11,584	6457.1	1.8	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.5	103.0	101
	03/15/06	7267.5	4.8	706	278	127,829,000	75	11,863	4,050,000	3,769,000	3,841,000	11,660	6499.4	1.8	103	101.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	100
	03/16/06	7271.6	4.8	711	272	127,896,000	67	11,930	4,073,000	3,791,000	3,863,000	11,727	6536.8	1.8	104	102.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	03/17/06	7276.5	4.8	715	276	127,977,000	81	12,011	4,102,000	3,817,000	3,890,000	11,809	6582.5	1.8	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
26	03/20/06	7288.8	4.8	728	275	128,180,000	203	12,214	4,173,000	3,882,000	3,958,000	12,013	6696.2	1.5	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	100
	03/21/06	7291.3	4.8	730	273	128,221,000	41	12,255	4,187,000	3,895,000	3,971,000	12,053	6718.5	1.1	104	103.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.6	103.0	101
	03/22/06	7295.1	4.8	734	268	128,282,000	61	12,316	4,208,000	3,915,000	3,992,000	12,115	6753.1	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	03/23/06	7299.3	4.8	738	278	128,352,000	70	12,386	4,233,000	3,938,000	4,015,000	12,186	6792.6	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	03/24/06	7302.7	4.8	742	275	128,408,000	56	12,442	4,252,000	3,956,000	4,034,000	12,242	6823.9	1.1	104	103.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
27	03/27/06	7315.7	4.8	755	273	128,621,000	213	12,655	4,327,000	4,024,000	4,105,000	12,456	6943.1	1.0	105	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	101
	03/28/06	7319.1	4.8	758	275	128,677,000	56	12,711	4,346,000	4,042,000	4,124,000	12,512	6974.4	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	03/29/06	7323.3	4.8	762	274	128,746,000	69	12,780	4,370,000	4,065,000	4,147,000	12,582	7013.4	1.0	103	102.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	101
	03/30/06	7327.9	4.8	767	272	128,821,000	75	12,855	4,396,000	4,088,000	4,171,000	12,655	7054.1	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	03/31/06	7332.4	4.8	771	274	128,895,000	74	12,929	4,422,000	4,112,000	4,196,000	12,730	7095.9	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
28	04/03/06	7344.3	4.8	783	272	129,089,000	194	13,123	4,490,000	4,175,000	4,262,000	12,927	7205.7	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	101
	04/04/06	7347.9	4.7	787	273	129,148,000	59	13,182	4,510,000	4,194,000	4,281,000	12,985	7238.0	1.9	104	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.7	103.0	101
	04/05/06	7353.2	4.7	792	274	129,235,000	87	13,269	4,540,000	4,222,000	4,312,000	13,074	7287.6	1.8	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.2	103.0	102
	04/06/06	7355.2	4.7	794	275	129,268,000	33	13,302	4,553,000	4,234,000	4,323,000	13,110	7307.7	1.8	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	04/07/06	7361.8	4.7	801	275	129,377,000	109	13,411	4,590,000	4,268,000	4,359,000	13,217	7367.3	1.8	102	100.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	100
28	04/03/06	7344.3	4.8	783	272	129,089,000	194	13,123	4,490,000	4,175,000	4,262,000	12,927	7205.7	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	101
	04/04/06	7347.9	4.7	787	273	129,148,000	59	13,182	4,510,000	4,194,000	4,281,000	12,985	7238.0	1.9	104	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.7	103.0	101
	04/05/06	7353.2	4.7	792	274	129,235,000	87	13,269	4,540,000	4,222,000	4,312,000	13,074	7287.6	1.8	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.2	103.0	102
	04/06/06	7355.2	4.7	794	275	129,268,000	33	13,302	4,553,000	4,234,000	4,323,000	13,110	7307.7	1.8	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	04/07/06	7361.8	4.7	801	275	129,377,000	109	13,411	4,590,000	4,268,000	4,359,000	13,217	7367.3	1.8	102	100.0	1.5	102.0	101.0	1.3	102.0	101.0	1.2	102.0	100
29	04/10/06	7381.2	4.8	820	274	129,696,000	319	13,730	4,700,000	4,370,000	4,467,000	13,537	7545.7	1.5	105	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.5	104.0	101
	04/11/06	7383.9	4.8	823	272	129,740,000	44	13,774	4,713,000	4,383,000	4,480,000	13,576	7567.4	0.9	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.7	103.0	101
	04/12/06	7388.2	4.8	827	271	129,810,000	70	13,844	4,739,000	4,407,000	4,505,000	13,651	7609.3	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.5	103.0	101
	04/13/06	7392.7	4.8	832	274	129,884,000	74	13,918	4,764,000	4,431,000	4,513,000	13,708	7641.0	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	04/14/06	7406.8	4.8	846	279	130,120,000	236	14,154	4,845,000	4,506,000	4,611,000	13,962	7782.6	1.1	104	103.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
30	04/17/06	7407.0	4.7	846	167	130,122,000	2	14,156	4,846,000	4,507,000	4,612,000	13,965	7784.3	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.5	103.0	101
	04/18/06	7410.4	4.7	849	275	130,178,000	56	14,212	4,865,000	4,525,000	4,631,000	14,021	7815.5	1.1	104	102.0	1.6	104.0	103.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.7	103.0	101
	04/19/06	7414.6	4.7	854	270	130,246,000	68	14,280	4,888,000	4,546,000	4,654,000	14,088	7852.8	1.1	104	103.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.6	103.0	101
	04/20/06	7419.6	4.7	859	280	130,330,000	84	14,364	4,917,000	4,573,000	4,683,000	14,173	7900.2	1.0	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	100
	04/21/06	7427.7	4.7	867	272	130,462,000	132	14,496	4,962,000	4,615,000	4,729,000	14,306	7974.4	NA	104	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
31	04/24/06	7448.2	4.8	887	275	130,800,000	338	14,834	5,080,000	4,723,000	4,842,000	14,645	8163.3	1.0	104	103.0	1.5	104.0	102.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	1.0	103.0	101
	04/25/06	7453.6	4.8	893	275	130,889,000	89	14,923	5,111,000	4,752,000	4,872,000	14,735	8213.5	1.2	104	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	04/26/06	7460.2	4.8	899	275	130,998,000	109	15,032	5,149,000	4,787,000	4,908,000	14,844	8274.2	1.7	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	102.0	1.5	103.0	101
	04/27/06	7465.3	4.8	904	275	131,082,000	84	15,116	5,179,000	4,814,000	4,936,000	14,929	8321.6	1.7	104	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	101
	04/28/06	7470.4	4.8	909	275	131,166,000	84	15,200	5,208,000	4,840,000	4,964,000	15,012	8367.9	1.7	104	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.3	102.0	101.0	1.3	103.0	101
32	05/01/06	7492.8	4.8	932	272	131,531,000	365	15,565	5,336,000	4,958,000	5,086,000	15,380	8573.0	1.5	103	102.0	1.5	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	102.0	1.0	103.0	101
	05/02/06	7502.5	4.9	941	273	131,690,000	159	15,724	5,392,000	5,008,000	5,139,000	15,539	8661.6	0.9	103	102.0	1.6	103.0	102.0	1.4	102.0	102.0	1.4	103.0	101
	05/03/06	7504.3	4.8	943	269	131,719,000	29	15,753	5,402,000	5,017,000	5,148,000	15,567	8677.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

EPA Arsenic Demonstration Project at STGMID in Washoe County, NV – Summary of Run 2 Daily System Operation

		Pump House				Total System Operation Data								Tank Pressure Operation Data											
		Hour Meter	Avg. Op Hours	Total Hours	Avg. Flowrate	Master Flow Meter	Treated Volume	Total Treated Volume	Flow Totalizer Tank A	Flow Totalizer Tank B	Flow Totalizer Tank C	Cumulative Flow	Cumulative Bed Volume	Tank A			Tank B			Tank C			Total System Pressure Data		
Week	Date	hr	hr	hr	gpm	gal	Kgal	Kgal	gal	gal	gal	Kgal	# of BV	ΔP	Inlet	Outlet	ΔP	Inlet	Outlet	ΔP	Inlet	Outlet	ΔP	Inlet	Outlet
1	04/05/07	8549.0				148,292,000			958,400	454,300	674,500			1.4	104.0	102.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	0.8	104.0	103.0	2.0	104.0	102.0
	04/06/07	8564.5	12.8	16	271	148,544,000	252	252	1,019,500	551,400	772,500	256	142.8	0.7	105.0	105.0	1.1	104.0	103.0	0.8	104.0	104.0	0.7	105.0	103.0
2	04/10/07	8596.2	8.4	47	268	149,054,000	510	762	1,141,000	744,000	968,000	766	426.9	1.1	105.0	104.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	0.8	104.0	104.0	1.1	105.0	103.0
	04/11/07	8605.4	7.9	56	268	149,202,000	148	910	1,191,000	793,000	1,018,000	915	509.9	1.3	103.0	102.0	0.9	102.0	102.0	0.8	102.0	102.0	1.3	103.0	100.0
	04/12/07	8610.9	6.0	62	264	149,289,000	87	997	1,220,000	823,000	1,047,000	1,003	559.0	1.3	103.0	102.0	0.9	102.0	101.0	0.7	101.0	101.0	1.4	103.0	100.0
3	04/17/07	8646.6	7.0	98	267	149,860,000	571	1,568	1,410,000	1,014,000	1,239,000	1,576	878.4	1.2	102.0	101.0	0.8	102.0	102.0	0.7	102.0	102.0	0.8	102.0	100.0
	04/18/07	8651.9	6.2	103	264	149,944,000	84	1,652	1,437,000	1,042,000	1,266,000	1,658	924.1	1.3	105.0	104.0	0.8	105.0	104.0	0.6	104.0	104.0	0.7	106.0	103.0
	04/19/07	8658.3	5.7	109	260	150,044,000	100	1,752	1,471,000	1,076,000	1,301,000	1,761	981.5	1.2	103.0	102.0	0.8	102.0	101.0	0.7	102.0	102.0	0.7	103.0	100.0
	04/20/07	8663.8	6.0	115	267	150,132,000	88	1,840	1,500,000	1,106,000	1,330,000	1,849	1030.5	1.2	103.0	102.0	0.8	101.0	101.0	0.6	101.0	101.0	0.7	103.0	100.0
4	04/24/07	8694.8	7.6	146	266	150,626,000	494	2,334	1,663,000	1,272,000	1,497,000	2,345	1307.0	1.2	103.0	102.0	0.8	102.0	102.0	0.7	102.0	102.0	0.8	102.0	99.0
	04/25/07	8707.5	12.7	159	268	150,830,000	204	2,538	1,730,000	1,341,000	1,565,000	2,549	1420.7	1.4	102.0	100.0	1.0	102.0	102.0	0.8	100.0	100.0	0.6	103.0	100.0
	04/27/07	8728.4	10.4	179	270	151,168,000	338	2,876	1,841,000	1,456,000	1,679,000	2,889	1610.3	1.9	102.0	100.0	0.9	101.0	101.0	0.6	101.0	101.0	0.8	103.0	100.0
5	05/01/07	8768.3	10.1	219	271	151,816,000	648	3,524	2,054,000	1,672,000	1,899,000	3,538	1972.0	1.8	103.0	101.0	0.8	103.0	103.0	0.5	102.0	102.0	0.8	103.0	100.0
	05/04/07	8794.5	8.4	246	267	152,235,000	419	3,943	2,192,000	1,812,000	2,042,000	3,959	2206.7	1.9	105.0	103.0	0.8	105.0	105.0	0.6	105.0	105.0	0.8	106.0	103.0
6	05/09/07	8839.8	9.2	291	268	152,964,000	729	4,672	2,434,000	2,060,000	2,289,000	4,696	2617.5	1.9	105.0	103.0	0.8	105.0	104.0	0.5	104.0	104.0	0.8	105.0	102.0
7	05/15/07	8925.4	14.3	376	271	154,358,000	1,394	6,066	2,882,000	2,531,000	2,757,000	6,083	3390.6	1.8	103.0	101.0	0.8	101.0	101.0	0.5	101.0	101.0	0.8	103.0	100.0
	05/18/07	8974.9	17.0	426	270	155,159,000	801	6,867	3,152,000	2,804,000	3,023,000	6,892	3841.6	1.9	104.0	106.0	0.9	104.0	103.0	0.5	103.0	103.0	0.7	104.0	101.0
9	05/30/07	9180.4	17.1	631	271	158,496,000	3,337	10,204	4,240,000	3,945,000	4,141,000	10,239	5707.2	1.6	104.0	102.0	1.0	104.0	103.0	0.8	103.0	103.0	1.1	104.0	101.0
10	06/08/07	9325.1	15.9	776	270	160,837,000	2,341	12,545	5,052,000	4,707,000	4,914,000	12,586	7015.5	1.5	105.0	103.0	0.8	103.0	103.0	0.7	104.0	104.0	1.6	105.0	102.0
11	06/12/07	9389.9	16.2	841	267	161,874,000	1,037	13,582	5,630,000	4,963,000	5,127,000	13,633	7599.1	1.4	105.0	100.0	0.8	101.0	101.0	0.4	101.0	101.0	1.0	102.0	100.0
12	06/20/07	9507.6	14.9	959	271	163,788,000	1,914	15,496	6,273,000	5,595,000	5,766,000	15,547	8666.0	0.8	105.0	104.0	0.8	105.0	104.0	0.6	105.0	104.0	1.3	105.0	103.0
13	06/27/07	9612.7	14.8	1064	269	165,487,000	1,699	17,195	6,792,000	6,178,000	6,371,000	17,254	9617.5	1.1	104.0	103.0	1.1	104.0	103.0	0.8	103.0	103.0	0.7	104.0	101.0
14	07/03/07	9714.7	17.1	1166	270	167,140,000	1,653	18,848	7,359,000	6,719,000	6,920,000	18,911	10541.1	1.3	105.0	104.0	0.8	105.0	104.0	0.5	105.0	105.0	0.6	105.0	102.0

Notes:
Tank A contains GFH
Tank B contains Kemira CFH-0818
Tank C contains Kemira CFH-0818

APPENDIX B

ANALYTICAL DATA TABLES

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV

Sampling Date		09/27/05						10/04/05					10/12/05				
Sampling Location		IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC
Parameter	Unit																
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	-	-	2.2	2.1	2.1
Alkalinity	mg/L[(a)]	92	-	<1	<1	<1	<1	88	-	92	92	92	97	-	92	97	88
Fluoride	mg/L	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	6.1	-	<1	<1	<1	<1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	0.9	-	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	<0.05	-	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	0.1	-	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	115	-	<10	<10	<10
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	95.1	-	6.3	4.9	4.4	9.1	51.5	-	52.7	51.2	48.8	69.9	-	61.7	60.8	60.1
Turbidity	NTU	0.3	-	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	-	0.2	<0.1	<0.1	0.5	-	<0.1	0.2	0.1
pH	S.U.	7.1	-	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.2	7.0	-	6.9	6.9	7.0	7.4	-	7.3	7.3	7.3
Temperature	°C	16.2	-	16.3	16.6	16.6	16.6	14.6	-	14.6	14.6	14.7	15.7	-	15.5	15.5	15.4
DO	mg/L	4.4	-	4.3	4.8	4.7	4.6	5.2	-	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.7	-	4.2	4.1	4.2
ORP	mV	269	-	280	392	280	269	237	-	626	648	650	242	-	598	603	592
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	1.1	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.0	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-
Total Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	29.3	-	24.8	27.4	31.8	29.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	20.2	-	14.9	16.6	20.7	18.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	9.1	-	9.9	10.8	11.1	10.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	35.0	-	0.9	0.9	1.1	1.3	53.7	-	0.5	0.3	0.2	66.5	-	0.5	0.8	0.3
As (soluble)	µg/L	29.5	-	0.7	0.7	0.8	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	5.5	-	0.2	0.2	0.3	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	0.4	-	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	29.1	-	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	232	-	<25	35.9	<25	34.1	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	<25	<25
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	0.9	-	15.1	14.8	16.0	12.4	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	1.0	-	15.3	15.4	16.8	13.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	10.2	-	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.5	14.7	-	3.7	4.2	3.5	16.2	-	8.4	7.8	7.4
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	11.1	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		10/25/05					11/03/05[b,d]					11/08/05[c]				
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	IN	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	2.5	2.4	2.4	-	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	-	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.7
Alkalinity	Mg/L[a]	92	-	88	88	88	88	83	79	80	83	97	101	88	92	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	7	8	8	8	8	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	0.1	-	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	0.1	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	0.1	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
Total P (as P)	µg/L	123	-	<10	<10	<10	128	<10	<10	<10	<10	139	<10	<10	<10	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	68.5	-	5.0	48.8	47.0	69.7	56.7	56.1	55.5	54.6	-	-	-	-	-
Turbidity	NTU	0.2	-	0.2	0.5	<0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	<0.1	9.5	-	-	-	-	-
pH	S.U.	7.1	-	7.1	7.2	7.1	6.7	6.6	6.5	7.0	6.7	7.1	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9
Temperature	°C	17.0	-	17.0	16.9	16.9	15.6	15.4	15.3	15.4	15.4	16.5	16.7	16.6	16.6	16.6
DO	mg/L	6.2	-	4.7	4.6	4.6	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.7	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.1
ORP	mV	307	-	603	619	629	252	699	723	733	732	245	688	714	721	724
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	0.6
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	1.7
Total Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	17.3	18.0	17.4	17.5	17.9	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	9.9	9.4	9.4	9.4	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	7.8	8.1	7.9	8.1	8.4	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	50.1	-	0.2	1.9	0.3	60.0	1.8	1.1	1.4	0.3	53.4	0.2	0.1	0.1	-
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	60.1	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	1.1	0.9	1.1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	59.7	0.3	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	42.4	<25	<25	<25	<25	-
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	<25	<25	<25	<25	72.4	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	0.2	-	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	-
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	1.9	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	13.8	-	3.2	2.8	3.1	15.3	4.7	4.0	3.8	4.5	12.3	3.5	3.0	2.7	-
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	14.4	4.6	3.8	3.7	4.7	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.
(b) Water quality parameters measured on 11/04/05.
(c) Chlorine residual not measured at AC.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		11/15/05						11/29/05						12/07/05					
Sampling Location		IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Parameter	Unit																		
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	-	-	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4	-	-	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.6
Alkalinity	mg/L[(a)]	94	-	91	91	91	-	88	-	88	92	92	-	88	-	88	90	90	91
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.1	-	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05
Total P (as P)	µg/L	89	-	<10	<10	<10	-	130	-	<10	<10	<10	-	132	-	13	<10	<10	<10
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	69.7	-	59.1	56.7	56.9	-	75.4	-	66.8	65.7	66.8	-	71.4	-	67.2	65.8	65.7	66.9
Turbidity	NTU	<0.1	-	0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	2.0	-	0.1	0.1	0.2	-	0.2	-	<0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2
pH	S.U.	6.8	-	6.9	6.9	6.5	6.8	7.0	-	6.8	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.2	-	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1
Temperature	°C	16.7	-	17.0	16.7	10.7	16.7	17.1	-	16.9	16.7	16.6	14.9	15.9	-	15.2	15.3	15.1	15.8
DO	mg/L	1.1	-	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.8	-	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.9	1.1	-	1.3	1.3	1.3	4.3
ORP	mV	245	-	739	742	753	739	260	-	675	712	721	730	381	-	735	742	741	741
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	1.2	-	-	-	1.1	-	1.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	1.0	-	-	-	1.0
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	1.3	-	-	-	1.3	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	1.0	-	-	-	1.0
Total Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.1	-	20.9	20.9	21.0	17.5
Ca Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.0	-	12.0	11.9	12.0	10.9
Mg Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.1	-	8.9	8.9	9.1	6.6
As (total)	µg/L	59.8	-	0.6	0.6	<0.1	-	71.7	-	0.9	0.5	0.4	-	69.3	-	1.4	0.5	0.5	0.2
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70.1	-	1.4	0.4	0.3	0.3
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	0.2	<0.1
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	0.2	0.2	<0.1	<0.1
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69.7	-	1.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25
Mn (total)	µg/L	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	0.4	-	0.1	0.2	0.1	-	0.1	-	0.1	0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Sb (total)	µg/L	21.0	-	7.2	6.0	3.0	-	15.8	-	7.4	7.0	6.7	-	15.9	-	10.0	9.6	9.3	9.2
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.9	9.4	9.3	9.2

(a) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		12/13/05						01/10/06						01/18/06					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.9	-	-	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.1	-	-	4.6	4.3	4.4	4.4
Alkalinity	mg/L[(a)]	88	-	92	88	92	-	92	-	92	92	92	185	97	-	92	92	92	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.7	-	7	7	7	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	<0.05	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	150	-	39	31.4	32.4	-	105	-	<10	<10	<10	<10	94.6	-	17.3	<10	<10	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	75.5	-	69.5	68.5	67.5	-	73.6	-	66.2	67.5	66.1	66.7	73.9	-	70.8	70.1	68.9	-
Turbidity	NTU	0.1	-	0.1	0.3	0.1	-	0.4	-	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.4	-	0.2	0.2	0.2	-
pH	S.U.	7.1	-	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.4	-	7.3	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	-	7.3	7.2	7.2	7.3
Temperature	°C	16.8	-	16.1	16.1	15.7	16.1	15.8	-	15.1	15.0	15.1	15.9	16.6	-	16.6	16.4	16.2	15.4
DO	mg/L	1.4	-	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	-	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.4	-	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4
ORP	mV	202	-	682	693	711	703	260	-	264	273	273	264	279	-	719	732	740	740
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.6	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.9
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0	-	1.0	-	-	-	1.0
Total Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	20.6	-	22.7	22.3	22.0	21.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.3	-	14.5	14.3	14.3	14.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.3	-	8.2	8.0	7.6	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	55.6	-	2.2	1.0	1.0	-	54.0	-	1.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	61.1	-	2.0	0.7	0.6	-
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	53.4	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	53.1	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<25	-	-	-	-	25.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	0.3	-	0.2	0.2	0.2	-	0.8	-	0.3	0.1	<0.1	0.9	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	11.7	-	7.8	7.1	6.9	-	13.0	-	7.8	7.0	6.9	7.4	13.7	-	11.6	10.4	10.1	-
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.6	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		01/24/06						01/31/06						02/07/06					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.7	-	-	5.1	4.8	4.9	4.9	-	-	5.4	5.1	5.2	5.2
Alkalinity	mg/L[(a)]	97	-	92	97	97	-	93	-	-	-	-	93	92	-	92	90	91	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.0	-	-	-	-	7.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	124	-	29.6	16.6	15.4	-	96.5	-	-	-	-	13.5	109	-	29.7	21.1	18.6	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	74.7	-	71.2	70.9	70.6	-	72.1	-	-	-	-	72.4	72.6	-	69	69.6	70.3	-
Turbidity	NTU	0.3	-	0.4	0.2	0.4	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.6	0.3	-	0.7	0.5	0.3	-
pH	S.U.	7.4	-	7.2	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.8	-	7.5	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.9	-	7.6	7.6	7.5	7.5
Temperature	°C	16.2	-	14.9	14.8	15.8	16.0	16.5	-	17.0	17.0	17.0	16.7	16.8	-	16.9	16.9	16.8	17.0
DO	mg/L	1.4	-	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.3	-	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.4	-	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2
ORP	mV	278	-	729	736	744	749	256	-	691	709	713	725	380	-	713	725	733	730
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.9	-	-	-	1.0	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7
Total Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.8	-	-	-	-	22.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.0	-	-	-	-	15.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.8	-	-	-	-	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	75.6	-	4.1	1.1	0.9	-	68.2	-	2.9	2.8	0.9	1.7	54.2	-	4.4	1.5	1.2	-
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	67.2	-	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	66.9	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	-	-	-	<25	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<25	-	-	-	-	<25	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	0.4	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	14.1	-	9.5	8.7	9.0	-	16.2	-	-	-	-	10.1	12.0	-	9.3	9.2	9.5	-
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.4	-	-	-	-	10.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		02/22/06						03/07/06[b]						03/21/06					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3		-	6.0	5.6	5.7	5.7	-	-	6.5	6.0	6.1	6.2	-	-	7.0	6.5	6.6	6.7
Alkalinity	Mg/L[a]	96 96	-	96 91	91 96	96 91	-	95	-	95	95	91	-	91	-	91	91	91	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	114 116	-	54.0 55.9	45.4 46.0	44.6 44.7	-	95	-	42.3	31.8	39.9	-	97.9	-	54.7	47.6	46.6	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	77.1 76.0	-	73.7 73.8	73.4 72.4	71.9 75.1	-	70.9	-	68.4	70.3	67.9	-	73	-	69.7	71.2	70.3	-
Turbidity	NTU	0.5 0.4	-	0.8 0.7	0.5 0.4	0.5 0.5	-	0.4	-	0.3	0.7	1.2	-	0.3	-	0.3	0.4	0.3	-
pH	S.U.	7.4	-	7.3	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.1	-	7.0	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.1	-	7.1	7.0	7.0	7.0
Temperature	°C	16.8	-	16.3	14.8	14.6	15.2	17.2	-	16.9	16.8	16.7	16.5	16.5	-	16.2	16.1	1.7	15.4
DO	mg/L	1.5	-	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.2	-	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	-	2.1	2.2	2.4	3.3
ORP	mV	263	-	696	723	731	707	115	-	676	695	706	710	219	-	699	710	716	722
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.6	-	-	-	0.6	-	0.6	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.6	-	-	-	0.6	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.8
Total Hardness	Mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	Mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.2	-	10.6	10.7	11.0	-
Mg Hardness	Mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-				-
As (total)	µg/L	71.1 75.9	-	6.2 6.7	3.5 3.4	3.1 3.1	-	77.7	-	7.9	4.6	3.8	-	78.7	-	14.7	6.2	5.7	-
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25 <25	-	<25 <25	<25 <25	<25 <25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	<0.1 <0.1	-	<0.1 <0.1	<0.1 <0.1	<0.1 <0.1	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	15.1 14.1	-	11.7 11.3	10.5 10.7	10.6 10.3	-	14.2	-	10.5	10.1	10.6	-	15.7	-	12.9	12.2	12.1	-
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.
(b) Water quality measurements taken on 03/02/06.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		03/28/06						04/04/06						04/11/06					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	7.4	6.9	7.0	7.1	-	-	7.5	7.0	7.2	7.2	-	-	7.9	7.3	7.5	7.6
Alkalinity	mg/L[a]	91	-	91	91	95	-	95	-	-	-	-	87	101		97	101	97	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.4	-	-	-	-	7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	124	-	77.0	69.2	66.4	-	116	-	-	-	-	67.4	102	-	63.4	63.8	64.3	62.8
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	72	-	73.7	70.7	72.4	-	71.8	-	-	-	-	70	70	-	70.1	68.4	69.4	-
Turbidity	NTU	0.4	-	0.6	0.4	0.5	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.7	-	0.7	0.8	1.2	-
pH	S.U.	6.9	-	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.2	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	-	7.1	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
Temperature	°C	17.1	-	17.0	17.0	16.5	16.4	16.5	-	16.6	16.4	15.3	16.4	17.0	-	16.9	16.6	16.5	16.4
DO	mg/L	1.9	-	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.2	1.1	-	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	0.8	-	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.8
ORP	mV	220	-	713	719	723	728	218	-	706	720	728	731	273	-	730	744	751	754
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.8	-	-	-	0.8
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.8	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.8	-	-	-	0.8
Total Hardness	mg/L[a]	22.8	-	24.2	24.4	24.4	-	25.1	-	-	-	-	26.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[a]	16.7	-	17.6	17.7	17.7	-	18.4	-	-	-	-	19.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[a]	6.1	-	6.6	6.6	6.7	-	6.7	-	-	-	-	7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	80.1	-	11.1	6.9	6.2	-	78.6	-	11.1	10.8	10.9	8.9	83.8	-	15.4	11.2	10.7	11.9
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	79.7	-	-	-	-	8.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	79.4	-	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	-	-	-	<25	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<25	-	-	-	-	<25	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	0.7	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.5
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	14.1	-	11.1	10.8	10.7	-	14.7	-	-	-	-	13.7	17.6	-	14.5	14.6	14.5	14.0
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.4	-	-	-	-	13.9	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		04/18/06						04/25/06						05/02/06					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	8.1	7.6	7.7	7.8	-	-	8.5	7.9	8.1	8.2	-	-	9.0	8.4	8.6	8.7
Alkalinity	mg/L[a]	101	-	96	101	97	-	92	-	92	92	96	-	92	-	96	96	96	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	126	-	82.9	72.5	75.6	-	123	-	90.8	97.3	85.5	204	109	-	87.9	84.1	83.7	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	71.3	-	69.7	69.4	69.7	-	72.9	-	71.2	73	72.1	-	75.5	-	75.2	76.0	75.6	-
Turbidity	NTU	0.6	-	0.3	0.1	0.2	-	0.2	-	0.3	0.3	0.2	-	0.1	-	0.5	0.1	0.2	-
pH	S.U.	7.1	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.1	-	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.1	6.9	-	6.9	6.9	6.9	-
Temperature	°C	15.9	-	16.3	16.2	15.8	15.6	17.1	-	16.7	16.7	16.6	16.6	17.7	-	17.7	17.7	17.6	-
DO	mg/L	1.1	-	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.6	-	2.0	2.0	203.0	2.3	1.6	-	2.0	1.9	1.9	-
ORP	mV	263	-	721	733	743	748	241	-	739	739	749	746	230	-	215	236	242	-
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.8	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.9	-	-	-	1.0	-	0.0	-	-	-	0.0
Total Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	75.7	-	13.2	9.3	8.8	11.0	81.5	-	17.9	13.3	12.1	18.9	88.0	-	25.1	20.0	19.8	21.6
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	873	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	110
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.4	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	40.4	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	2.2
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	14.2	-	11.2	11.1	10.9	11.5	15.0	-	12.6	12.4	12.2	9.1	14.9	-	12.6	12.5	13.1	12.6
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 1 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV (Continued)

Sampling Date		09/19/06						09/28/06						10/03/06					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	10	9.4	9.6	9.6	-	-	11	10.4	10.6	10.7	-	-	11.5	10.8	11.0	11.1
Alkalinity	mg/L[(a)]																		
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	112	-	82.6	80.1	77.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turbidity	NTU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
pH	S.U.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Temperature	°C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DO	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ORP	mV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[(a)]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	70.2	-	17.1	15.8	14.1	15.5	51.3	-	20.1	15.8	16.8	18.1	81.9	-	31.2	28.1	25.6	27.5
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (total)	µg/L	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	57.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fe (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (total)	µg/L	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	0.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mn (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sb (total)	µg/L	13.0	-	11.6	11.7	11.6	11.6	9.16	-	9.99	10.0	9.87	9.91	14.9	14.9	13.6	13.2	12.3	13.1
Sb (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(b) As $CaCO_3$.

Run 2 Analytical Results from Treatment Plant Sampling at Reno, NV

Sampling Date		04/05/07[b]						4/27/2007						5/30/2007						06/20/07[c]					
Sampling Location / Parameter	Unit	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT	IN	AC	TA	TB	TC	TT
Bed Volume	10^3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.4	-	-	5.5	5.8	5.8	5.7	-	-	8.9	8.6	8.5	8.7
Alkalinity	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fluoride	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulfate	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nitrate (as N)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orthophosphate (as P)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total P (as P)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	106	-	<10	<10	<10	-	119	-	78.7	46.9	49	-	111	-	91.6	57.6	57.3	-
Silica (as SiO_2)	mg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	73.7	-	61.3	49	48.8	-	75.5	-	75.5	74	74	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Turbidity	NTU	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
pH	S.U.	7.6	-	6.9	7.4	8	7.6	7.2	-	6.4	6.4	6.5	6.4	7.1	-	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.3	-	6.8	6.7	6.6	6.7
Temperature	^{0}C	17.2	-	17.3	17.4	17.4	16.7	17.9	-	17.9	17.9	17.9	18	18.3	-	18.5	18.4	18.6	18.4	18.3	-	18.1	18	18	18.3
DO	mg/L	4.2	-	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.5	7.6	-	7.4	6.1	6.4	5.9	5	-	5.3	5.2	5.3	5	5.6	-	5.7	5.4	5.9	5.2
ORP	mV	256	-	654	536	477	603	121	-	388	717	720	742	157	-	643	666	670	680	183	-	676	706	717	722
Free Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.90	-	-	-	0.4	-	1.25	-	-	-	1.2	-	0.88	-	-	-	0.8	-	0.93	-	-	-	0.9
Total Chlorine	mg/L	-	0.92	-	-	-	0.4	-	0.88	-	-	-	1.3	-	0.90	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.96	-	-	-	1.0
Total Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ca Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mg Hardness	mg/L[a]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (total)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	59.4	-	0.5	0.3	0.2	-	101	-	30.6	29.2	28.7	-	110	-	55.4	46.2	44.9	-
As (soluble)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (particulate)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (III)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
As (V)	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Fe	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-	<25	-	<25	<25	<25	-
Soluble Fe	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Mn	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-	<0.1	-	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1	-
Soluble Mn	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total Sb	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	5.3	4.3	4.4	-	15.7	-	14.4	14	13.8	-	15.4	-	14.7	14.5	14.5	-
Soluble Sb	µg/L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(a) As $CaCO_3$. (b) No samples collected, only water quality parameters taken. (c) Water quality parameters taken on 06/27/07