September 2001
NSF 01/23/EPADW395

Environmental Technology Verification Report

Removal of Arsenic in Drinking Water

Kinetico Incorporated Macrolite® Coagulation and Filtration System, Model CPS100CPT

Prepared by

NSF International

Under a Cooperative Agreement with
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

THE ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY VERIFICATION PROGRAM

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

NSF International

ETV Joint Verification Statement

TECHNOLOGY TYPE:	**CHEMICAL COAGULATION/FILTRATION SYSTEM USED IN PACKAGED DRINKING WATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS**
APPLICATION:	**REMOVAL OF ARSENIC**
TECHNOLOGY NAME:	**MACROLITE® COAGULATION AND FILTRATION SYSTEM, MODEL CPS100CPT**
COMPANY:	**KINETICO, INC.**
ADDRESS:	**10845 KINSMAN ROAD** **NEWBURY, OHIO 44065**
PHONE:	**(440) 564-9111**
FAX:	**(440) 564-9541**
EMAIL:	**glatimer@kinetico.com**
WEB:	**www.kinetico.com**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has created the Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program to facilitate the deployment of innovative or improved environmental technologies through performance verification and dissemination of information. The goal of the ETV program is to further environmental protection by substantially accelerating the acceptance and use of improved and more cost-effective technologies. ETV seeks to achieve this goal by providing high quality, peer reviewed data on technology performance to those involved in the design, distribution, permitting, purchase, and use of environmental technologies.

ETV works in partnership with recognized standards and testing organizations; stakeholders groups which consist of buyers, vendor organizations, and permitters; and with the full participation of individual technology developers. The program evaluates the performance of innovative technologies by developing test plans that are responsive to the needs of stakeholders, conducting field or laboratory tests (as appropriate), collecting and analyzing data, and preparing peer reviewed reports. All evaluations are conducted in accordance with rigorous quality assurance protocols to ensure that data of known and adequate quality are generated and that the results are defensible.

NSF International (NSF) in cooperation with the EPA operates the Drinking Water Treatment Systems (DWTS) pilot, one of 12 technology areas under ETV. The DWTS pilot recently evaluated the performance of a Chemical Coagulation/Filtration system used in package drinking water treatment system applications. This verification statement provides a summary of the test results for the Kinetico, Inc. Macrolite® Coagulant and Filtration System (KIMCFS), Model CPS100CPT, Cartwright, Olsen & Associates, an NSF-qualified field testing organization (FTO), performed the verification testing.

ABSTRACT

Verification testing of the KIMCFS, Model CPS100CPT, was conducted at the Park City, Utah, Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant from April 7 to April 22, 2000. The source water was groundwater from an abandoned silver mine, representing one of the sources of drinking water for the City of Park City, Utah. Verification testing was conducted at the operating conditions specified by the manufacturer. Starting on April 8, 2000, ferric chloride ($FeCl_3$) and sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) were metered into the feedwater supply at a rate of 0.074 gallons per hour (gph) of 3.5% $FeCl_3$ and 0.82 gph of 578 mg/L NaOCl to effect coagulation. When operated under the designed conditions at this site, the KIMCFS removed each arsenic (As) species [total As, dissolved As and As (V)], from the feedwater supply to an average concentration of less than 3.0 µg/L.

TECHNOLOGY DESCRIPTION

The KIMCFS utilizes NaOCl and $FeCl_3$ to convert the arsenate to an insoluble precipitate that is removed by the media filter. The KIMCFS consists of metering pumps to feed $FeCl_3$ and NaOCl into the feedwater stream, two retention tanks to facilitate coagulation, and a repressurization pump to feed coagulated water to a Macrolite® media filter to continuously remove the precipitated As. The Macrolite® media is a proprietary ceramic material specifically designed for filtration of water supplies. The system initiates backwashing based on filter headloss or turbidity breakthrough.

The KIMCFS is designed for small system applications; this sized unit would serve 15 – 20 people. The test unit is self-contained, skid-mounted and easily transportable by truck. The only connections required are an inlet line for pressurized feedwater, outlet line for filtrate, drain line for backwash water, and an electrical connection. The footprint of the unit is approximately 23 ft^2 (2.1 m^2), including retention tanks.

VERIFICATION TESTING DESCRIPTION

Test Site

The verification testing site was the Park City Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant in Park City, Utah. The source water was the Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead water, which is considered a groundwater source under the State of Utah source water protection program. Water is developed from water bearing fissures in abandoned silver mine tunnel. A five-foot high bulkhead built approximately two miles into the tunnel holds back the water and creates a reservoir. Water is piped from this reservoir to the treatment plant through a 12-inch diameter pipe. The water is considered stable with respect to quality and quantity, and is known to contain arsenic.

Methods and Procedures

Temperature, pH, turbidity (both on-line and bench-top), and dissolved oxygen analyses were conducted on both the feedwater and filtrate streams at least once per day at the test site in accordance to *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 18th edition (APHA, et. al., 1992). The State of Utah, Department of Health, and Division of Laboratory Services performed analyses daily for alkalinity, antimony and speciated As [total, dissolved, As (III) and As (V)] on both the feedwater and filtrate streams. The As speciation procedure (see Appendix D of the Final Report) involved filling containers as follows: bottle A – as collected; bottle B – filtered through a 0.45µ filter; and bottle C – a portion of the solution from bottle B run through an ion exchange resin for As (V) removal.

The Division of Laboratory Services also analyzed hardness, total organic carbon (TOC), UV_{254} absorbance, aluminum, total iron (Fe), manganese, sulfate, and algae (chlorophyll A) on a weekly basis. These parameters were also measured on a more frequent basis during the verification performance period where eleven sets of samples were collected over a 48-hour period.

VERIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE

System Operation

Verification testing was conducted under manufacturer's specified operating conditions. The flow rate of the system ranged between 3.4 and 5.0 gpm with a total backwash volume of 84 gallons produced after processing approximately 1,600 gallons of water (approximately 95% recovery).

The system initially operated for 24 hours without coagulation chemicals ($FeCl_3$ and NaOCl). At the end of this initial operation period, the metering pumps were activated and the coagulant chemicals of $FeCl_3$ and NaOCl were fed into the system. This coagulant addition continued, with only one brief interruption, for another 342.5 hours.

Evaluation of the required concentration of $FeCl_3$ necessary for optimum As removal was carried out by means of a simple series of jar tests conducted at the end of March prior to the initiation of the ETV testing period. Water from the Park City Bulkhead supply source was tested with increasing amounts of $FeCl_3$ added. The samples were then analyzed during the incremental addition of $FeCl_3$. The results were used to determine the optimum $FeCl_3$ injection concentration for the ETV testing period at approximately 1.4 mg/L (as Fe).

The KIMCFS was set to automatically backwash based on a terminal headloss (pressure drop) of 20 psig or a turbidity breakthrough of 0.15 NTU, whichever came first. These settings were maintained throughout the duration of the test.

Arsenic Removal

During initial operations, without coagulation chemicals, the media filter removed approximately 50% of the total As in the feedwater stream and approximately 11% of dissolved As was removed. Because Fe is present in the tunnel water, and this supply is exposed to the air, it is suspected that the resulting $[Fe(OH)_3]$ reacted with a portion of the total As in the feedwater stream forming the insoluble $[Fe(OH)_3]$ / As complex, which was removed by the media filter.

During the test period, while coagulant chemicals were being fed to the feedwater stream, the total As concentration in the feedwater stream was removed to an average of 2.9 µg/L in the filtrate. The dissolved As in the feedwater stream was removed to an average level of 1.5 µg/L in the filtrate. The As (V) species constituted 93% of the dissolved As concentration in the feedwater stream, and was removed to an average of 0.8 µg/L in the filtrate. The As (III) species was detected near the detection limit (quantitative at 2 µg/L) in the feed water and at an average concentration of 0.7 µg/L in the filtrate. A summary of the concentrations of As species in both the feedwater and filtrate stream is presented in the following table.

Arsenic Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000) based on 23 samples

	Feedwater (µg/L)	Filtrate (µg/L)
Total Arsenic		
Average	71.4	2.9
Minimum	59.9	0.9
Maximum	75.8	11.6
Standard Deviation	4.43	2.4
95% Confidence Interval	69.3, 73.4	1.9, 3.9
Dissolved Arsenic		
Average	41.1	1.5
Minimum	37.6	1
Maximum	42.7	2.6
Standard Deviation	1.16	0.35
95% Confidence Interval	40.6, 41.7	1.3, 1.6
Arsenic (III)		
Average	2.7	0.7
Minimum	1.4	<0.5
Maximum	3.4	1.1
Standard Deviation	0.46	0.2
Confidence Interval	2.5, 2.9	0.6, 0.8
Arsenic (V)		
Average	38.4	0.8
Minimum	35.1	<0.5
Maximum	40.4	1.5
Standard Deviation	1.22	0.3
95% Confidence Interval	37.8, 39.0	0.7, 0.9

*All readings at the MDL for Arsenic III (<0.5 µg/L) were used as that number in calculations.
Note: the reliability of the low-level data (MDL of 0.1 µg/L to approximately 2 µg/L) should be considered only qualitative (not quantitative).

Iron Removal

Total iron in the feedwater stream was at an average concentration of 0.299 mg/L and an average of 0.063 mg/L in the filtrate.

Turbidity

Turbidity measurements made both with on-line turbidimeters and the bench-top instrument showed significant turbidity reduction by the KIMCFS. On-line feedwater turbidity readings during the testing period averaged 1.75 NTU, compared to the bench-top turbidity average of 1.54 NTU. The on-line filtrate turbidity readings for the testing period averaged 0.097 NTU, compared to the bench-top average of 0.25 NTU. Although there was a lack of complete agreement between the instruments in the measurement of filtrate turbidity, the trend was consistent.

Operation and Maintenance Results

Testing was initiated at 1400 hours on April 7, 2000, and the system ran continuously until 2045 hours on April 22, 2000. It is estimated that 51 backwashing episodes occurred during the test period.

The coagulant chemical metering pumps required no adjustments during the test. The concentration of ferric chloride in the feedwater stream was approximately 8.6 mg/L; the concentration of hypochlorite was approximately 1.6 mg/L in the feedwater.

The electrical power used was 110VAC, single phase, 20A service. The power was recorded on an Amprobe Kilowatt/Hour (kWh) Meter (non-demand). The total power consumed was 516 kWh. The total quantity of filtrate produced was 82,200 gallons. Total quantity of NaOCl consumed was 280.9 gallons of 5.25% bleach. Total quantity of $FeCl_3$ consumed was 25.3 gallons of a 32.5% $FeCl_3$ solution.

The backwash water was collected (while the test system was staffed) with an average quantity of 84 gallons per backwash episode. Samples were analyzed for TSS. This revealed an average concentration of 333 mg/L.

Original Signed by	*Original Signed by*
E. Timothy Oppelt *9/26/01*	*Gordon Bellen* *10/02/01*
E. Timothy Oppelt Date	Gordon Bellen Date
Director	Vice President
National Risk Management Research Laboratory	Federal Programs
Office of Research and Development	NSF International
United States Environmental Protection Agency	

NOTICE: Verifications are based on an evaluation of technology performance under specific, predetermined criteria and the appropriate quality assurance procedures. EPA and NSF make no expressed or implied warranties as to the performance of the technology and do not certify that a technology will always operate as verified. The end user is solely responsible for complying with any and all applicable federal, state, and local requirements. Mention of corporate names, trade names, or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use of specific products. This report is not a NSF Certification of the specific product mentioned herein.

Availability of Supporting Documents

Copies of the *ETV Protocol for Equipment Verification Testing for Arsenic Removal* dated March 30, 2000, the Verification Statement, and the Verification Report (NSF Report #01/23/EPADW395) are available from the following sources:
(NOTE: Appendices are not included in the Verification Report. Appendices are available from NSF upon request.)

1. Drinking Water Systems ETV Pilot Manager (order hard copy)
   NSF International
   P.O. Box 130140
   Ann Arbor, Michigan 48113-0140
2. NSF web site: http://www.nsf.org/etv (electronic copy)
3. EPA web site: http://www.epa.gov/etv (electronic copy)

September 2001

Environmental Technology Verification Report

Removal of Arsenic from Drinking Water

Kinetico Incorporated Macrolite® Coagulation and Filtration System, Model CPS100CPT

Prepared for
NSF International
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

Prepared by
Cartwright, Olsen and Associates, LLC
Cedar, Minnesota 55011

Under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Jeffrey Q. Adams, Project Officer
National Risk Management Research Laboratory
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Cincinnati, Ohio 45268

Notice

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) through its Office of Research and Development has financially supported and collaborated with NSF International (NSF) under Cooperative Agreement No. CR 824815. This verification effort was supported by the Drinking Water Treatment Systems Pilot operating under the Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program. This document has been peer reviewed and reviewed by NSF and EPA and recommended for public release.

Foreword

The following is the final report on an Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) test performed for NSF International (NSF) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by Cartwright, Olsen & Associates, LLC (COA) in cooperation with Kinetico, Inc. The test was conducted during March and April of 2000 at the Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant, Park City, Utah.

Throughout its history, the EPA has evaluated the effectiveness of innovative technologies to protect human health and the environment. A new EPA program, the Environmental Technology Verification Program (ETV) was developed to verify the performance of innovative technical solutions to environmental pollution or human health threats. ETV was created to substantially accelerate the entrance of new environmental technologies into the domestic and international marketplace. Verifiable, high quality data on the performance of new technologies is made available to regulators, developers, consulting engineers, and those in the public health and environmental protection industries. This encourages more rapid availability of approaches to better protect the environment.

The EPA has partnered with NSF, an independent, not-for-profit testing and certification organization dedicated to public health, safety and protection of the environment, to verify performance of small drinking water systems that serve small communities under the Drinking Water Treatment Systems (DWTS) ETV Pilot. A goal of verification testing is to enhance and facilitate the acceptance of small drinking water treatment equipment by state drinking water regulatory officials and consulting engineers while reducing the need for testing of equipment at each location where the equipment's use is contemplated. NSF will meet this goal by working with manufacturers and NSF-qualified Field Testing Organizations (FTO) to conduct verification testing under the approved protocols. Cartwright, Olsen & Associates is one such FTO.

The ETV DWTS is being conducted by NSF with participation of manufacturers, under the sponsorship of the EPA Office of Research and Development, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, Water Supply and Water Resources Division, Cincinnati, Ohio. It is important to note that verification of the equipment does not mean that the equipment is "certified" by NSF or "accepted" by EPA. Rather, it recognizes that the performance of the equipment has been determined and verified by these organizations for those conditions tested by the FTO.

Table of Contents

Section Page

Verification Statement ..... VS-i
Title Page i
Notice ii
Foreword iii
Table of Contents iv
Abbreviations and Acronyms x
Acknowledgments xi

Chapter 1 Introduction 1
1.1 ETV Purpose and Program Operation 1
1.2 Testing Participants and Responsibilities 1
1.2.1 NSF International 2
1.2.2 Field Testing Organization 2
1.2.3 Manufacturer 3
1.2.4 Analytical Laboratory 3
1.2.5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 3
1.2.6 Park City Municipal Corporation, Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant 4
1.3 Verification Testing Site 4
1.3.1 Arsenic Chemistry 5
1.3.2 Health Concerns 7
1.3.3 Regulatory 7
1.3.4 Water Source 7

Chapter 2 Equipment Description and Operating Processes 9
2.1 Historical Background 9
2.2 Equipment Description 10
2.3 Operating Process 18

Chapter 3 Methods and Procedures 20
3.1 Experimental Design 20
3.1.1 Objectives 20
3.1.1.1 Evaluation of Stated Equipment Capabilities 20
3.1.1.2 Evaluation of Equipment Performance Relative To Water Quality Regulations 20
3.1.1.3 Evaluation of Operational and Maintenance Requirements 20
3.1.1.4 Evaluation of Equipment Characteristics 20
3.2 Verification Testing Schedule 21
3.3 Initial Operations 21
3.3.1. Water Quality Characteristics 21
3.3.1.1 Feed Water Characteristics 21
3.3.1.2 Water Quality Data Collection and Analysis 22

Table of Contents, continued

Section Page

3.3.2 Initial Test Runs....22
3.3.2.1 Coagulant Chemistry....23
3.3.2.2 Filter Loading Rate....23
3.4 Verification Task Procedures....23
3.4.1 Task 1 - Verification Testing Runs And Routine Equipment Operation....24
3.4.2 Task 2 - Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization....24
3.4.3 Task 3 - Documentation of Operating Conditions and Treatment Equipment Performance....26
3.4.4 Task 4 - Arsenic Removal....27
3.5 Recording Data....27
3.5.1 Objectives....28
3.5.2 Procedures....28
3.5.2.1 Log Books....28
3.5.2.2 Photographs....28
3.5.2.3 Chain of Custody....28
3.6 Calculation of Data Quality Indicators....29
3.6.1 Representativeness....29
3.6.2 Statistical Uncertainty....29
3.6.3 Accuracy....29
3.6.4 Precision....29
3.7 Equipment....30
3.7.1 Equipment Operations....30
3.7.2 Analytical Equipment....30
3.8 QA/QC Procedures....31
3.8.1 QA/QC Verifications....31
3.8.2 On-Site Analytical Method....31
3.8.2.1 pH....31
3.8.2.2 Temperature....32
3.8.2.3 Turbidity....32
3.8.2.4 True Color....32
3.8.2.5 Total Chlorine....32
3.8.2.6 Particle Free Water (PFW)....32
3.8.2.7 Pressure Gauges....33
3.8.3 Off-Site Analysis for Chemical and Biological Samples....33
3.8.3.1 Organic Parameters, Total Organic Carbon and UV_{254} Absorbance....33
3.8.3.2 Algae (Chlorophyll A) Samples....33
3.8.3.3 Inorganic Samples....33

Chapter 4 Results and Discussion....34
4.1 Introduction....34

Table of Contents, continued

Section Page

4.2 Initial Operations Results 34
4.2.1 Characterization of Influent Water 34
4.2.2 Initial Test Runs 34
4.2.2.1 Coagulant Chemistry 38
4.2.2.2 Coagulant Dosage 38
4.2.3 Filter Run Times 38
4.2.4 Backwashing Frequency 38
4.3 Verification Testing Results 39
4.3.1 Task 1 - Verification Testing Runs And Routine Equipment Operation 39
4.3.2 Task 2 - Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization 47
4.3.3 Task 3: Documentation of Operating Conditions and Treatment Equipment Performance 58
4.3.4 Task 4: Arsenic Removal Results 64
4.4 Results of Equipment Characterization 70
4.4.1 Qualitative Factors 70
4.4.1.1 Susceptibility to Changes in Environmental Conditions 70
4.4.1.2 Operational Reliability 70
4.4.1.3 Equipment Safety 70
4.4.2 Quantitative Factors 71
4.4.2.1 Electrical Power 71
4.4.2.2 Consumables 71
4.4.2.3 Waste Disposal 71
4.4.2.4 Length of Operating Cycle 72
4.5 QA/QC Results 72
4.5.1 Arsenic Speciation and Analysis 72
4.5.2 Data Correctness 73
4.5.2.1 Representativeness 73
4.5.2.2 Statistical Uncertainty 73
4.5.2.3 Accuracy 73
4.5.2.4 Precision 73
4.5.3 Daily QA/QC Results 74
4.5.4 Results Of QA/QC Verifications At The Start Of Each Testing Period 74
4.5.4.1 Tubing 74
4.5.4.2 Thermometer 74
4.5.4.3 Turbidimeters 75
4.5.4.4 True Color 76
4.5.4.5 Total Chlorine 76
4.5.4.6 Pressure Gauges 77
4.5.4.7 Metering Pump 77
4.5.4.8 Flow Rates 77

Table of Contents, continued

Section Page
4.5.5 Off-Site Analysis for Chemical and Biological Samples....77
4.5.5.1 Organic Parameters, Total Organic Carbon and UV_{254} Absorbance....77
4.5.5.2 Algae (Chlorophyll A) Samples....77
4.5.5.3 Inorganic Samples....77

Chapter 5 References....78

Table Page
Table 1-1. Historical Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead Water Quality Parameters....5
Table 1-2. Selected Inorganic Arsenic Compounds....7
Table 2-1. Uniformity of the Macrolite® 70/80 Mesh Medium (AWWA Standard B100-96)....17
Table 2-2. Uniformity of the Macrolite® 70/80 Mesh Medium (Micromeritics Autopore)....17
Table 2-3. Kinetico CPS100CPT System Maximum and Maximum Operating Characteristics....18
Table 3-1. Analytical Data Collection Schedule....25
Table 3-2. Operational Data Collection Schedule....26
Table 3-3. Filtration Performance Capability Objectives....27
Table 4-1. Initial Testing without Coagulant Chemicals (April 7 & 8, 2000)....35
Table 4-2. Arsenic Data Summaries (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7-8, 2000)....35
Table 4-3. Sources, Strengths, Dilution And Flow Rates Of The Coagulant Chemicals....38
Table 4-4. Daily Temperature Data (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....40
Table 4-5. Temperature Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....41
Table 4-6. Daily pH Data (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....42
Table 4-7. Daily pH Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....43
Table 4-8. Daily Bench-Top Turbidity Data (NTU) (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....44
Table 4-9. Bench-Top Turbidity Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....44
Table 4-10. Daily Dissolved Oxygen Data (mg/L) (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....46
Table 4-11. Daily Dissolved Oxygen Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....46
Table 4-12. Continuous Turbidity Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....48
Table 4-13. Iron Concentrations (April 7 - April 22, 2000)....49
Table 4-14. Iron Data Summary (April 7 – April 22, 2000)....49
Table 4-15. Alkalinity Daily Measurements (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....50
Table 4-16. Alkalinity Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....50
Table 4-17. Antimony Daily Measurements (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....52
Table 4-18. Antimony Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....52
Table 4-19. Arsenic Data Measurements (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....54
Table 4-20. Arsenic Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)....55
Table 4-21. Feed Flow Rate Data Summary (April 7 – April 22, 2000)....60
Table 4-22. Filter System Runs Times & Water Volume Processed (April 10 – April 22, 2000)....61
Table 4-23. Filter Backwash Water Characteristics (April 10 – April 22, 2000)....62
Table 4-24. Task 4 Arsenic Data (April 20 – April 22, 2000)....64

Table of Contents, continued

Table Page
Table 4-25. Task 4 Arsenic Data Summary (April 24 – April 26, 2000).....64
Table 4-26. Task 4 Analytical Data For Antimony, Alkalinity and Total Iron (April 20 – April 22, 2000) and Chlorophyll A (April 12 – April 22).....67
Table 4-27. Task 4 Analytical Data Summary for Antimony, Alkalinity and Total Iron (April 20 – April 22, 2000) and Chlorophyll A (April 12 – April 22).....67
Table 4-28. Task 4 Analytical Data Summary for Temperature, pH and Dissolved Oxygen (April 20-April 22, 2000) 68
Table 4-29. Task 4 Total Chlorine Data (April 20 – April 22, 2000).....68
Table 4-30. Task 4 Analytical Data Summary for Continuous Turbidity and Bench-Top Turbidity (April 20 – April 22, 2000) 69
Table 4-31. Task 4 Analytical Data – Miscellaneous Parameters (April 20 – April 22, 2000) 69
Table 4-32. Bench-Top Turbidimeter Calibration Verification Data (using 0.4 NTU standard).....76
Table 4-33. Bench-Top Turbidimeter Calibration Verification Data Summary.....76

Figure Page
Figure 1-1. Schematic of Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant.....6
Figure 2-1. Schematic of Kinetico CSP100CPTCoagulation/Filtration System 12
Figure 2-2. Illustration of Kinetico CPS100CPT Filter Vessel.....13
Figure 4-1. Total Arsenic Concentrations For Initial Testing Period (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7 & 8, 2000).....36
Figure 4-2. Dissolved Arsenic Concentrations For Initial Testing Period (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7 - 8, 2000.....36
Figure 4-3. Insoluble Arsenic Concentrations For Initial Testing Period (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7-8, 2000).....37
Figure 4-4. Antimony Concentration vs. Time (no coagulant chemicals) (April 7-8, 2000).....37
Figure 4-5. Daily Temperature Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000) 41
Figure 4-6. Daily pH Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....43
Figure 4-7. Daily Bench-Top Turbidity Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....45
Figure 4-8. Daily Dissolved Oxygen Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....47
Figure 4-9. Continuous Turbidity vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....48
Figure 4-10. Alkalinity vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000) 51
Figure 4-11. Antimony vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....53
Figure 4-12. Total Arsenic vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000) 56
Figure 4-13. Dissolved Arsenic vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000) 57
Figure 4-14. Arsenic (III) vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....57
Figure 4-15. Arsenic (V) vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000).....68
Figure 4-16. Flow Rate Over Time (April 7 – April 22, 2000) 60
Figure 4-17. Pressure Drop Across System Over Time (April 7 – April 22, 2000) 63
Figure 4-18. Task 4 Total Arsenic vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000).....65
Figure 4-19. Task 4 Dissolved Arsenic vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000).....65

Table of Contents, continued

Table Page
Figure 4-20. Task 4 Arsenic (III) vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000) 66
Figure 4-21. Task 4 Arsenic (V) vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000) 66

Photographs Page
Photograph 1 – Front view of the Kinetico CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System 14
Photograph 2 – View of the Kinetico CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System (view from feed end) 15
Photograph 3 - View of the Kinetico CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System (showing backwash collection tank).....16

Appendices
A. State of Utah Division Epidemiology and Laboratory Services QA/QC Manual
B. Historical Water Quality Data For Park City, Utah
C. Coagulant Chemistry Initial Testing, Macrolite® Filter Media MSDS, and Operations & Maintenance Manual For CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System
D. Arsenic Speciation Procedure
E. Analytical Reports, Flow Rate Data, Pressure Drop Data, On-Line Continuous Turbidity Data, and Chain-of-Custody Sheets
F. On-Site Logbook
G. Certification of Calibration for Pressure Gauge and Certificate of Conformance for Bench-Top Turbidimeter
H. QA/QC Procedures, Data, and Discussion

Abbreviations and Acronyms

APHA	American Public Health Association
AWWA	American Water Works Association
°C	Degrees Celsius
COA	Cartwright, Olsen and Associates, LLC
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESWTR	Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
ETV	Environmental Technology Verification
FOD	Field Operations Document
FRP	Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic
ft^2	Square foot (feet)
FTO	Field Testing Organization
gpm	Gallon(s) per minute
ICR	Information Collection Rule
KIMCFS	Kinetico, Inc. Macrolite® Coagulation Filtration System
L	Liters
µ	Micron(s)
µg/L	Microgram(s) per liter (ppb)
m^2	Square meter(s)
m^3/d	Cubic meter(s) per day
MCFS	Macrolite® Coagulation Filtration System
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
MCLG	Maximum Contaminant Level Goal
MDL	Minimum Detection Limit
mg/L	Milligram(s) per liter
mL	Milliliter(s)
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NSF	NSF International, formerly known as the National Sanitation Foundation
NTU	Nephelometric turbidity unit(s)
ORP	Oxidization-Reduction Potential
PFW	Particle Free Water
ppb	Parts per billion (µg/L)
psi	Pound(s) per square inch
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
QA	Quality assurance
QC	Quality control
SM	Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater
SWTR	Surface Water Treatment Rule
TDS	Total dissolved solids
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
Ten State's Standards	Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State Public Health and Environmental Managers, *Recommended Standards for Water Works.*
UV_{254}	Ultraviolet light absorbance at 254 nanometers
WEF	Water Environment Federation
WHO	World Health Organization

Acknowledgments

The Field Testing Organization, Cartwright, Olsen & Associates (COA), was responsible for all elements in the testing sequence, including collection of samples, calibration and verification of instruments, data collection and analysis, data management, data interpretation and the preparation of this report.

Cartwright, Olsen & Associates, LLC
19406 East Bethel Blvd.
Cedar, Minnesota 55011
Phone: (952) 854-4911
Fax (952) 854-6964
E-mail: cartwrightconsul@cs.com
Contact: Peter Cartwright, PE.

The laboratory that conducted the analytical work of this study was:

State of Utah
Department of Health
Division of Laboratory Services
46 Medical Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84113-1105
Phone: (801) 536-4204
Fax (801) 615-5311
Contact: Larry P. Scanlan, Environmental Scientist III

The Manufacturer of the Equipment was:

Kinetico Incorporated
10845 Kinsman Road
Newbury, Ohio 44065
(440) 564-9111 or (800) 432-1166
Fax (440) 564-9541
e-mail: glatimer@kinetico.com
Contact Person: Glen Latimer, Operations Manager

COA wishes to thank NSF International, especially Mr. Bruce Bartley, Project Manger, and Ms. Carol Becker and Ms. Kristie Wilhelm, Environmental Engineers, for providing guidance and program management.

COA is especially indebted to the following individuals at the Spiro Tunnel Water Treatment Plant: John A. Lind, Assistant Public Works Director, Richard W. Hilbert, Assistant Public Superintendent, Leo

Williams for his invaluable assistance in monitoring and sample collection speciation, and Jay Glazier and Scott Clayburn for their assistance to Mr. Williams.

Mr. Larry Scanlan, Environmental Scientist, State of Utah, Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Drinking Water, deserves special recognition for obtaining and regenerating the anion resin used for arsenic speciation.

Dr. Zenon Pawlak, Chief of the Radiochem and Metals Lab, Division of Laboratory Services, was invaluable in his coordination of all laboratory analyses and processing of the resulting data. Wayne Pierce, Director of the Bureau of Environmental Chemistry and Toxicology, Division of Laboratory Services, is thanked for his able supervision of all analytical activities.

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 ETV Purpose and Program Operation

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has created the Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program to facilitate the deployment of innovative or improved environmental technologies through performance verification and dissemination of information. The goal of the ETV program is to further environmental protection by substantially accelerating the acceptance and use of improved and more cost-effective technologies. ETV seeks to achieve this goal by providing high quality, peer reviewed data on technology performance to those involved in the design, distribution, permitting, purchase, and use of environmental technologies.

ETV works in partnership with recognized standards and testing organizations; stakeholders groups which consist of buyers, vendor organizations, and permitters; and with the full participation of individual technology developers. The program evaluates the performance of innovative technologies by developing test plans that are responsive to the needs of stakeholders, conducting field or laboratory (as appropriate), collecting and analyzing data, and preparing peer reviewed reports. All evaluations are conducted in accordance with rigorous quality assurance protocols to ensure that data of known and adequate quality are generated and that the results are defensible.

NSF International (NSF) in cooperation with the EPA operates the Drinking Water Treatment Systems (DWTS) pilot, one of 12 technology areas under ETV. The DWTS program evaluated the performance of the Kinetico, Inc. Macrolite® Coagulation Filtration System (KIMCFS), which is a backwashable depth filtration system used in package drinking water treatment system applications. This document provides the verification test results for the KIMCFS.

1.2 Testing Participants and Responsibilities

The ETV testing of the Kinetico, Inc. CPS100CPT Macrolite® Coagulation Filtration System was a cooperative effort between the following participants:

NSF International
Cartwright, Olsen & Associates, LLC
Kinetico, Incorporated
State of Utah Division of Drinking Water Laboratory
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Park City Municipal Corporation, Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant

The following is a brief description of each ETV participant and their roles and responsibilities.

1.2.1 NSF International

NSF is a not-for-profit standards and certification organization dedicated to public health safety and the protection of the environment. Founded in 1946 and located in Ann Arbor, Michigan, NSF has been instrumental in the development of consensus standards for the protection of public health and the environment. NSF also provides testing and certification services to ensure that products bearing the NSF Name, Logo and/or Mark meet those standards. The EPA partnered with NSF to verify the performance of drinking water treatment systems through the EPA's ETV Program.

NSF provided technical and primary quality oversight of the verification testing. NSF arranged an inspection of the field analytical and data gathering and recording procedures on April 17 and 18, 2000. NSF reviewed the Field Operations Document (FOD) to assure its conformance with the pertinent ETV generic protocol and test plan. NSF also conducted a review or this report and coordinated the EPA and technical reviews of this report.

Contact Information:

NSF International
789 N. Dixboro Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
Phone: 734-769-8010
Fax: 734-769-0109
Contact: Bruce Bartley, Project Manager
E-mail: bartley@nsf.org

1.2.2 Field Testing Organization

Cartwright, Olsen & Associates, (COA), a Limited Liability Company, conducted the verification testing of the KIMCFS. COA is a NSF-qualified Field Testing Organization (FTO) for the Drinking Water Treatment System ETV Pilot.

COA was responsible for conducting the verification testing. COA provided all needed logistical support, established a communications network, and scheduled and coordinated activities of all participants. COA determined that the testing location and feed water conditions were such that the verification testing could meet its stated objectives. COA prepared the FOD, oversaw the package plant testing, managed, evaluated, interpreted and reported on the data generated by the testing, as well as evaluated and reported on the performance of the technology.

COA conducted the onsite analyses and data recording during the testing. Oversight of the daily tests was provided by Peter Cartwright, of COA.

Contact Information:

Cartwright, Olsen & Associates, LLC
19406 East Bethel Blvd.

Cedar, MN 55011
Contact: Peter Cartwright, P.E., Project Manager
Phone: (952) 854-4911
Fax (952) 854-6964
E-mail: cartwrightconsul@cs.com

1.2.3 Manufacturer

The treatment system is manufactured by Kinetico, that considers itself a pioneer in non-electric, demand operated water processing systems. Headquartered in Newbury, Ohio, Kinetico is one of the most sophisticated manufacturing and development facilities of its kind.

Kinetico was responsible for supplying a field-ready CPS100CPT KIMCFS equipped with all necessary components including treatment equipment, instrumentation and controls and an operations and maintenance manual. Kinetico was responsible for providing logistical and technical support as needed as well as providing technical assistance to the FTO during operation and monitoring of the equipment undergoing field verification testing.

Contact Information:
Kinetico Incorporated
10845 Kinsman Road
Newbury, Ohio 44065
Contact: Glen Latimer
Phone: (440) 564-9111: Fax (440) 564-9541
e-mail: glatimer@kinetico.com

1.2.4 Analytical Laboratory

All chemical analyses were performed by the State of Utah Division of Drinking Water Laboratory. These analyses were made under the direct supervision of Larry P. Scanlan, Environmental Scientist III.

Contact Information:
State of Utah Division of Drinking Water Laboratory
Phone: (801) 536-4204: Fax (801) 615-5311
Contact: Larry P. Scanlan, Environmental Scientist III
E-mail: lscanlan@dep.state.ut.us

The QA/QC manual for this laboratory is located in Appendix A.

1.2.5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The EPA through its Office of Research and Development has financially supported and collaborated with NSF under Cooperative Agreement No. CR 824815. This verification effort was supported by

the Drinking Water Treatment Systems Pilot operating under the ETV Program. This document was peer reviewed for technical and quality control content by the EPA.

1.2.6 Park City Municipal Corporation, Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant

Park City Municipal Corporation personnel performed non-supervisory labor associated with the operation and monitoring of equipment under direct supervision of Peter Cartwright. These activities included collecting operating data and collection of analytical samples and speciation of arsenic samples.

Contact Information:

Park City Municipal Corporation
445 Marsac Avenue
P.O. Box 1480
Park City, Utah 84060
Contact: Jerry Gibbs, Public Works Director
Phone: (435) 615-5310: Fax (435) 615-4904

The address of the testing site is:

Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant
1884 Three Kings Drive
Park City, Utah 84060
Contact: Rich Hilbert
Phone: (435) 615-5321: Fax (435) 658-9022

1.3 Verification Testing Site

The site selected for challenge testing of the KIMCFS was the Park City Spiro Tunnel Water Treatment Plant, 1884 Three Kings Drive, Park City, Utah 84060.

The Park City Municipal Corporation has direct access to Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead water. This water source was used for verification testing. Historical (non-ETV verified) water data at the intake location are summarized in Table 1–1. A schematic of the Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant is attached as Figure 1-1.

Table 1-1. Historical Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead Water Quality Parameters

Parameter	Minimum	Maximum
pH	7.3	8.2
Total dissolved solids (TDS) (mg/L)	520	660
Arsenic (Total As) (µg/L)	4	225
Turbidity (NTU)	1	4
Total alkalinity (mg/L as HCO_3^-)	140	152
Total hardness (mg/L)	420	680
Iron (mg/L)	0.07	2.7
Calcium (mg/L as Ca)	106	160
Chloride (mg/L)	1	10
Sulfate (mg/L)	260	450
Manganese (mg/L)	5	30
Antimony (µg/L)	6	<100
Beryllium (µg/L)	<1	5
Cadmium (µg/L)	<1	<24
Cyanide (µg/L)	<2	5
Nitrite (NO_2^-) (µg/L)	<0.01	<0.02
Nitrate (NO_3^-) (µg/L)	<0.02	8.15
Selenium (µg/L)	<1	<5
Thallium (µg/L)	<2	<500
Mercury (µg/L)	<0.02	<1.1

Influent water quality to the KIMCFS was verified and documented as a function of the Initial Operations tasks and are detailed in Chapter 4, Results and Discussions.

Backwash water generated during the verification testing was quantified, sampled and discharged to the Snyderville Sewer Improvement District. A discharge permit was not required.

1.3.1 Arsenic Chemistry

Arsenic is the 20th most abundant element in the earth's crust and is a component of over 245 minerals. Because the physical appearance of arsenic resembles that of a metal, it is classified as a metalloid and is located in group V of the Periodic Table. It readily forms both oxide and sulfide compounds in the environment.

Arsenic also enters the environment as the result of both manufacturing and natural processes. Arsenic trioxide (As_20_3) is formed during smelting operations and has created significant air and land pollution problems. Arsenic also is released through the burning of certain fossil fuels and volcanic eruptions.

In natural waters, soluble arsenic is virtually always present in the oxidation states of either of +3(III) or +5(V) valence. An organic species (methylated) has been detected; however, concentrations of this organic compound rarely exceed 1 µg/L and it is considered of little or no significance as a drinking water contaminant.



Figure 1-1. Schematic of Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant

In oxygenated waters, the As (V) valence is dominant, existing in the anionic forms of $H_2AsO_4^-$, $HAsO_4^=$ and AsO_4^{-3}. In waters containing little or no oxygen (anoxic), As (III) exists in the nonionic form, H_3AsO_3 below a pH of 9.22, and the anionic form, $H_2AsO_3^-$ at a pH above 9.22.

1.3.2 Health Concerns

Arsenic has significant notoriety as a poison, even featured in a stage play, "Arsenic and Old Lace". Recent studies have indicated that arsenic in drinking water is more dangerous than previously thought, with risks to exposure comparable to that of radon and second hand tobacco smoke (Edwards, 1994). In humans, ingested arsenic can cause liver, lung, kidney, bladder and skin cancers. Arsenite [As (III)] is significantly more toxic than arsenate [As (V)].

1.3.3 Regulatory

The proposed USEPA Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) for arsenic in drinking water is 10 ìg/L, with a Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) of 0. The World Health Organization (WHO) has established a provisional arsenic limit of 10 ppb.

The Table 1-2 lists the properties of selected inorganic arsenic compounds.

Table 1-2. Selected Inorganic Arsenic Compounds

Property	Arsenic	Arsenic Trioxide	Sodium Trioxide	Sodium Arsenate
Synonyms	Arsenic black, colloidal arsenic, gray arsenic	Arsenic oxide, arsenious acid, arsenious oxide, white arsenic	Disodium arsenate, sodium biarsenate, arsenic acid disodium salt	Arsenious acid sodium salt, sodium metaarsenite
Chemical formula	As	As_2O_3 (As_40_6)	Na_2HAs0_4	$NaAsO_4$
Molecular weight	74.92	197.84	185.91	129.91
Valence state	0	3	5	3
Water Solubility	Insoluble	Soluble 37 g/L at 20°C. 101 g/L at 100°C	Soluble	Very Soluble

1.3.4 Water Source

The Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead source is considered a groundwater source under the State of Utah source protection program. It is located at N40° 41' 20.8" and W111° 31' 25.0". Water is developed from water bearing fissures in an abandoned silver mine tunnel at approximately 13,600 feet into the tunnel, a five-foot high bulkhead has been constructed to hold back a quantity of water. This water exits the tunnel through a 12" diameter pipe at a flow rate of 1,150 gpm, and enters the treatment plant, which is located about 300 yards away. The tunnel is located 1,000 feet or more under remote unoccupied forest in a mountainous region, and the tunnel entrance is approximately 50 feet below the bulkhead. There is no use of manmade chemicals on the ground above this source.

The water source used for this test is known as the Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead source, is stable with respect to quality and quantity. Because this water source contains arsenic, for the municipal supply, it is currently diluted with the treatment plant finished water to form a blend that meets the present arsenic standard. For this test, only the untreated, unblended Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead supply was used.

The filtration plant was built in February, 1993, has nominal capacity of 1,000 gpm, and is designed to remove iron, manganese, and arsenic from the raw water. This source is one of five active sources serving the municipality: 2 tunnels, 2 deep wells, and a spring. The water system serves 6,500 residents, and as much as 20,000 people per day during the winter season.

Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead water quality before treatment is listed in Table 1-1. These data are historical and not ETV verified. This table is a summary of water quality data contained in Appendix B.

Chapter 2
Equipment Description and Operating Processes

2.1 Historical Background

The highly respected filtration scientist, Appiah Amirtharajah, once wrote, "It is ironic that filtration fails when pretreatment fails, and theory also fails when pretreatment fails." At the same time he commented, "Chemical pretreatment with particle destabilization is the single most important factor for the production of the best quality filtered water" (Amirtharajah, 1988).

Particles in colloidal suspensions, where electrostatic forces keep the particles dispersed, have proven to be a challenge to depth filtration. In many cases, chemical pretreatment, by agglomerating the particles into larger floc, will allow solids separation of water matrices that otherwise resist filtration.

Large water treatment systems have long employed coagulation, flocculation, settling and filtration for the production of quality water. Small systems have been more reluctant to build treatment plants that use coagulation because of the higher level of operator training required and the need for continuous monitoring. With the soon to be implemented Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rules (IESWTR), and revised arsenic MCL, coagulation may be a suitable technology for smaller systems allowing them to meet tough new standards with a modest increase in cost.

Only in recent times have we been able to quantify the collection of material within the filter bed, especially the particulate matter that lies below our visual capabilities. We now know that particles that we cannot see can also be removed by filtration. Still under investigation, however, are the mechanisms through which particulate matter is accumulated within the filter media.

It has been assumed that along with simple straining, which is the physical capture of a mass too large to move through the pores between the media granules, small particles are captured through other attachment mechanisms. Most of those mechanisms involve a surface charge attraction of the particle to granulated media and as a result, many experiments have been performed to both better understand the process and to seek methods to improve it. Some particles are also assumed to be collected by impact on the surface of the filter media granules; while the actual mechanisms are not clearly understood, straining is certainly among them.

The most common filtration system used in municipal treatment is the gravity filter, which uses the weight or head of the water to force it through the filter at very low flow rates. Normal gravity filters, often called "rapid" sand filters, have a normal flow rate of 3 gpm per square foot of surface, or less. Other filters, such as slow sand filters, have even slower service flow rates.

Also included among rapid sand filters are pressure filters, where the water is forced through a media bed by high head pressures and where the media are contained in a pressure vessel. They have long been used for iron and manganese removal, but have not been as readily accepted for surface water treatment (Ten State's Standards, 1992). The advantages—especially to small systems—of rapid sand

pressure filters are many. They are relatively passive treatment systems, involve minimal operator attention, are low in cost and long lived. Of concern, however, is whether pressure filters can capture and contain particles that are small, and more importantly, contaminants that may pose a threat to public health, such as arsenic.

Of the several treatment regimens that incorporate coagulation are those that include a settling basin, where the floc is allowed to settle by gravity and the supernatant decanted and filtered. This is a scheme common to municipal gravity filter systems. The KIMCFS is a direct filtration system, where the coagulant is added to the raw water in a constant stream, mixed in a mixing chamber, and then the solids separated through backwashable granulated media filtration. Because the process stream is slow (5 gpm), filtration can be accomplished with an off-the-shelf pressure vessel. The process rate of 5 gpm allows for a daily total of 7,200 gallons; thus it is well suited to small system requirements where waters must be treated to reduce arsenic levels.

Kinetico, Inc. has successfully piloted many filtration systems that employ coagulation as pretreatment.

The primary issue here was whether the KIMCFS could effectively reduce the total concentration of arsenic to meet the anticipated arsenic MCL of 10 µg/L.

The operation of this equipment is more technically sophisticated than a filter alone, and required more extensive training in the proper dosing of coagulating chemistry; therefore, the state and municipal health authorities may have requirements for operation beyond those of a filter. Kinetico, Inc., requires no special licensing, and will offer operator training upon equipment installation and start-up.

The wastewater produced by the Park City Municipal Corporation is directed to the raw water wet well.

2.2 Equipment Description

This environmental technology verification (ETV) test is designed to challenge the KIMCFS to convert soluble arsenic into an insoluble precipitate and to remove the precipitate at flow rates of 5 gpm (9.2 gpm/ft^2). Kinetico, Inc. expected that the filter system would achieve a total arsenic concentration of less that 5 µg/L, from an influent stream containing up to 80 µg/L of arsenic. The performance claim evaluated during field testing of the system was that the system is capable of producing a filtrate stream containing less than 5 µg/L total arsenic at a flow rate of 8-9 gpm/ft^2 filter bed surface area from an influent stream containing a maximum concentration of 76 µg/L total arsenic.

The KIMCFS utilizes chlorine and ferric chloride ($FeCl_3$) to convert the arsenate to an insoluble precipitate which is removed by the media filter. In the Park City Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead Municipal Water Supply, almost all of the arsenic is in the soluble arsenate (V) form (see ChemTech-Ford letter in Appendix B).

The KIMCFS included the following components, described in order of process water flow: Ferric chloride injection into feedwater supply via metering pump→ Sodium hypochlorite injection via metering pump → In-line static mixer→ Flow control→ Retention tank (165 gallon capacity, 33 minute detention time)→ Retention tank (84 gallon capacity, 17 minute detention time)→ Repressurization pump→ Filtration [10" diameter x 54" FRP (Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic) filters vessels (2) each containing 1.1 ft^3 of Macrolite® filter media]→ Flow control.

The coagulant chemicals are sodium hypochlorite plus ferric chloride, injected separately into the feedwater stream by LMI metering pumps and blended with the water by means of an in-line static mixer. The two retention tanks (total capacity of 249 gallons) provide holding time for the oxidation and coagulation reactions to take place. From the tanks, the water is pumped into one of two filter vessels (10" diameter x 54" high) each containing 1.1 ft^3 of Macrolite® medium to effect the removal of the coagulated arsenic. This medium is described below.

Figure 2-1 is a schematic of the package treatment plant and Figure 2-2 illustrates the Kinetico pressure filter vessel. Photograph 1 illustrates the placement of the KIMCFS in the Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant. Photograph #2 illustrates the chemical feed portion of the KI Test System along with the first retention tank. Photograph #3 is of the skid mounted portion of the Test System showing the on-line turbidimeters and the two filter vessels, as well as the backwash collection tank.

Appendix C includes the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Manual.



Figure 2-1. Schematic of Kinetico CSP100CPTCoagulation/Filtration System



Figure 2-2. Illustration of Kinetico CPS100CPT Filter Vessel

Photograph 1 – Front view of the Kinetico CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System



Photograph 2 – View of the Kinetico CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System (view from feed end)



Photograph #3 View of the Kinetico CPS100CPT Coagulation and Filtration System (showing backwash collection tank)

The filter medium is Macrolite®, a synthetic ceramic, filter medium and is not covered under American Water Works Association (AWWA) standards for filter media (B100-89). Standard B100-89 is a purchase guide for filter media and is not intended as a design standard; however, many of the testing parameters will be of interest to public health administrators, especially those physical characteristics that may impact on the longevity of the material. Thus, hardness, specific gravity, acid solubility, uniformity coefficients, particle sieve size distributions (within manufacturing lots and from lot to lot) and other similar physical data have been furnished by the manufacturer and are noted below.

Scanning Electron Microscope Photos of Macrolite® media are in Appendix C. Macrolite® of the 70/80 mesh size has a bulk density of 0.96 grams/cc. The specific gravity (as measured by ASTM D2840) is 2.23 g/cc. The collapse strength for the media of this size has not been measured, however, for a larger sphere (30/50 mesh) the collapse strength (as measured by ASTM D 3102) is a nominal 7,000-psi for 10% and nominal 8,000 psi for 20% collapse.

The uniformity of the Macrolite® 70/80 mesh media was analyzed in accordance with AWWA Standard B100-96 by Bowser-Morner, Inc in December, 1997. The results of this analysis are summarized below in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1. Uniformity of the Macrolite® 70/80 Mesh Medium (AWWA Standard B100-96)

Sieve Size, USA Std.	Nominal, mm	Effective, mm	Percent passing
#45	0.355	0.360	100.0
#50	0.300	0.307	99.9
#60	0.250	0.249	79.8
#70	0.212	0.212	28.9
#80	0.180	0.180	7.2
#100	0.150	0.150	0.4

Effective Size: 0.19 mm
Uniformity Coefficient: 1.2

In addition, a Kinetico Inc. internal laboratory analysis in June of 1998 of 70 mesh media (lot #: 352) employing a mercury/penetrometer Micromeritics Autopore II 9220 instrument produced the following results as shown in Table 2-2.

Table 2-2. Uniformity of the Macrolite® 70/80 Mesh Medium (Micromeritics Autopore)

Total intrusion volume	0.2098 mL/g
Total pore area	0.18 sq-m/g
Median pore diameter volume	53.7990 µm
Median pore diameter area	52.5351 µm
Median pore diameter 4V/A	46.5685 µm

The pore diameters are those measured by an instrument, AutoPore II, performing an intrusion study of the media. A measured volume of the media was placed in a glass penetrometer which was then degassed by vacuum. A known volume of mercury was introduced into the penetrometer which was then placed under pressure. As the mercury penetrates the interstitial spaces, the volume is electronically measured. The volumes and pore sizes are then calculated from the data by use of the Washburn Equation. The total intrusion volume is the maximum volume of mercury at the highest

pressure; the total pore area is the area of the pore wall as calculated on the pore shape as a right cylinder. The Median Pore Diameter (volume) is the pore diameter at the 50th percentile point on the volume distribution curve; the Median Pore Diameter (area) is the pore diameter at the 50th percentile point on the area distribution curve and the Average Pore Diameter (4V/A) is based on the total pore diameter wall area of a right cylinder.

A Material Safety Data Sheet for Macrolite® is included as a part of Appendix C. Macrolite® medium meets the requirements of ANSI/NSF Standard 61 and is NSF listed. The manufacturer claims the filter medium is long lasting and estimates that less than 2% per year is lost to attrition.

The KIMCFS is designed for small system applications. The tanks can be made of fiberglass or of steel. The piping is Schedule 80 PVC. Polyethylene or PVC tanks are used for the reaction tanks and to hold the coagulant chemicals.

2.3 Operating Process

The KIMCFS is an automated, 100% redundant system with electronic monitoring and electronic controls for placing each filter vessel on-line, backwash and rinse (filter to waste) cycles. The automatic operation is performed by a programmable industrial computer.

Table 2-3 summarizes the operating characteristics of this system.

Table 2-3. Kinetico CPS100CPT System Maximum and Minimum Operating Characteristics

Parameter	Unit
Inlet flow rate – maximum	5 gpm
Inlet flow rate – minimum	0 gpm
Maximum static pressure	100 psi
Minimum inlet dynamic pressure	35 psi
Expected pressure drop	15/30 psi
Minimum outlet pressure	10 psi
High pH	pH 8
Low pH	pH 3
Maximum temperature	100 F
Minimum Temperature	35°F
Maximum inlet turbidity	8 NTU
Normal outlet turbidity	0.1 NTU
Maximum allowable outlet turbidity	0.5 NTU

The KIMCFS is designed to automatically backwash under any of the following conditions:

Effluent Turbidity	0.5 or greater (adjustable)
Differential Pressure	20 psid or greater
Run Time	24 hours
By Manual Initiation	

Built-in are several controls to allow repeated backwash if the initial sequence is insufficient.

The KIMCFS automatic backwash sequence is:

a. The standby tank is rinsed with feedwater (3-5 minutes).
b. The service tank is drained for one minute.
c. The service tank is air sparged for 0.5 minutes with air approximately 1 ½cfm per square foot.
d. The media is allowed to settle (1 minute).
e. The service tank is backwashed with water from the standby tank at an approximate flow rate of 3-½gpm for 20 minutes.
f. The service tank then becomes the standby tank.

Chapter 3
Methods and Procedures

3.1 Experimental Design

This verification study was designed to provide accurate information regarding the performance of the KIMCFS treatment system. Due to the unpredictability of environmental conditions and mechanical equipment performance, this document should not be viewed in the same light as scientific research conducted in a controlled laboratory setting.

3.1.1 Objectives

The verification testing was undertaken to evaluate the performance of the KIMCFS for arsenic reduction. Specifically evaluated were Kinetico's stated equipment capabilities and equipment performance relative to the removal of arsenic to help communities meet the new MCL.

3.1.1.1 Evaluation of Stated Equipment Capabilities

This ETV study was undertaken to demonstrate the manufacturer's claim that the KIMCFS is capable of producing a filtrate stream containing a maximum of 5 µg/L total arsenic at a flow rate of 8-9 gpm/ft^2 filter bed surface area from an influent stream containing a maximum of 80 µg/L total arsenic.

3.1.1.2 Evaluation of Equipment Performance Relative To Water Quality Regulations

With the revised arsenic MCL established at 10 µg/L, with an MCLG of 0 µg/L, it is expected that the search for alternative arsenic removal technologies will grow significantly.

3.1.1.3 Evaluation of Operational and Maintenance Requirements

An overall evaluation of the operational requirements for the treatment system was undertaken as part of this verification. This evaluation was qualitative in nature. The manufacturer's O&M manual, experiences, and events that occurred during the verification period were used to develop a subjective judgment of the operational requirements of this system. The O&M manual is attached to this report as Appendix C.

Verification testing also evaluated the maintenance requirements of the treatment system. Not all of the system's maintenance requirements were necessary due to the short duration of the testing cycle. The O&M manual details various maintenance activities and their frequencies.

3.1.1.4 Evaluation of Equipment Characteristics

The qualitative, quantitative and cost factors of the tested equipment were identified, in so far as possible, during the verification testing. The relatively short duration of the testing cycle creates difficulty

in reliably identifying some of the qualitative, quantitative operational and cost factors. The quantitative factors examined during the verification were operational aspects of the KIMCFS, for example, the measurement of head loss, as well as other factors that might impact performance. The qualitative factors examined during the verification testing process included the dosing requirement of the coagulant chemical. Power consumption, waste disposal, and operations and maintenance issues, and the effect of each on the length of the operating cycle are also addressed. The operating conditions were recorded to allow reasonable prediction of performance under other, similar conditions.

3.2 Verification Testing Schedule

The KIMCFS drinking water treatment was operated continuously for a minimum of 320 hours (the equivalent of 13 full days plus one 8-hour work shift) from April 7, 2000 until April 22, 2000. During this time, the coagulation and filtration package treatment equipment operated continuously from start-up until turbidity breakthrough or terminal head loss was attained. Interruptions in filtration occurred only as needed for backwashing of the filter.

The duration of each filter run and the number of gallons of water produced per square foot of filter area were recorded in the operational results.

During routine equipment operation, the package water treatment equipment was operated to meet the system demands and water quality requirements.

3.3 Initial Operations

The objective of the Initial Operations was to establish operational data including coagulant dosage, filter run times and backwashing schedules, and to qualify the equipment for performance with the selected source water.

Initial operations allowed Kinetico, Inc. to refine the unit's operating procedures and to make operational adjustments as needed to successfully treat the source water. Coagulant chemistry and optimum dosages were determined as well as the relationship between filtrate turbidity and total arsenic concentration in the filtrate.

The major operating parameters examined during initial operations were coagulant chemistry, filter loading rate, pressures and flow rates.

3.3.1. Water Quality Characteristics

3.3.1.1 Feed Water Characteristics

Specifically, the water quality characteristics that were recorded and analyzed were:

- Turbidity

- Temperature
- pH
- Total Alkalinity
- Total Hardness
- Total Organic Carbon
- Ultraviolet light absorbance at 254 nanometers (UV_{254})
- True Color
- Arsenic (concentration by species)
- Algae (chlorophyll A)
- Iron
- Manganese
- Aluminum
- Sulfate
- Antimony
- Dissolved Oxygen

3.3.1.2 Water Quality Data Collection and Analysis

Although not required by the Test Plan and not stated in the FOD, analytical samples were collected daily from the influent (feed) and effluent (filtrate) streams and speciated in order for the State Laboratory to measure total arsenic, dissolved arsenic, As III and As V, as well as antimony. The arsenic speciation procedure is detailed in Appendix D; and involved filling containers as follows: bottle A – as collected (for total arsenic); bottle B – filtered through a 0.45 µ filter (for dissolved arsenic); bottle C – [for arsenic (III)] part of the filtered sample processed though an ion exchange resin to remove ionic arsenic, which is assumed to be all As (V). Arsenic (V) concentration was calculated as dissolved arsenic minus the arsenic (III).

Daily samples were taken beginning on April 7, during Initial Operations and into April 20. On April 20, Task 4 activities commenced, wherein 11 analytical samples were collected during a 48-hour period. The entire test was completed on April 22, 2000.

The parameters, which were analyzed as part of this testing and the sampling frequency, are presented in Table 3-1, Section 3.4. Daily on-site analyses were recorded in the Operations Logbook; semi-weekly analyses were recorded in the Operations Logbook and also recorded on separate laboratory report sheets. These data are summarized in Chapter 4, Results and Discussions, and the data spreadsheets are attached to this report as Appendix E, and on-site Logbook Appendix F.

Both the feedwater and filtrate streams were sampled for each parameter.

3.3.2 Initial Test Runs

Before runs were made in which coagulant was used, the package plant equipment was operated with uncoagulated feed water for one 24-hour run. The samples were collected from the feed water and the

filter effluent at 0, 6, 12, 18, and 24 hours of operation to determine if arsenic losses occur through the system.

3.3.2.1 Coagulant Chemistry

Optimization of coagulant chemistry is dependent on chemical composition and temperature of the source water. Accordingly, it was of critical importance that coagulant chemistry be studied and tested prior to performance verification. This was first accomplished with testing to identify suitable coagulant chemicals, dosage and contact time. Once this testing was complete, initial test runs were performed to both terminal head loss and turbidity breakthrough. The manufacturer utilized ferric chloride as the coagulant and used their test unit to optimize the $FeCl_3$ dosage. They selected sodium hypochlorite as the oxidant and optimized the dosage of that chemical at the same time. Information on these Initial Operations activities is detailed in Appendix C.

3.3.2.2 Filter Loading Rate

Initial filter runs were performed to both terminal headloss and turbidity breakthrough. Total filtered water volume was measured and the character of finished water was evaluated throughout each filter run. Terminal head loss was established at 20 psi delta P across the filter. Turbidity breakthrough was considered reached when the turbidity in the effluent water was 0.15 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU). Backwashing was initiated automatically, when either a terminal headloss was reached or when turbidity breakthrough occurred. Filters were backwashed until the waste stream ran clear, as determined by turbidity of 5 NTU or less. Filters were run in a rinse-to-waste cycle for a minimum of two bed volumes before a filter was returned to service. Filter service flow rate was established at 8-9 gpm/ft^2. Backwash flow rate was established at 6-7 gpm/ft^2, all within original manufacturer operating specifications for the equipment under test. Upon return to service, the filter ripening period was monitored and timed. These data were used to better understand time requirements for backwash, rinse and especially the expected duration of service run cycles during the testing and verification period.

3.4 Verification Task Procedures

The procedures for each task of verification testing were developed in accordance with the requirements of the EPA/NSF Protocol for Equipment Verification Testing For Arsenic Removal (EPA/NSF, 2000) and approved in the FOD (dated April, 2000). The Verification Tasks were as follows:

- Task 1 - Verification Testing Runs and Routine Equipment Operation
- Task 2 - Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization
- Task 3 - Documentation of Operating Conditions and Treatment Equipment Performance
- Task 4 - Arsenic Contaminant Removal Testing

Detailed descriptions of each task are provided in the following sections.

3.4.1 Task 1 - Verification Testing Runs And Routine Equipment Operation

The objective of this task was to operate the equipment provided by Kinetico, Inc. for the 13.33 day period and assess its ability to meet water quality goals and other performance characteristics specified by the Manufacturer.

Verification testing consisted of continuous evaluation of the treatment system, using the most successful treatment parameters defined in Initial Operations. The total verification testing was conducted over a period of slightly more than the required 13.33 days (320 hours). During this period, the feed water quality was consistent with the Manufacturer's statement of performance capability of the equipment. Feed water quality (turbidity and temperature) during this period ranged from 1.10 to 4.04 NTU (based on on-line turbidimeter readings), and 8.8 to 9.8 °C.

Temperature, turbidity, other feed water quality parameters such as algae, natural organic matter, pH, alkalinity and hardness can influence coagulant chemistry and filtration. In order to offer a "worst case" challenge to the equipment under test, no attempt was made to lower the turbidity or raise the temperature of the incoming feed water.

The ETV protocol required the equipment to be run continuously with coagulant chemistry for 13.33 days. In actuality, the testing period with coagulant feed was a total of 342.5 hours, beginning on April 8, 2000 at 14:15 and the testing was completed on April 22, 2000 at 20:45. During the 24 hour period immediately prior to this run, the system was operated without coagulant chemistry and analytical samples collected at time 0, 6 hours, 12 hours, 18 hours and 24 hours of operation to determine arsenic and antimony losses (if any) within the system. On-line coagulation chemistry was monitored by comparing turbidity levels measured at three sample ports: feedwater, filter influent (after coagulation), and filter effluent (filtrate). The KIMCFS control functions allowed for differing conditions to initiate backwash. These conditions included turbidity breakthrough and filter headloss.

Standard operating parameters for filtration, backwash, and coagulant feed were established through the use of the manufacturer's O&M Manual and during initial operations of the treatment system. The unit was then operated under those conditions and operational data were collected according to the schedule presented in Table 3-1.

3.4.2 Task 2 - Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization

This task identified the water quality matrices of the influent water and effluent water and the composition of the removed particulate material, with the relationships to the terminal headloss and/or turbidity breakthrough point. This information was used to evaluate performance of the water treatment equipment relative to stated performance goals. Feedwater and finished water parameters were analyzed and recorded during the verification period according to the schedule in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Analytical Data Collection Schedule

Parameter	Facility	*Standard Methods*[1] Number or other method reference	EPA Method[2]	Minimum Frequency
Temperature (ºC)	On-site	2550 B		Daily
pH	On-site	4500-H^+ B	150.1 / 150.2	[3]
Total Alkalinity (mg/L)	Lab	2320 B		Daily
Total Hardness (mg/L)	Lab		200.7[4]	Weekly
Total Organic Carbon (mg/L)	Lab	5310 B		Weekly
UV_{254} Absorbance (cm^{-1})	Lab	5910 B		Weekly
Turbidity (NTU)	On-site	2130 B / Method 2	180.1	Daily
Aluminum (mg/L)	Lab		200.7	Weekly
Iron (mg/L)	Lab		200.7	Weekly
Manganese (mg/L)	Lab		200.7	Weekly
Suspended Solids in Backwash Water (mg/L)	Lab		160.2	Task 4
Algae (µg/l)	Lab	10200H		Weekly[5]
Sulfate (mg/L)	Lab		375.2	Weekly
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	On-site	4500		Daily
True Color (TCU)	On-site	2120 B (Hach Company modification of *SM* 2120 measured in spectrophotometer at 455 nm)		Weekly
Arsenic Concentration and Species (µm)	Lab		200.8	Task 4
Antimony (µm)	Lab		200.8	Task 4

Notes:

[1]Standard Methods source: 18th Edition of Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 1992 American Water Works Association.

[2] EPA Methods source: EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water. EPA Methods are available from the National Technical Information Services (NTIS).

[3]Once per 8 hours during runs with (when test system was staffed) no arsenic sampling. Each time arsenic samples were taken, coagulant water pH was measured.

[4]Calculated by adding together calcium and magnesium

[5]Weekly or once during each set of treatment conditions for which arsenic sampling was done.

All data collecting and analytical testing was performed in accordance with the procedures and protocols established in *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 18th Edition *(SM)* or EPA approved methods. Water sampling ports were located on the feedwater supply between the retention tank and filter and on the filter effluent.

Turbidity monitors were both continuous and bench. The continuous (on-line) turbidity meter was checked daily against a bench turbidimeter that was checked against turbidity standards. The bench turbidimeter was checked against secondary standards with each use. The turbidity instruments for this study included a Great Lakes Model 95T/SS4 (on-line) and a HACH P2100 (bench).

Evaluation of water quality in this task was related to manufacturer's claims of performance for the KIMCFS, as stated in Section 3.1.1.1, Evaluation of Stated Equipment Capabilities.

3.4.3 Task 3 - Documentation of Operating Conditions and Treatment Equipment Performance

During each day of verification testing while the equipment was staffed, operating conditions were documented. This documentation included description of pretreatment chemistry for coagulation and such treatment equipment operating data, as flow rate, pressure drop (filter head loss) and backwash frequency and volume.

Treatment equipment operating parameters for both pretreatment and filtration were monitored and recorded on a routine basis. Data on filter head loss and backwashing were also collected, as well as electrical energy consumed by the treatment equipment. Operational data were read and recorded for each day of the testing cycle. The operational parameters and frequency of the readings are listed in Table 3-2 below.

Table 3-2. Operational Data Collection Schedule

Operating Data	Action
Chemicals Used	Record on a daily basis. Type: supplier, commercial and dilution for stock solution to be fed.
Chemical Type, Feed Volume and Dosage	Check every two hours. Refill as needed, note volumes and time of refill. Maintain all calculations on coagulant chemical solution preparation and all data on coagulant chemicals as purchased from supplier or chemical manufacturer. Calculate the chemical dosage for each filter fun in which arsenic challenge testing was carried out.
Feedwater Flow and Filter Flow	Check and record every two hours. Adjust when flow >10% above or below goal. Record flows before and after adjustment.
Filter Head Loss	Record initial clean bed total head loss at start of filter run. Record total head loss every two hours. Record terminal head loss at end of filtration.
Filtered Water Production	Record gallons of water produced per square foot of filter bed area for each filter run. (This figure is the product of filtration rate (gpm/ft^2) and length of filter run in minutes performed at a constant rate).
Filter Backwash	Record time and durations of each filter backwashing. Record water volume used to wash filter.
Suspended Solids in Washwater	Determine suspended solids in backwash water for each set of arsenic removal testing conditions.
Electrical Power	Record meter reading once per day.
Hours Operated Per Day	Record in logbook at end of day or at beginning of first shift on each following workday.

Note: All Parameters were checked only during times when package plant was staffed.

Manufacturer operating performance criteria to which collected data were compared are presented in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3 below summarizes the operational objectives of this ETV test.

Table 3-3. Filtration Performance Capability Objectives

Characteristic	Definition	Criteria
Initial turbidity	Filtrate turbidity at 15 minutes into run	0.15 NTU or less
Operating turbidity	Turbidity from matured filter	0.10 NTU or less
Maximum allowable filtrate turbidity		0.5 NTU
Water production	Volume of water during a filter run	2,750 gallons per sq. ft. (1,500 gallons)

3.4.4 Task 4 - Arsenic Removal

The objective of this task was to evaluate arsenic removal during verification testing by measuring arsenic concentration naturally present in the feedwater as well as arsenic concentration in the filtrate. This portion of the study was of central importance, as it measured the effectiveness of the KIMCFS for arsenic removal.

A task involving a total of 48 hours of operation with collection of 11 arsenic and antimony samples was conducted to provide statistically verifiable arsenic removal data. This task was initiated immediately at the conclusion of the Task 1 activity, which lasted for 282.75 hours.

Water quality samples were collected from the plant feedwater supply and the filter effluent water sampling ports. Samples were collected after the treatment plant had been in operation for a total of three (3) theoretical detention times (the theoretical detention time is the volume of water held in the treatment equipment divided by the rate of flow) as measured through the pretreatment process up to the filter. The theoretical detention time ranged from 50 to 70 minutes. Arsenic samples were collected at time zero and at 1, 3 and 6 hours past time zero. Thereafter arsenic samples were collected once every 6 hours thereafter until the filter run had lasted 48 hours from time zero. This resulted in collection of 11 sets of arsenic samples in a 48-hour filter run. During the sampling event, one 250-mL sample was collected at each sampling location and speciated on-site to allow Laboratory determination of total arsenic, dissolved arsenic, As (III) and As (V). Total chlorine concentration of the treated water was also measured at the same time each sample was collected.

3.5 Recording Data

The water quality parameters and operating data were maintained in the Operations Logbook. All readings were manually logged.

Also recorded were the following:

- Type of chemical added and concentration.
- Water type (feedwater, filtrate)

Documentation of study events was facilitated through the use of logbooks, notebooks, photographs, data sheets and chain of custody forms. Data handling is a critical component of any equipment evaluation testing. Care in handling data assures that the results are accurate and verifiable. Accurate sample analysis is meaningless without verifying that the numbers are being entered into spreadsheets and reports accurately and that the results are statistically valid.

The data management system used in the verification-testing program involved the use of computer spreadsheet software and manual recording methods for recording operational parameters. The following describes how data were managed for each parameter.

3.5.1 Objectives

The objective was to tabulate the collected data for completeness and accuracy, and to permit ready retrieval for analysis and reporting. In addition, the use of computer spreadsheets allowed manipulation of the data for arrangement into forms, useful for evaluation. A second objective was the statistical analysis of the data as described in the "NSF/EPA ETV Protocol for Equipment Verification Testing for Arsenic Removal" (EPA/NSF 2000).

3.5.2 Procedures

The above data handling procedures were used for all aspects of the verification test. Procedures existed for the use of the log books used for recording the operational data, the documentation of photographs taken during the study, the use of chain of custody forms, the gathering of on-line measurements, and the method for performing statistical analyses.

3.5.2.1 Log Books

Data were collected by COA in bound logbooks, a laboratory notebook and on computer generated charts from the appropriate testing instruments. There was a single field logbook containing all on-site operating data, which remained on site and contained instrument readings, on-site analyses and any comments concerning the test run with respect to either the nature of the feedwater or the operation of the equipment.

Each page of the notebook was sequentially numbered and identified as Kinetico ETV Test. Each completed page was signed by the on-duty FTO staff. Errors were crossed out with a single line and initialed. Deviations from the FOD whether by error or by a change in the conditions of either the test equipment or the water conditions were noted in the notebook. The notebook included a carbon copy of each page. The original notebook was stored on-site, and the carbon copy sheets retained by the FTO. This not only eased referencing of the original data, but offered protection of the original record of results.

3.5.2.2 Photographs

Photographs were taken with a camera and were utilized by COA to select the most appropriate photographs for this report.

3.5.2.3 Chain of Custody

Original chain of custody forms traveled with the samples (copies of which are attached as Appendix E).

3.6 Calculation of Data Quality Indicators

3.6.1 Representativeness

Water quality parameter samples were collected as indicated in Table 3-1. Off-site samples were collected in accordance with *SM* 1060B, held and preserved according to *SM* 5010, and delivered to the laboratory for analysis. On-site samples were collected utilizing *SM* 1060B sampling techniques.

3.6.2 Statistical Uncertainty

Statistical 95% confidence calculations were performed for arsenic data, and confidence intervals determined by taking three discrete samples of arsenic at one operating set during the testing period. Sampling requirements are noted below in the work plan below. The formula used for confidence calculations follows:

$$\textit{confidence interval} = \overline{X} \pm t_{n-1,\,1-\frac{a}{2}} \left(S / \sqrt{n}\right)$$

S = standard deviation
n = number of measurements in data set
t = distribution value with n-1 degrees of freedom
a = the significance level defined for 95% confidence as: 1- 0.95 = 0.05.

$$\textit{95\% confidence interval} = \overline{X} \pm t_{n-1,0.975} \left(S / \sqrt{n}\right)$$

Statistical 95% confidence calculations were also performed for critical water quality data. The above confidence calculations were used for these water quality data, and results are presented in Chapter 4, Task 2, Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization.

3.6.3 Accuracy

For water quality parameters, the accuracy referred to the difference between the sample result and the true or reference value. Care in sampling, calibration and standardization of instrumentation and consistency in analytical technique increased accuracy.

The pressure gauges used were NIST-traceable standard gauges. Performance evaluation was established by calibration of instruments used on-site and by conformance to *SM* and EPA protocols.

3.6.4 Precision

Precision was the measure of the degree of consistency from test to test, and was assured by replication. In the case of on-site testing for water quality, precision was increased by multiple tests and

averaging; for single reading parameters, such as pressure and flow rates, precision was increased by redundant readings from operator to operator. Travel blanks were not required for this testing.

3.7 Equipment

In order to assure data validity, the non-chemical processes used by the EPA/NSF Verification Testing Plan procedures were followed. This ensured the accurate documentation of both water quality and equipment performance. Strict adherence to these procedures resulted in verifiable performance of equipment. A summary of how the Kinetico system testing and analytical equipment was operated during the verification testing is presented in this section.

3.7.1 Equipment Operations

The operating process for the KIMCFS is described in the Operations Manual (Appendix C), which was maintained on site.

In summary, the system works by the injection of sodium hypochlorite into the water stream followed by the injection of ferric chloride. The ferric chloride is oxidized by the sodium hypochlorite to ferric hydroxide. Based on studies by Clifford, et al, the arsenic removal mechanism can be modeled as an adsorption phenomenon. A ligand exchange process dominates, and in the presence of ionic arsenic, an arsenate ion replaces an hydroxide ion in the structure of the ferric hydroxide and this arsenic compound precipitates with the insoluble ferric hydroxide.

The insoluble ferric hydroxide is filtered out of the water stream by the media filter, which is automatically backwashed, initiated by either turbidity breakthrough or terminal headloss.

Residence time to ensure a complete chemical reaction between the ferric chloride, sodium hypochlorite and arsenic ion was accomplished by the retention tanks located between the chemical injection pumps and the filter unit.

3.7.2 Analytical Equipment

The following analytical equipment was used on-site during the verification testing:

- A Hach 2100P portable turbidimeter (serial number 000100024023) was used for bench-top turbidity analyses. A Certificate of Conformance for this meter is located in Appendix G.
- The pressure gauges for this study were glycerin-filled and calibrated against a glycerin-filled National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) traceable Precision WGG 66/60 gauge, 0-60 psig.
- RadioShack Model No: 63-1009A indoor-outdoor thermometer was used for the measurement of temperature. This RadioShack thermometer was calibrated against a NIST-traceable Thermometer (Tel-Tru model 0054-5).

- A rotometer [(Blue and White model F40750-LN16 (0 to 10 gpm)] was used to measure flow rates.
- On-line turbidity measurements were taken with a Great Lakes Model 95T/SS4 turbidimeter.
- Chlorine measurements were taken with a HACH 2010 spectrophotometer.
- Dissolved oxygen measurements were taken with a Hach "Sension 8" dissolved oxygen meter, serial no. 990900000112.
- pH measurements were taken with an Oakton pH/mV/°C meter, part no. 35615-00.

3.8 QA/QC Procedures

The objective of the Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) was to control the methods and instrumentation procedures such that the data were not subject to corruption. Adherence to analytical methods as published in *SM* and EPA Methods was assured. Moreover, instrumentation and standard reagents were referenced to NIST. Instruments used to gather data were standardized and calibrated in accordance with the schedules noted below.

3.8.1 QA/QC Verifications

Daily QA/QC Verifications included:

On-line turbidimeter readings standardized against a calibrated bench turbidimeter, which was calibrated against secondary standards with each use.

pH meter calibration was verified at pH 4, 7 and 10 with NIST-traceable pH buffers

QA/QC Verifications at the beginning of each testing period included:

Cleaning and re-calibration of on-line turbidimeters;

Pressure gauges with NIST-traceable gauge;

Inspection of turbidimeter tubing for unimpeded flow and integrity.

Calibration of test unit flow meter using "bucket and stopwatch" method. This activity was performed on April 22, 2000, and was recorded in the Laboratory Notebook.

Further descriptions of these verification procedures are provided below.

3.8.2 On-Site Analytical Method

Specific Instrumentation methods for on-site QA/QC accuracy were as follows:

3.8.2.1 pH

Analyses were made by *SM* 4500-H^+. A three-point calibration with NIST-traceable pH buffers was performed daily. Between tests, the pH probe was kept wet in KCl solution. For on-site determination of pH, field procedures were used to limit absorbance of carbon dioxide to avoid skewing results by poorly buffered water.

pH measurements do not lend themselves to "blank" analyses. Duplicates were run once a day. Performance evaluation samples were analyzed during the testing period. Results of the duplicates and performance evaluation were recorded. The unit was also calibrated against a standardized pH instrument in the State of Utah Laboratory and found to be within 5% accuracy.

3.8.2.2 Temperature

Temperatures were measured in accordance with *SM* 2550, at least once per day. The thermometer read in 0.1° C increments and calibrated by the State of Utah Laboratory as well as against a NIST-traceable thermometer.

3.8.2.3 Turbidity

The turbidimeters remained on during the duration of the testing period. On-line and bench top turbidimeters were used, and the bench top turbidimeter was the calibration standard for the test. Manufacturer's procedures for maintenance were followed and the schedules for maintenance and cleaning noted in the logbook. All glassware was dedicated and cleaned with lint free tissues to prevent scouring or deposits on the cells. The calibration of the bench-top turbidimeter (Hach 2100P) was verified on March 15, 2000, using Hach StablCal® Standards (Stabilized Formizin Turbidity Standards) of 800, 100, 20 and <0.1 NTU. On a weekly basis, the instrument calibration was verified using secondary standards of Hach Gelex measuring 526, 52.2 and 4.87 NTU. Another secondary standard, measuring 0.4 NTU was used to verify calibration before every use. *SM* 2130 was employed for measurement of turbidity.

3.8.2.4 True Color

True color was measured in accordance with *SM* 2120 at 455nm wavelength with a Hach DR2010 spectrophotometer.

3.8.2.5 Total Chlorine

Total chlorine measurements were made in accordance with *SM* 4500 on a Hach DR2000 spectrophotometer which was standardized with each set of measurements in accordance with the method.

3.8.2.6 Particle Free Water (PFW)

The State of Utah, Department of Health, Division of Laboratory Services, provided water for our use at the site. The ultra-pure water was brought from the Laboratory in new, transparent, polyethylene one-gallon bottles marked and dedicated for this purpose.
This water was prepared by treating with reverse osmosis, followed by exchange deionization resins.

3.8.2.7 Pressure Gauges

The pressure gauges for this study were a glycerin-filled and calibrated against a glycerin-filled NIST-traceable Precision WGG 66/60 Gauge (0- 60 psig).

3.8.3 Off-Site Analysis for Chemical and Biological Samples

3.8.3.1 Organic Parameters, Total Organic Carbon and UV_{254} Absorbance

Samples for these analyses were collected in glass bottles supplied by the State of Utah Laboratory and delivered to the Laboratory by COA at least twice a week. Metals samples were collected in acidified bottles and all samples held for no more than three days at 4°C prior to delivery to the Laboratory in accordance with *SM* 5010B and *SM* 1060. This processing procedure is reflected in the chain of custody forms located in Appendix E. Table 3-1 lists the *SM* number used for these tests.

3.8.3.2 Algae (Chlorophyll A) Samples

Samples were collected in opaque containers supplied by the State Laboratory and kept at 0°C in the on-site refrigerator prior to delivery to the laboratory. Table 3-1 lists the sampling frequency and *SM* number used.

3.8.3.3 Inorganic Samples

Inorganic samples were collected, held in the refrigerator at 4°C, and shipped in accordance with *SM* 3010B and C and 1060 and EPA §136.3, 40 CFR Ch.1. Proper bottles and preservatives, where required (iron and manganese for example) were used. Although the travel time was brief, samples were shipped in coolers at 4° C. The appropriate *SM* and EPA test methods and minimum testing frequencies are listed in Table 3-1.

Chapter 4
Results and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

Verification testing of the KIMCFS, which occurred at the Park City Spiro Tunnel Water Filtration Plant, commenced on April 7, 2000, and concluded on April 22, 2000. A summary of the dates and times required for each activity follows:

Activity	Dates	Total Hours
Initial Test Run	April 7 – April 8, 2000	24.25
Tasks 1-3	April 8 – April 20, 2000	282.75
Task 4	April 20 – April 22, 2000	59.75
Total Testing	April 7 – April 22, 2000	366.75

This section of the verification report presents the results of the Initial Operations period as well as the Verification Testing period and a discussion of the results. Results and discussions of the following are included: initial operations, verification tasks, and QA/QC.

4.2 Initial Operations Results

An Initial Operations period allowed COA and Kinetico, Inc. to refine the unit's operating procedures and to make operational adjustments as needed to successfully treat the source water. The primary goals of the Initial Operations period were to establish an optimum process of coagulant chemistry, coagulant dosage, filter run times and backwashing frequency.

4.2.1 Characterization of Influent Water

Historical untreated surface water quality data that were obtained from Park City Municipal Corporation showed that the Spiro Tunnel Bulkhead water exhibited the following characteristics as shown in Table 1-1. Review of these historical data indicated that the technology should be suitable for this site.

4.2.2 Initial Test Run

The Test Plan required that an initial test run be performed with uncoagulated feed water, and that samples be collected after 6, 12, 18 and 24 hours of operation. This activity was intended to determine if arsenic is removed from the system in the absence of coagulant chemicals. Table 4-1 and Figures 4-1 through 4-3 provide the analytical results of this Initial Operations activity for a number of parameters.

Table 4-2 summarizes the arsenic species from Table 4-1.

Table 4-1. Initial Testing without Coagulant Chemicals (April 7 & 8, 2000)

Parameter	Hour 0	Hour 6	Hour 12	Hour 18	Hour 24
As (total) (µg/L)					
Feedwater	80.3	68.9	79.8	67.4	77.1
Filtrate	38.4	38.1	38.2	38.2	35.3
As (dissolved) (µg/L)					
Feedwater	38.6	39	38.9	38.72	38.2
Filtrate	34.3	35.3	35	35.1	32.8
As (insoluble) (µg/L)					
[1] Feedwater	41.7	29.9	40.9	28.68	38.9
[2] Filtrate	4.1	2.8	3.2	3.1	2.5
As (III) (µg/L)					
Feedwater	2.5	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.3
Filtrate	2.4	2.1	2	2.3	2.2
As (V) (µg/L)					
Feedwater	36.1	37.2	36.7	36.42	35.9
Filtrate	31.9	33.2	33	32.8	30.6
Antimony (µg/L)					
Feedwater	8.6	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.7
Filtrate	8.6	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.7
In-Line Continuous Turbidity (NTU)					
Feedwater	1.75	2.66	2.04	2.03	3.79
Filtrate	0.007	0.008	0.002	0.005	0.085
Alkalinity (mg/L)					
Feedwater	143	147	-	-	146
Filtrate	151	143	-	-	146
Temperature (°C)					
Feedwater	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.7	9.7
Filtrate	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.7	9.8
pH					
Feedwater	7.40	7.38	7.34	7.39	7.11
Filtrate	7.31	7.29	7.33	7.34	7.10

All readings at the MDL were used as that number in calculations.

[1] Feedwater Insoluble As = Total Feedwater As - Dissolved Feedwater As

[2] Filtrate Insoluble As = Total Filtrate As - Dissolved Filtrate As

Table 4-2. Arsenic Data Summaries (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7-8, 2000)

	As (total) (µg/L)		As (dissolved) (µg/L)		As (insoluble) (µg/L)		As III (µg/L)		As V (µg/L)	
	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate
Average	74.7	37.6	38.7	34.5	36.0	3.1	2.2	2.2	36.5	32.3
Min.	67.4	35.3	38.2	32.8	28.68	2.5	1.8	2	35.9	30.6
Max.	80.3	38.4	39	35.3	41.7	4.1	2.5	2.4	37.2	33.2
Std. Dev	6.12	1.31	0.312	1.02	6.24	0.60	0.26	0.16	0.512	1.07
95% CI	69.3, 80.1	36.5, 38.8	38.4, 39.0	33.6, 35.4	30.5, 41.5	2.6, 3.7	2.0, 2.4	2.1, 2.3	36.0, 36.9	31.4, 33.2

All readings at the Minimum Detection Limit (MDL) for Arsenic III of (<0.5 µg/L) were used as that number in calculations.

Note: The reliability of the low level (MDL of 0.1 µg/L to approximately 2 µg/L) should be considered as only qualitative (not quantitative).

Figure 4-1 demonstrates reduction in total arsenic concentrations during the 24-hour Initial Operations period of approximately 50%.



Figure 4-1. Total Arsenic Concentrations For Initial Testing Period (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7 & 8, 2000)

Figure 4-2 illustrates the dissolved arsenic concentrations during the Initial Operations period. As shown in this figure, the data suggest that there is very little removal of dissolved arsenic by the filter alone without the addition of coagulation chemicals, the percent removal ranged from 9 to 14%.



Figure 4-2. Dissolved Arsenic Concentrations For Initial Testing Period (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7 - 8, 2000)

The average dissolved As concentration in the filtrate stream is 10.9% lower than that in the feedwater stream. While this reduction is minimal, it is greater than expected.

Figure 4-3 illustrates the insoluble arsenic concentrations during the Initial Operations period. As shown in this figure, the data suggest significant removal of insoluble arsenic by the filter alone without the addition of coagulation chemicals, in the range of 89 to 94%.

It is postulated that the iron present in the feedwater supply oxidizes in the presence of air and forms an insoluble complex with a portion of the arsenic in the feedwater supply. This accounts for the average reduction in insoluble arsenic from an average of 36.0 µg/L in the feedwater to an average of 3.1 µg/L in the filtrate, a 91% reduction.



Figure 4-3. Insoluble Arsenic Concentrations For Initial Testing Period (no coagulation chemicals) (April 7-8, 2000)

Figure 4-4 illustrates the antimony concentrations in both feedwater and filtrate streams during the initial run when no coagulant chemicals were added. Review of this Figure suggests very little removal of antimony by the KIMCFS.



Figure 4-4. Antimony Concentration vs. Time (no coagulant chemicals) (April 7-8, 2000)

4.2.2.1 Coagulant Chemistry

Evaluation of the required concentration of $FeCl_3$ necessary for optimum arsenic removal was carried out by means of a simple series of jar tests conducted at the end of March prior to the initiation of the ETV testing period. Water from the Park city Bulkhead supply source was introduced into the KIMCFS with increasing amounts of ferric chloride added. The samples were then analyzed and the results were used to fix the ferric chloride injection concentration for the ETV testing period at approximately 3 mg/L (as Fe). The description of this initial testing is documented in Appendix C. The dosage in the verification testing was higher than that determined in the jar tests to compensate for varying feedwater flow rates and concentrations of the chemical reagent.

It had already been determined that the major component necessary for arsenic reduction in the Bulkhead water supply was iron, and that little additional oxidation enhancement was required. However, the Park City water sources had experienced historical fluctuations in the concentration of arsenic as well as other elements; it was therefore decided by the manufacturer to maintain a residual chlorine concentration of approximately 1.6 mg/L (as Cl_2) as an insurance measure against the need for unforeseen oxidation requirements.

4.2.2.2 Coagulant Dosage

The sources, strengths, dilution and flow rates of the coagulant chemicals were established as follows and are listed in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3. Sources, Strengths, Dilution And Flow Rates Of The Coagulant Chemicals

Parameter	Sodium Hypochlorite	Ferric Chloride
Source	**Whirl Brand (Grocery Store)**	**AquaMark AQ126**
Strength (as supplied)	5.25%	50%
Dilution* (as fed)	578 mg/L (as Hypochlorite)	3½%
Metering Rate	0.82 gph	0.074 gph
Feedwater Concentration (at 5 gpm)	1.58 mg/L (as Hypochlorite)	8.63 mg/L (as $FeCl_2$)

*Plant Tap Water

The above parameters were maintained throughout the duration of the test.

4.2.3 Filter Run Times

The KIMCFS was set to automatically backwash based on either headloss or turbidity breakthrough. The on-line turbidimeter was set to initiate backwash when the filtrate turbidity reached 0.15 NTU.

4.2.4 Backwashing Frequency

Backwash cycles were automatically initiated and controlled with a timer/controller, based on a maximum filtrate turbidity of 0.15 NTU or a maximum pressure drop of 20 psig. These settings were maintained throughout the duration of the test.

The KIMCFS is designed to run fully automatic with 100% redundancy. As the system produces filtrate, the differential pressure and turbidity are monitored. When a preset value for either of these parameters is reached, a backwash sequence is automatically initiated.

When this backwash is initiated, the standby filter begins to produce water for the backwash of the exhausted tank only. As a result, there is no filtrate produced during the backwash, and none available for sampling with the on-line turbidimeter or for bench-top analysis. When the backwash sequence has been initiated, the data from the turbidimeter are no longer recorded in the data logging device; this continues until the unit has completed the backwash cycle and is again in the service mode producing filtrate. Therefore, all samples taken from the filtrate sample tap during a backwash cycle may contain raw water and/or backwash water.

In an attempt to confirm the exact cause of each backwash event (filtrate turbidity or filter head loss) during this test, the filtrate turbidity data were often recorded in the Laboratory Notebook when the pneumatic actuator indicated the initiation of a backwash event. It was later determined that once the event was initiated (because the effluent turbidimeter receive no water flow), the readings were not accurate, so all of these particular data are meaningless. As a result, these data were not entered into the On-site Logbook, from which the data for this report were taken.

During this test, care was taken to record readings and take samples only while the system was in normal operation and not during backwash episodes. During the Task 4 activities, however, readings and samples were required to be taken at specific times, and one of these times (0900 on 4/21/00) was in the middle of a backwash episode. Because the filtrate samples collected at this time were not representative of the actual stream, the data collected were included in the appropriate lists of data, but not in the data summaries and graphs presented later in this report.

4.3 Verification Testing Results

4.3.1 Task 1 - Verification Testing Runs And Routine Equipment Operation

Oxidant and coagulant feeding was initiated at 1415 on April 8, 2000, immediately at the conclusion of the 24-hour Initial Test Run period.

At least once per day, the following parameters were measured on-site on both the feedwater and filtrate streams:

- Temperature
- pH
- Bench-Top Turbidity
- Dissolved Oxygen

From April 8 until April 11, readings intended to be taken from the feedwater sample tap were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap. All coagulated feedwater data, collected on April 13 through April 18 are listed in Appendix E.

Daily temperature readings for the verification testing period are listed in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4. Daily Temperature Data (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Temperature (°C)	
		Feedwater	Filtrate
4/8/00	1715	9.7	9.8
4/9/00	1035	9.8	10.0
4/9/00	1635	9.7	9.9
4/9/00	1730	9.7	9.9
4/10/00	0730	9.8	10.0
4/10/00	1540	9.9	9.9
4/11/00	1130	9.8	10.0
4/12/00	1710	8.8	10.0
4/13/00	1830	8.8	10.0
4/14/00	0930	8.8	10.1
4/14/00	1420	8.8	10.0
4/15/00	1630	8.8	10.0
4/16/00	0830	8.8	10.0
4/17/00	0845	8.8	10.1
4/18/00	1330	9.4	10.1
4/19/00	1245	9.0	10.2
4/20/00	0900	9.0	9.9
4/20/00	1200	9.0	10.0
4/20/00	1500	9.0	10.0
4/20/00	2100	9.0	10.2
4/21/00	0300	9.0	9.9
4/21/00	0900	8.9	10.1
4/21/00	1500	9.0	10.2
4/21/00	2100	9.0	10.1
4/22/00	0300	9.0	10.0
4/22/00	0900	9.0	10.0
4/22/00	1830	8.9	10.1

These data are summarized and plotted in the following tables and figures. Note that the multiple readings for temperature as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in the graphs as additional data points.

The 4/21/00, 0900, temperature data reading are not included in the Table 4-5 data summary and Figure 4-5 due to the measurement being taken in error during the backwash cycle.

Table 4-5. Temperature Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feed (°C)	Filtrate (°C)
Average	9.2	10.0
Minimum	8.8	9.8
Maximum	9.9	10.2
Standard Deviation	0.40	0.10
95% Confidence Interval	9.0, 9.3	10.0, 10.1

Note that there is approximately a 1°C increase in temperature from the feed to the filtrate stream as shown in Figure 4-5. This increase is likely due to the residence time in the reaction tanks, which were installed in an area where the ambient temperature was maintained by the facility at approximately 70°F (21° C).



Figure 4-5. Daily Temperature Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Daily pH measurements taken during the verification testing period are shown in Table 4-6. As noted in Section 4.3.1, from April 8 until April 11, pH readings intended to be taken from the raw feedwater sample tap were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap (See Figure 2-1).

Table 4-6. Daily pH Data (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Feedwater	Filtrate
4/8/00	1715	-	7.10
4/9/00	1035	-	7.14
4/9/00	1635	-	7.06
4/9/00	1730	-	7.06
4/10/00	0730	-	7.01
4/10/00	1540	-	7.10
4/11/00	1130	-	7.11
4/11/00	1220	-	7.15
4/11/00	1530	-	7.14
4/12/00	1710	7.30	7.14
4/13/00	1830	7.26	7.10
4/14/00	0930	7.25	7.16
4/14/00	1420	7.36	7.24
4/15/00	1320	7.22	7.15
4/15/00	1630	7.21	7.14
4/15/00	1900	7.18	7.12
4/16/00	0800	7.24	7.14
4/16/00	1630	7.25	7.18
4/17/00	0815	7.15	7.11
4/18/00	1035	7.21	7.20
4/18/00	2000	7.21	7.08
4/19/00	1700	7.19	7.12
4/20/00	0900	7.23	7.18
4/20/00	1200	7.33	7.24
4/20/00	1500	7.29	7.20
4/20/00	2100	7.26	7.22
4/21/00	0300	7.29	7.19
4/21/00	0900	7.28	7.22
4/21/00	1500	7.23	7.15
4/21/00	2100	7.23	7.19
4/22/00	0300	7.22	7.17
4/22/00	0900	7.26	7.20
4/22/00	1830	7.24	7.18

- No measurement taken

The filtrate pH readings are virtually always lower than the feedwater pH. This is likely due to the addition of acidic ferric chloride to effect coagulation. The 4/21/00, 0900 pH data reading are not included in the Table 4-7 data summary and Figure 4-6 due to the measurement being taken in error during the backwash cycle.

Table 4-7. Daily pH Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater	Filtrate
Average	7.24	7.15
Minimum	7.15	7.01
Maximum	7.36	7.24
Standard Deviation	0.0477	0.0533
95% Confidence Interval	7.22, 7.26	7.13, 7.16

The multiple readings for pH as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in Figure 4-6 as additional data points.



Figure 4-6. Daily pH Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Table 4-8 lists the bench-top turbidity readings for the testing period. As noted in Section 4.3.1, bench-top turbidity readings intended to be taken from the raw feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap (See Figure 2-1).

Table 4-8. Daily Bench-Top Turbidity Data (NTU) (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Feedwater (NTU)	Filtrate (NTU)
4/8/00	-	-	-
4/9/00	1035	-	0.04
4/9/00	1635	-	0.11
4/10/00	0730	-	0.30
4/10/00	1540	-	0.15
4/11/00	1130	-	0.30
4/11/00	1220	-	0.86
4/11/00	1530	-	0.27
4/12/00	1710	1.95	0.17
4/13/00	1830	1.82	0.18
4/14/00	0930	1.58	0.30
4/14/00	1420	1.52	0.15
4/15/00	1630	1.45	0.40
4/16/00	0830	1.60	0.31
4/17/00	0845	1.53	0.97
4/18/00	1330	1.4	-
4/19/00	1245	1.47	0.17
4/20/00	0900	1.84	0.09
4/20/00	2100	1.49	0.17
4/21/00	0300	1.51	0.10
4/21/00	0900	1.47	0.012
4/21/00	1500	1.59	0.18
4/21/00	2100	1.49	0.10
4/22/00	0300	1.38	0.090
4/22/00	0900	1.30	0.19
4/22/00	1830	1.34	0.15

- No measurement taken

From the Table 4-8 data, it is obvious that particulate material in the feedwater was substantially reduced by the multimedia filter in the test unit. The 4/21/00, 0900 bench-top turbidity reading was not included in the Table 4-9 data summary and Figure 4-7 due to the measurement being taken in error during the backwash cycle

Table 4-9. Bench-Top Turbidity Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (NTU)	Filtrate (NTU)
Average	1.54	0.25
Minimum	1.30	0.04
Maximum	1.95	0.97
Standard Deviation	0.18	0.23
95% Confidence Interval	1.45, 1.63	0.15, 0.35

Note that multiple readings for the bench-top turbidity data as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in the graphs as additional data points



Figure 4-7. Daily Bench-Top Turbidity Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Turbidity as shown in Figure 4-7 was substantially reduced by the media filters in the KIMCFS.

Table 4-10 shows the daily measurements for dissolved oxygen. As noted in Section 4.3.1, dissolved oxygen readings intended to be taken from the raw feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap.

Table 4-10. Daily Dissolved Oxygen Data (mg/L) (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Feedwater (mg/L)	Filtrate (mg/L)
4/8/00	-	-	-
4/9/00	-	-	-
4/10/00	1540	-	7.26
4/11/00	1130	-	5.96
4/11/00	1220	-	6.03
4/11/00	1530	-	5.96
4/12/00	1710	5.71	5.58
4/13/00	1830	5.77	5.74
4/14/00	0930	5.94	6.21
4/14/00	1420	5.53	5.53
4/15/00	1630	5.77	5.26
4/16/00	0830	5.26	5.36
4/17/00	0845	5.29	5.69
4/18/00	1330	5.07	5.33
4/19/00	1245	5.56	5.12
4/20/00	0900	5.17	5.80
4/20/00	2100	6.23	5.98
4/21/00	0300	6.21	5.65
4/21/00	0900	6.47	5.65
4/21/00	1500	5.50	5.75
4/21/00	2100	5.81	5.83
4/22/00	0300	5.59	5.96
4/22/00	0900	5.82	5.46
5/22/00	1830	5.40	5.52

The 4/21/00, 0900 dissolved oxygen data are not included in the Table 4-11 data summary and Figure 4-8 due to the measurement being taken in error during the backwash cycle

Table 4-11. Daily Dissolved Oxygen Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (mg/L)	Filtrate (mg/L)
Average	5.63	5.76
Minimum	5.07	5.12
Maximum	6.23	7.26
Standard Deviation	0.333	0.445
95% Confidence Interval	5.47, 5.78	5.57, 5.95

Note that multiple readings for the dissolved oxygen data as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in the graphs as additional data points.



Figure 4-8. Daily Dissolved Oxygen Data vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

There do not appear to be substantial differences in dissolved oxygen concentration between feedwater and filtrate streams.

4.3.2 Task 2 - Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization

Continuous turbidity data from the wall-mounted plant turbidimeter on the feedwater stream, and from the Kinetico turbidimeter on the filtrate stream (Appendix E) summarized are in Table 4-13 and plotted in Figure 4-9. In-line feedwater turbidity readings during the testing period averaged 1.75 NTU, compared to the bench-top turbidity average of 1.54 NTU. The in-line filtrate turbidity readings for the testing period averaged 0.096 NTU, compared to the bench-top average of 0.23 NTU. The Kinetico filtrate turbidity data varied considerably over the test period. This was expected as the filtration process involves a build-up of suspended solids in the media filter which eventually began to break through raising the filtrate turbidity. The system was set to start backwashing when the turbidimeter reading reached 0.15 NTU.

As noted in Section 4.3.1, readings intended to be taken from the feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap.

The 4/21/00, 0900 continuous turbidity data are not included in the Table 4-12 data summary and Figure 4-9 due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-12. Continuous Turbidity Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (NTU)	Filtrate (NTU)
Average	1.75	0.097
Minimum	1.10	0.008
Maximum	3.77	0.920
Standard Deviation	0.644	0.145
95% Confidence Interval	1.62, 1.89	0.069, 0.125



Figure 4-9. Continuous Turbidity vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Based on the average continuous turbidity data from Table 4-12, feedwater turbidity was reduced by 92% by the KIMCFS. The differences in filtrate readings between bench-top and on-line instruments are addressed in Section 4.5.3.3.

Table 4-13 lists the iron measurements for the testing period, and these data are summarized in Table 4-14. As noted in Section 4.3.1, readings intended to be taken from the feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap.

Table 4-13. Iron Concentrations (April 7 - April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Feedwater Iron (mg/L)	Filtrate Iron (mg/L)
4/7/00	1630	0.699	0.03
4/20/00	0900	0.236	-
4/20/00	0900	0.253	<0.02
4/20/00	1000	0.247	0.0318
4/20/00	1200	0.441	0.062
4/20/00	1500	0.257	0.0984
4/20/00	2100	0.253	0.103
4/21/00	0300	0.265	0.0226
4/21/00	0900	0.244	0.737[1]
4/21/00	1500	0.249	0.0984
4/21/00	2100	0.249	0.0284
4/22/00	0300	0.252	<0.02
4/22/00	0900	0.238	0.138
4/22/00	1830	0.247	0.0989

- not tested

[1] This data point does not represent the actual filtrate iron concentration because the unit was in the backwash mode when the sample was collected. See Section 4.2.4 for explanation.

The 4/21/00, 0900 iron data are not included in the Table 4-14 data summary due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle

Table 4-14. Iron Data Summary (April 7 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (mg/L)	Filtrate (mg/L)
Average	0.299	0.063
Minimum	0.236	<0.02
Maximum	0.699	0.138
Standard Deviation	0.132	0.042
95% Confidence Interval	0.227, 0.370	0.039, 0.087

*All readings at the MDL (0.02 mg/L) were used as that number in calculations.

Tables 4-13 and 4-14 indicate that with the exception of data at 0900 on 4/21/00, the majority of the iron in the feedwater was removed by the KIMCFS, even through $FeCl_3$ was injected as a coagulant.

On a daily basis, samples were taken and the laboratory measured the concentrations of alkalinity. Table 4-15 lists the alkalinity data and Table 4-16 provides a summary of the data. Figure 4-10 is a plot of alkalinity data over the test period.

As noted in Section 4.3.1, readings intended to be taken from the feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap.

Table 4-15. Alkalinity Daily Measurements (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Feedwater (mg/L)	Filtrate (mg/L)
4/8/00	-	-	-
4/9/00	-	-	-
4/10/00	1030	-	136
4/11/00	1530	-	136
4/12/00	1710	144	134
4/13/00	1015	146	135
4/14/00	1420	144	138
4/15/00	1320	142	138
4/16/00	1000	145	138
4/17/00	1400	143	138
4/18/00	1035	136	144
4/19/00	1000	147	139
4/20/00	0900	142	137
4/20/00	0900	147	138
4/20/00	1000	143	137
4/20/00	1200	142	138
4/20/00	1500	142	140
4/20/00	2100	143	139
4/21/00	0300	138	146
4/21/00	0900	145	152
4/21/00	1500	144	138
4/21/00	2100	146	140
4/22/00	0300	145	141
4/22/00	0900	144	142
4/22/00	1830	137	136

- not tested

The 4/21/00, 0900 alkalinity data are not included in the Table 4-16 data summary and Figure 4-10 due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-16. Alkalinity Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (mg/L)	Filtrate (mg/L)
Average	143	139
Minimum	136	134
Maximum	147	146
Standard Deviation	3.04	2.82
95% Confidence Interval	142, 144	137, 140

The multiple readings for the alkalinity data as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in the graphs as additional data points.



Figure 4-10. Alkalinity vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Although the average alkalinity measurement of the filtrate stream is approximately 3% less than the feedwater stream, it is apparent that alkalinity is not effectively removed by this technology.

Antimony data generated during the testing are listed in the following tables and graph. Table 4-17 lists the daily measurements for antimony for the verification testing period. As noted in Section 4.3.1, readings intended to be taken from the feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap.

Table 4-17. Antimony Daily Measurements (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Feedwater (µg/L)	Filtrate (µg/L)
4/8/00	-	-	-
4/9/00	1635	-	8.0
4/10/00	1030	-	8.3
4/11/00	1220	-	8.4
4/12/00	1710	9.0	8.3
4/13/00	1015	9.1	8.5
4/14/00	1420	8.9	8.4
4/15/00	1320	8.8	8.4
4/16/00	1000	8.8	9.2
4/17/00	1400	9.3	8.9
4/18/00	1035	8.3	9.5
4/19/00	1000	9.2	8.9
4/20/00	0900	9.3	8.7
4/20/00	1000	9.1	8.9
4/20/00	1200	8.9	8.5
4/20/00	1500	9.2	8.4
4/20/00	2100	8.9	8.5
4/21/00	0300	8.8	8.6
4/21/00	0900	8.7	8.8
4/21/00	1500	9.1	8.6
4/21/00	2100	9.2	8.7
4/22/00	0300	9.3	8.6
4/22/00	0900	9.1	8.6
4/22/00	1830	9.6	8.4

- not tested

The 4/21/00, 0900 antimony data are not included in the Table 4-18 data summary and Figure 4-11 due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-18. Antimony Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (µg/L)	Filtrate (µg/L)
Average	9.0	8.6
Minimum	8.3	8.0
Maximum	9.6	9.5
Standard Deviation	0.28	0.33
95% Confidence Interval	8.9, 9.2	8.5, 8.7

The multiple readings for the antimony data as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in the graphs as the additional data points.



Figure 4-11. Antimony vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

From the above data, it is evident that, although there is a slight reduction, antimony is not effectively removed by this process.

Sample measurements for Arsenic (Total, Dissolved, III, and V) for the testing period are listed below in Table 4-19. As noted in Section 4.3.1, readings intended to be taken from the feedwater sample tap from April 8 until April 11 were mistakenly taken from the coagulated feedwater sample tap. From April 12 through the end of the test period, feedwater readings were taken from the correct sample tap.

Table 4-19. Arsenic Data Measurements (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

		Total As (µg/L)		Dissolved As (µg/L)		As (III) (µg/L)		As (V) (µg/L)	
Date	Time	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate
4/8/00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4/9/00	1635	-	3.4	-	1.1	-	0.52	-	0.58
4/10/00	1030	-	0.9	-	1.2	-	<0.5*	-	0.7
4/11/00	1220	-	11.6	-	1.1	-	<0.5*	-	0.6
4/12/00	1710	74.6	1.8	41.8	1.1	2.6	<0.5*	39.2	0.6
4/13/00	1015	75.3	1.3	40.5	1	2.3	<0.5*	38.2	0.5
4/14/00	1420	59.9	1.4	37.6	1.3	2.5	<0.5*	35.1	0.8
4/15/00	1320	64.1	0.9	40.7	1.4	2.4	<0.5*	38.3	0.9
4/16/00	1000	67.2	1.2	42.7	1.5	2.3	<0.5*	40.4	1
4/17/00	1400	74.2	4.1	42.1	1.5	2.5	<0.5*	39.6	1
4/18/00[1]	1035	1.2	68	1.4	38.5	<0.5*	2.4	0.9	36.1
4/19/00	0930	67.4	1.4	40.9	1.4	1.4	<0.5*	39.5	0.9
4/20/00	0900	72.7	1.2	41.5	1.4	2.8	1	38.7	<0.5*
4/20/00	1000	72.9	2	41.3	1.6	3	0.9	38.3	0.7
4/20/00	1200	71.8	2.7	41.5	1.5	3	1	38.5	0.5
4/20/00	1500	75.1	4	40.6	1.4	3.4	1	37.2	<0.5*
4/20/00	2100	70.5	4.3	41.2	1.6	2.8	0.9	38.4	0.7
4/21/00	0300	74.1	2.8	42.6	2.6	3	1.1	39.6	1.5
4/21/00[2]	0900	72	26.1	40.6	1.7	3.4	0.8	37.2	0.9
4/21/00	1500	74.7	3.8	41.5	1.7	3.1	0.9	38.4	0.8
4/21/00	2100	73.3	1.9	39.9	1.5	3.1	0.9	36.8	0.6
4/22/00	0300	73.6	1.5	41.8	1.7	2.9	1	38.9	0.7
4/22/00	0900	67.3	5	40.4	1.6	3	0.9	37.4	0.7
4/22/00	1830	75.8	3.9	41.9	2.2	3.1	1	38.8	1.2

- Measurement not taken

* MDL for Arsenic III (<0.5 µg/L).

Note: the reliability of the low-level data (MDL of 0.1 µg/L to approximately 2 µg/L) should be considered only qualitative (not quantitative).

[1] April 18 data for all arsenic species tested in the raw feedwater and filtrate streams appear to have been reversed in the Laboratory reports. Because this is believed to have been a sampling bottle labeling error, these data are not included in the summary table.

[2] The filtrate Total As reading for 0900 on 4/21/00 is unusually high. Since the unit was in backwash mode at the time (0849 to 0909) with no filtrate flowing through the system, it is suspected that backwash water was in the filtrate manifold containing a high concentration of insoluble arsenic. This would also account for the more reasonable levels of dissolved arsenic, As(III) and As(V) in the filtrate stream during that sampling event.

Samples tested for arsenic (Total, Dissolved, III, and V) in the coagulated feedwater are not graphed in corresponding arsenic Figures 4-12 through 4-15, but are shown in Appendix E. Data were collected as an indicator of the process operations and are in addition to the ETV Protocol. The 4/21/00, 0900 arsenic data are not included in the Table 4-20 data summary or graphed in Figures 4-12 through 4-15 due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-20. Arsenic Data Summary (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

	Feedwater (µg/L)	Filtrate (µg/L)
Total Arsenic		
Average	71.4	2.9
Minimum	59.9	0.9
Maximum	75.8	11.6
Standard Deviation	4.43	2.4
95% Confidence Interval	69.3, 73.4	1.9, 3.9
Dissolved Arsenic		
Average	41.1	1.5
Minimum	37.6	1
Maximum	42.7	2.6
Standard Deviation	1.16	0.35
95% Confidence Interval	40.6, 41.7	1.3, 1.6
Arsenic (III)		
Average	2.7	0.7
Minimum	1.4	<0.5
Maximum	3.4	1.1
Standard Deviation	0.46	0.2
Confidence Interval	2.5, 2.9	0.6, 0.8
Arsenic (V)		
Average	38.4	0.8
Minimum	35.1	<0.5
Maximum	40.4	1.5
Standard Deviation	1.22	0.3
95% Confidence Interval	37.8, 39.0	0.7, 0.9

All readings at the MDL for Arsenic III (<0.5 µg/L) were used as that number in calculations.
Note: the reliability of the low-level data (MDL of 0.1 µg/L to approximately 2µg/L) should be considered only qualitative (not quantitative).

A closer inspection of the dissolved arsenic data in Table 4-20 shows that there is an inconsistency between the dissolved arsenic results and the total arsenic results shown for the filtrate in Table 4-19. Some of the total arsenic results are less than the dissolved arsenic concentrations. This obviously cannot be an accurate result. The feedwater and concentrate data show in all cases that the total arsenic is higher than the dissolved arsenic. The concentration in these streams is much higher suggesting that the problem only occurs at concentrations near the detection limit. This data would suggest that the problem is related to interference in the analysis at very low concentrations.

Given this inconsistency, the State of Utah laboratory was asked to review the data and attempt to explain the possible cause of the discrepancy. Their findings are presented in their entirety in Appendix H. The basic cause of the problem, in their opinion, appears to be that the use of sulfuric acid in the preservation process for the dissolved arsenic samples causes a positive interference in the ICP-MS

analysis. This positive interference is relatively small (a few tenths of a µg/l; typically 0.4-0.6 µg/l), but at the low concentrations being measured in the filtrate stream, this positive interference is significant. Therefore, the dissolved arsenic results appear to be biased high. This positive bias results in an understating of the removal percentage for the dissolved arsenic in the feed water.

The NSF quality control review of the data suggested that a higher quantitation limit maybe more appropriate for the arsenic analysis. For more information, see Section 4.5.1 of this report.

Total arsenic readings as required for Task 4 for the period of April 24 through 26 are included in Figure 4-12 as additional data points.



Figure 4-12. Total Arsenic vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Based on average total arsenic data in Table 4-20, 95.9% of this contaminant was removed. In addition, with the exception of 3 readings, all filtrate concentrations of total arsenic were at 5 µg/L or below.

The multiple readings for the dissolved arsenic data as required for Task 4 for the period of April 20 through 22 are included in Figure 4-13 as additional data points.



Figure 4-13. Dissolved Arsenic vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Based on average dissolved arsenic values in Table 4-20, over 96.4% of this species was removed by the KIMCFS. With the exception of 2 data points, all of the filtrate readings are at or below 2 µg/L.

Sample collections for Arsenic III as required for Task 4 during the period of April 20 through 22 are included in Figure 4-14 as additional data points.



Figure 4-14. Arsenic (III) vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

Although calculations indicate that 72.8% removal of As III occurred in this test, the uncertainty associated with the analytical measurements of concentrations at or below the quantitative detection limit calls into question the accuracy of this removal percentage.

Sample collection and measurement of Arsenic V as required for Task 4 during the period of April 20 through 22 are included in Figure 4-15.



Figure 4-15. Arsenic (V) vs. Time (April 8 – April 22, 2000)

With the exception of 2 data points and based on the average data from Table 4-20, the filtrate concentration of As V exhibited substantial removal (98%). Although it is evident that removal as As V occurred in this test, the uncertainly associated with the analytical measurements of concentration at or below the quantification detection limit precludes calculation of accurate removal percentages.

When total arsenic is compared to dissolved arsenic in Table 4-20, an average of 57% of the total arsenic in the feedwater was dissolved. Additionally, from the same table it can be calculated than an average of 93% of the dissolved arsenic in the feedwater was in the arsenic (V) form. Because of the relative ease of oxidation of arsenic (III) to arsenic (V) and the presence of chlorine (an oxidizer) in the coagulation process, it is expected that most of the arsenic (III) was oxidized to arsenic (V) prior to the filtration step.

4.3.3 Task 3: Documentation of Operating Conditions and Treatment Equipment Performance

The KIMCFS is designed to automatically backwash based on either a 20 psig filter headloss or a filtrate turbidity reading of 0.15 NTU. The KIMCFS automatic backwash sequence is as follows:

1. The standby tank is rinsed with feedwater (3-5 minutes).
2. The service tank is drained for 1 minute.
3. This tank is air spared for 0.5 minutes with air at 1 ½CFM per square foot of bed surface area.
4. The media is allowed to settle (1 minute).
5. This tank is backwashed with water from the standby tank at a flow rate of 3-½gpm for 20 minutes.
6. This tank then becomes the standby tank.

During the entire testing period (April 7 – April 22, 2000), the following observations were made regarding the operation of the test equipment:

- Flow control through the test unit required manipulation of a plastic ball valve. This valve was difficult to adjust accurately in order to maintain a steady flow rate.
- When the service flow rate caused the level in the 2nd reaction tank (closest to the filters) to drop below the tank outlet, air entered the pump and filter housing, causing cavitation.
- On April 13, 2000 at 0715, the level of solution in the chlorine feed tank dropped below the suction opening, thus introducing air into the metering pump. This required shutting the system down for approximately 45 minutes to bleed air from the lines.
- On April 15, 2000, at 1800 while bleeding air from both chlorine and ferric chloride chemical delivery systems, the electrical power strip got wet and tripped the ground fault interrupter switch, shutting off the inlet solenoid, and allowing the level in the 2nd reaction tank to drop too low, resulting in cavitation again. This resulted in a 20-minute system shutdown.

From Table 4-19, the April 11 and 18 data for total arsenic in the filtrate stream indicate unusually high concentrations. The filtrate concentrations of dissolved arsenic, As (III) and As (V) on April 11 are not unusually high. In view of the fact that the feedwater concentrations of all of the arsenic species on these dates are not unusually high, the reason for these high filtrate readings for total arsenic is not clearly understood.

April 18 data for all arsenic species tested in the raw feedwater and filtrate streams appear to have been reversed in the Laboratory Notebook. Upon review of all related arsenic readings during the testing period, COA has concluded that these data were likely transposed, but this cannot be substantiated. Table 4-20 (Summary Data) does not include these two readings in the calculations.

From April 9 through April 11, samples thought to be from the raw feedwater stream were actually collected from the coagulated feedwater tap located between the 2nd reaction tank and the media filters. From April 12 through the end of the test, all feedwater samples were collected upstream of the metering pumps, except where noted. The effect of the coagulation chemistry is underscored by the dissolved As concentrations in the feedwater stream on April 9, 10, 11 and 18. In all cases, this figure is less than 2 µg/L as compared to the samples collected upstream of the coagulation chemistry, where the average dissolved arsenic concentration exceeds 40 µg/L.

As stated earlier, a uniform flow rate through the system was very difficult to maintain. The control device was a 1" plastic ball valve, which was not only difficult to accurately adjust, but also difficult to reach for adjustment. As a result, the flow rate varied from 3.5 to 5.0 gpm over the duration of the test. The raw data are tabulated in Appendix E. Table 4-21 summarizes these data and Figure 4-16 illustrates flow rate as a function of time.

Table 4-21. Feed Flow Rate Data Summary (April 7 – April 22, 2000)

	Flow Rate (gpm)
Average	4.0
Minimum	3.4
Maximum	5.0
Standard Deviation	0.36
95% Confidence Interval	3.9, 4.1



Figure 4-16. Flow Rate Over Time (April 7 – April 22, 2000)

Although either a filter head loss exceeding 20 psig or a filtrate turbidity exceeding 0.15 NTU would initiate a backwash episode, the fact that both the filter pressure gauges and the filtrate turbidimeter registered instantaneous readings meant that it was almost impossible to determine the specific cause of the backwash. Table 4-22 lists runs times and volumes of water processed during the testing period.

Table 4-22. Filter System Runs Times & Water Volume Processed (April 10 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time Backwash Initiated	Run Time (Minutes)*	Gallons Processed	(gpm/ft^2) min
4/10/00	1520	352	1,373	2,519
4/11/00	1826	346	1,384	2,539
4/12/00	1529	318	1,304	2,393
4/13/00	1347	349	1,361	2,497
4/14/00	1949	503	1,962	3,600
4/15/00	1830	387	1,509	2,769
4/16/00	1709	409	1,595	2,927
4/16/00	2200	271	1,057	1,939
4/18/00	1530	469	1,829	3,356
4/19/00	1400	408	1,591	2,919
4/19/00	2228	487	1,899	3,484
4/22/00	1911	503	1,962	3,600

* Run time between termination of one backwashing episode and initiation of the next one.

Because such data as backwash episode start and stop times and flow rates could only be recorded while the system was staffed, Table 4-22 does not include data from all backwash episodes. The variability of flow rates through the system means that the "Gallons Processed" figures are estimated based on the calculation of average flow rate data.

Table 4-23 tabulates that the volume of backwash water collected and TSS values for a number of backwash episodes during the test period.

Table 4-23. Filter Backwash Water Characteristics (April 10 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time*	Gallons Collected	TSS (mg/L)
4/10/00	0928	86	121.0
4/10/00	1540	85	908.0
4/11/00	0925	-	920.0
4/11/00	1240	85	952.0
4/11/00	1849	80	884.0
4/12/00	0350	85	876.0
4/12/00	1011	85	928.0
4/12/00	1549	83	138.0
4/13/00	0818	86	126.0
4/13/00	1407	83	164.0
4/14/00	1126	80	164.0
4/15/00	1203	83	140.0
4/16/00	1020	84	108.0
4/16/00	1729	-	120.0
4/17/00	0854	-	128.0
4/17/00	1420	84	124.0
4/18/00	0741	88	104.0
4/18/00	1550	-	116.0
4/18/00	2200	-	108.0
4/19/00	1421	82	-
4/19/00	2251	87	-
4/20/00	2344	88	-
4/21/00	0909	80	156.0
4/21/00	1725	-	140.0
4/22/00	1048	87	124.0
4/22/00	1933	84	116.0

* Termination of backwash episode
- Not tested

Each backwash episode lasted for 20-25 minutes, during which both filters were off line. When the system was staffed, all the backwash water was collected and TSS samples collected. Of the 20 TSS data points listed, all but 4 are in the range of 104.0 to 164.0 mg/L. The other 4 range from 876.0 to 920.0 mg/L and are from backwash water collected between April 10 and April 12, 2000. The reason for these unusually high TSS readings is not clear.

Pressure drop (filter head loss) data are listed in Appendix E. These data range from 2 to 21 psig, and are indicators of the necessity for backwashing. Figure 4-17 illustrates this pressure drop data.



Figure 4-17. Pressure Drop Across System Over Time (April 7 – April 22, 2000)

4.3.4 Task 4: Arsenic Removal Results

The Test Plan required that samples be collected from both the feedwater and filtrate streams for analyses of speciated arsenic in particular. Samples were collected at time zero and at 1, 3, 6 hours and every six hours thereafter for a total of 48 hours. In addition to arsenic, the samples were analyzed by the Laboratory for the following parameters: antimony; alkalinity and iron. Results of arsenic data are presented in Tables 4-24 and 4-25.

Table 4-24. Task 4 Arsenic Data (April 20 – April 22, 2000)

		Total As (µg/L)		Dissolved As (µg/L)		As (III)* (µg/L)		As (V) (µg/L)	
Date	Time	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate
4/20/00	0900	72.7	1.2	41.5	1.4	2.8	1	38.7	<0.5
4/20/00	1000	72.9	2	41.3	1.6	3	0.9	38.3	0.7
4/20/00	1200	71.8	2.7	41.5	1.5	3	1	38.5	0.5
4/20/00	1500	75.1	4	40.6	1.4	3.4	1	37.2	<0.5
4/20/00	2100	70.5	4.3	41.2	1.6	2.8	0.9	38.4	0.7
4/21/00	0300	74.1	2.8	42.6	2.6	3	1.1	39.6	1.5
4/21/00	0900	72	26.1	40.6	1.7	3.4	0.8	37.2	0.9
4/21/00	1500	74.7	3.8	41.5	1.7	3.1	0.9	38.4	0.8
4/21/00	2100	73.3	1.9	39.9	1.5	3.1	0.9	36.8	0.6
4/22/00	0300	73.6	1.5	41.8	1.7	2.9	1	38.9	0.7
4/22/00	0900	67.3	5	40.4	1.6	3	0.9	37.4	0.7
4/22/00	1830	75.8	3.9	41.9	2.2	3.1	1	38.8	1.2

*All readings at the MDL for Arsenic III (<0.5 µg/L) were used as that number in calculations.
Note: the reliability of the low-level data (MDL of 0.1 µg/L to approximately 2 µg/L) should be considered only qualitative (not quantitative).

The 4/21/00, 0900 arsenic data are not included in the Table 4-25 data summary or graphed in Figures 4-18 through 4-21 due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-25. Task 4 Arsenic Data Summary (April 20 – April 22, 2000)

	Total As (µg/L)		Dissolved As (µg/L)		As (III) (µg/L)		As (V)* (µg/L)	
	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate
Average	72.9	3.0	41.3	1.7	3.0	1	38.3	0.8
Minimum	67.3	1.2	39.9	1.4	2.8	0.9	36.8	<0.5
Maximum	75.8	5	42.6	2.6	3.4	1.1	39.6	1.5
Std. Dev.	2.39	1.3	0.754	0.37	0.17	0.07	0.824	0.3
95% Confidence Interval	71.5, 74.3	2.3, 3.8	40.8, 41.7	1.5, 1.9	2.9, 3.1	0.9, 1.0	37.8, 38.8	0.6, 0.9

*All readings at the MDL for Arsenic V (<0.5 µg/L) were used as that number in calculations.
Note: the reliability of the low-level data (MDL of 0.1 µg/L to approximately 2 µg/L) should be considered only qualitative (not quantitative).

This task indicates that about 60% of the arsenic in the feedwater stream was dissolved and 92% of that was in the arsenic (V) form. It is also evident most of the arsenic (III) was oxidized to arsenic (V) by the chlorine fed during the coagulation step. At the pH of this water supply, virtually all As (III) is non-ionic, and in that form, will not coagulate with ferric hydroxide.

Figures 4-18 through 4-21 are plots of each arsenic species for Task 4 activities.



Figure 4-18. Task 4 Total Arsenic vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000)



Figure 4-19. Task 4 Dissolved Arsenic vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000)



Figure 4-20. Task 4 Arsenic (III) vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000)



Figure 4-21. Task 4 Arsenic (V) vs. Time (April 20 – April 22, 2000)

Results for samples analyzed by the Laboratory for the Alkalinity, Algae (Chlorophyll A); Iron and Antimony are shown in Tables 4-26 with a summary shown in Table 4-27.

Table 4-26. Task 4 Analytical Data For Antimony, Alkalinity and Total Iron (April 20 – April 22, 2000) and Chlorophyll A (April 12 – April 22)

		Antimony (µg/L)		Alkalinity (mg/L)		Chlorophyll A (µg/L)		Total Iron (mg/L)	
Date	Time	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater (prior to $FeCl_3$ addition)	Filtrate
4/12/00	1715	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
4/13/00	1015	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
4/14/00	1830	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3		
4/15/00	1300	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.3	-	-
4/20/00	0900	9.3	8.7	142	137	0.3	0.3	0.236	-
4/20/00	0900	-	-	147	138	-	-	0.253	<0.02
4/20/00	1000	9.1	8.9	143	137	-	-	0.247	0.0318
4/20/00	1200	8.9	8.5	142	138	-	-	0.441	0.062
4/20/00	1500	9.2	8.4	142	140	-	-	0.257	0.0984
4/20/00	2100	8.9	8.5	143	139	-	-	0.253	0.103
4/21/00	0300	8.8	8.6	138	146	-	-	0.265	0.0226
4/21/00[1]	0900	8.7	8.8	145	152	-	-	0.244	0.737
4/21/00	1500	9.1	8.6	144	138	-	-	0.249	0.0984
4/21/00	2100	9.2	8.7	146	140	-	-	0.249	0.0284
4/22/00	0300	9.3	8.6	145	141	-	-	0.252	<0.02
4/22/00	0900	9.1	8.6	144	142	-	-	0.238	0.138
4/22/00	1830	9.6	8.4	137	136	0.3	0.3	0.247	0.0989

- not tested
[1] See Discussion under 4.2.4

Table 4-27. Task 4 Analytical Data Summary for Antimony, Alkalinity and Total Iron (April 20 – April 22, 2000) and Chlorophyll A (April 12 – April 22)

	Antimony (µg/L)		Alkalinity (mg/L)		Chlorophyll A (µg/L)		Total Iron (mg/L)*	
	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater (prior to $FeCl_3$ addition)	Filtrate
Average	9.1	8.6	143	139	0.3	0.3	0.266	0.066
Minimum	8.8	8.4	137	136	0.3	0.3	0.236	<0.02
Maximum	9.6	8.9	147	146	0.3	0.3	0.441	0.138
Std. Dev.	0.22	0.14	2.93	2.74	0.0	0.0	0.0558	0.0430
95% Conf. Int.	9.0, 9.3	8.5, 8.7	141, 144	138, 141	NA	NA	0.234, 0.297	0.0402, 0.0910

*All readings for Total Iron at the MDL (0.02 mg/L) were used at that number in calculations.
NA because Standard Deviation = 0

The test indicated that antimony is not removed by the KIMCFS.

Alkalinity was slightly removed (2% reduction from feedwater to filtrate on average), which may be attributed to the slight reduction in pH from feedwater to filtrate, as well as the addition of sodium hypochlorite to the feedwater.

Chlorophyll A concentrations were expected to be minimal in the feedwater because it is groundwater. Chlorophyll concentrations in the feedwater and filtrate streams were identical over the entire test.

Total iron concentrations in the feedwater streams were removed to the MDL in the filtrate stream.

Table 4-28 provides a summary of Task 4 testing results for temperature and pH measured on-site, and dissolved oxygen as measured by the Laboratory. The 4/21/00, 0900 data are not included in the Table 4-28 data summary due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-28. Task 4 Analytical Data Summary for Temperature, pH and Dissolve d Oxygen (April 20- April 22, 2000)

	Temperature (°C)		pH		Dissolved Oxygen (mg/L)	
	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate
Average	9.0	10.0	7.26	7.19	5.76	5.78
Minimum	8.9	9.9	7.22	7.15	5.17	5.46
Maximum	9.0	10.2	7.33	7.24	6.23	5.98
Std. Dev.	0.032	0.11	0.0355	0.0253	0.382	0.180
95% Confidence Interval	9.0, 9.0	10.0, 10.1	7.24, 7.28	7.18, 7.21	5.48, 6.04	5.64, 5.91

The pH of the filtrate stream averaged 0.06 unit less than that of the feedwater stream. This slight reduction is probably due to the addition of ferric chloride coagulant, which is acidic.

The dissolved oxygen data indicate that this system had no effect on this chemical parameter in this test

Table 4-29 lists the total chlorine data from the Task 4 activity. The feedwater source was unchlorinated and the residual chlorine in the filtrate stream was the unreacted portion of the sodium hypochlorite injected into the feedwater stream to oxidize As (III) to As (V). The low reading in the filtrate stream at 0300 on 4/21/00 is the result of the tank running out of sodium hypochlorite solution. That the arsenic removal performance of the system was unaffected is proof that the tank must have run out just prior to having been discovered.

Table 4-29. Task 4 Total Chlorine Data (April 20 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Total Chlorine (mg/L) Feedwater	Total Residual Chlorine (mg/L) Filtrate
4/20/00	0900	0.00	1.24
4/20/00	1500	0.00	1.26
4/20/00	2100	0.0	1.29
4/21/00	0300	0.0	0.01*
4/21/00	0900	0.0	1.58
4/21/00	1500	0	1.57
4/21/00	2100	0	1.55
4/22/00	0300	0	1.57
4/22/00	0900	0	1.58
4/22/00	1830	0	1.49

* Cl_2 tank ran dry

Table 4-30 summarizes all of the Task 4 turbidity readings for the feedwater and filtrate streams. The 4/21/00, 0900 data are not included in the Table 4-29 data summary due to the measurement being taken in error during a backwash cycle.

Table 4-30. Task 4 Analytical Data Summary for Continuous Turbidity and Bench-Top Turbidity (April 20 – April 22, 2000)

	Continuous Turbidity (NTU)		Bench-Top Turbidity (NTU)	
	Feedwater	Filtrate	Feedwater	Filtrate
Average	1.61	0.059	1.49	0.13
Minimum	1.29	0.008	1.30	0.09
Maximum	2.19	0.124	1.84	0.19
Std. Dev.	0.278	0.0407	0.171	0.043
95% Confidence Interval	1.50, 1.72	0.0433, 0.0751	1.37, 1.61	0.10, 0.16

Turbidity readings were made with both continuous turbidimeters and a manual bench-top turbidimeter. There was fairly close agreement between the on-line and bench-top instruments on the feedwater turbidity data; however, a substantial difference between the two on the filtrate stream data. An explanation for this is offered in QA/QC Results, Section 4.5.3.3. Table 4-30 does illustrate that turbidity is significantly reduced by this system.

Table 4-31 shows the miscellaneous parameters that were measured by the State of Utah Laboratory as part of Task 4 activities.

Table 4-31. Task 4 Analytical Data – Miscellaneous Parameters (April 20 – April 22, 2000)

Date	Time	Parameter	Units	Feedwater	Filtrate
4/20/00	0900	TOC	mg/L	<0.5*	<0.5*
4/22/00	1830	TOC	mg/L	<0.5*	<0.5*
4/20/00	0900	UV_{254} Absorbance	cm^{-1}	0.005	0.005
4/22/00	1830	UV_{254} Absorbance	cm^{-1}	0.024	0.008
4/20/00	0900	Aluminum	µg/L	<30*	<30*
4/20/00	0900	Manganese	mg/L	0.0142	0.0059
4/20/00	0900	Sulfate	mg/L	307.0	301.0
4/22/00	1830	Sulfate	mg/L	33.4	30.0
4/20/00	0900	Hardness	mg/L	443**	436**

* Sample reported below the MDL.

** Hardness calculated from laboratory readings of calcium and magnesium using *SM* for the Analysis of Water and Wastewater (18th Ed, Method 2340B)

As an indication of the extremely low organic content of this water, total organic carbon (TOC) measurements were below the detection limit and UV_{254} absorbance data were very low.

Aluminum levels were below the detection limit in both the feedwater and filtrate streams, and hardness and sulfate parameters appeared to have been unaffected by the coagulation/filtration process.

Since the concentration of manganese in the feedwater was less than 10% of the iron concentration, manganese probably had little or no effect on arsenic removal; and appears to have been removed, probably as manganese hydroxide. The iron present in the feedwater was of sufficient concentration to

react with the arsenic, particularly in the presence of chlorine, which oxidized the iron to the ferric form. The addition of ferric chloride ensured that there would be an excess of iron to complete the coagulation process.

4.4 Results of Equipment Characterization

During the verification testing, the factors associated with the qualitative, quantitative and cost characteristics of the KIMCFS were identified, within the limits of the short duration of the test.

4.4.1 Qualitative Factors

The qualitative factors examined were the susceptibility of the equipment to environmental condition changes, operational reliability and equipment safety.

4.4.1.1 Susceptibility to Changes in Environmental Conditions

Changes in environmental conditions that cause changes in feedwater quality can affect the performance of coagulation and filtration systems.

The optimum performance of any coagulant chemistry is a function of many chemical and environmental variables such as pH, temperature, Oxidation Reduction Potential (ORP) level and any chemical constituents which might interfere with the formation of the ferric hydroxide/arsenic complex. This has resulted in the requirement for the Initial Operations period of the verification testing program wherein the coagulant chemistries and dosages were optimized.

Since the source was groundwater, even though ambient conditions were changing, the feedwater temperature remained relatively unchanged throughout the test. Also, the equipment was located indoors, so it was unaffected by weather changes.

4.4.1.2 Operational Reliability

The equipment ran continuously throughout the duration of the test, with only 20-25 minute interruptions for automatic backwashing.

Once flows, pressures and backwash conditions were established during the Initial Operations period, no changes were made throughout the duration of the test.

4.4.1.3 Equipment Safety

Evaluation of the safety of the treatment system was done by examination of the components of the system and identification of hazards associated with these components. A judgment as to the safety of the treatment system was made from these evaluations.

There are safety hazards associated with electrical service and pressurized water. The electrical service was connected by a qualified electrical contractor according to local code requirements and did not present an unusual safety risk. Based on the pressure data recorded during the test, the water pressure inside the treatment system was relatively low (<40 psi) and did not present an unusual safety risk. (See Appendix G).

The coagulation chemicals, sodium hypochlorite and ferric chloride, are considered hazardous; however, safe handling procedures [as outlined in the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS)] were followed when replenishing the feed tanks and no problems were encountered.

No injuries or accidents occurred during the testing.

4.4.2 Quantitative Factors

Quantitative Factors examined during the verification testing were power, consumables, waste disposal and length of operating cycle.

4.4.2.1 Electrical Power

The electrical power used was 110VAC, single phase, 20A service. The power was recorded on an Amprobe Kilowatt/Hour Meter (non-demand). The total power consumed was 516 kWh.

4.4.2.2 Consumables

- Total quantity of filtrate produced (during coagulant feed):
  Average flow rate = 4.0 gpm
  4.0 gpm x 60 min/hr x 342.5 hr = 82,200 gallons.
- Total quantity of sodium hypochlorite consumed:
  0.82 gph x 342.5 hr = 280.9 gallons of 5.25% bleach.
  280.9 x 0.0525 = 14.8 gallons (100% NaOCl basis) ÷ 82,200 gallons of filtrate = 2 x 10^{-6} gallons of 100% sodium hypochlorite per gallon of filtrate produced.
- Total quantity of ferric chloride consumed:
  0.074 gph x 342.5 = 25.3 gallons of 32.5% $FeCl_3$.
  25.3 x .325 = 8.2 gallons (100% $FeCl_3$ basis) ÷ 82,200gallons of filtrate = 1 x 10^{-5} gallons of 100% $FeCl_3$ per gallon of filtrate produced.

4.4.2.3 Waste Disposal

The waste generated during the verification testing period was the backwash stream at approximately 84 gallons per episode.

The average run time, based on the data gathered while the system was staffed, was 400 minutes. Using this figure to calculate the total number of backwash episodes: 342.5 hrs x 60 min/hr = 20,550

minutes ÷ 400 = 51 backwash episodes. Assuming 4 gallons/episode, 51 x 84 = 4,284 gallons of wastewater produced during this test.

Based on a total filtrate volume of 82,200 gallons produced, the water recovery for the KIMCFS for this test was [1.0 – 4,284 ÷ (82,200 + 4,284)]100 = 95%.

4.4.2.4 Length of Operating Cycle

The average run time between backwash episodes, calculated from raw data in Appendix E was 400 minutes (6.67 hours).

4.5 QA/QC Results

The objective of this task is to assure the high quality and integrity of all measurements of operational and water quality parameters during the ETV project. QA/QC verifications were recorded in the laboratory logbooks. The results of QA/QC verification performed on on-line instrumentation, hand-held instruments and the analytical Laboratory are presented below, and a detailed discussion of the QA/QC procedures and apparent discrepancies is in Appendix H.

4.5.1 Arsenic Speciation and Analysis

On a daily basis, feed, concentrate and permeate samples were collected and speciated on-site. All samples were then delivered to the State Laboratory for analysis. The laboratory analyzed for total arsenic, dissolved arsenic and As (III). As (V) data were obtained by subtracting As (III) readings from the dissolved arsenic figure.

In many filtrate samples, the dissolved arsenic figures were higher than the total arsenic figures. The State Laboratory investigated this anomaly in detail and postulates that the presence of the H_2SO_4 preservative in bottle B (bottles A and C had HNO_3 preservative) affected the accuracy of the ICP-MS analytical equipment. This explanation, arsenic speciation protocol and Laboratory QA/QC procedures are detailed in Appendix H.

The Quality Control review by NSF raised the question of whether or not the laboratory could actually document a reporting limit of 0.5 µg/L for total arsenic, dissolved arsenic and the arsenic species. The reviewer indicated in the review comments that sulfate interference had not been proven in his opinion. It was also stated that a reporting limit (actual quantitation limit) is typically 10 - 30 times the MDL. Therefore, a reporting of limit of 3 - 5 µg/L maybe more appropriate. At this level, all of the data would be reported as "less than values" for the filtrate and the difference between the total and dissolved arsenic would be eliminated.

4.5.2 Data Correctness

Data correctness refers to data quality, for which there are four indicators:

- Representativeness
- Statistical Uncertainty
- Accuracy
- Precision

Calculation of all of the above data quality indicators was outlined in the Chapter 3, Methods & Procedures. All water quality samples were collected according to the sampling procedures specified by the EPA/NSF ETV protocols, which provided the representativeness of the samples.

4.5.2.1 Representativeness

Operational parameters graphs and discussions are included under Task 3 – Documentation of Operations Conditions and Treatment Equipment Performance. Testing equipment verification is presented below in discussions in Daily QA/QC Results and Results of QA/QC Verification At The Start Of Each Testing Period.

4.5.2.2 Statistical Uncertainty

Ninety-five percent confidence intervals were calculated for the water quality parameters of the KIMCFS as presented in the water sample summary tables in the discussion of Task 2 – Feed and Finished Water Quality Characterization.

4.5.2.3 Accuracy

For this ETV study, accuracy refers to the difference between the sample result and the true or reference value. Calculations of data accuracy were made to determine the accuracy of the testing equipment in this study. Accuracy of testing equipment verification is presented below in discussions on Daily QA/QC Results and Results of QA/QC Verification At The Start Of Each Testing Period.

4.5.2.4 Precision

Precision is a measure of the degree of consistency from test to test, and can be measured by replication. For single reading parameters, such as pressure and flow rates, precision was determined by redundant readings from operator to operator. Calibration procedures for those on-site parameters consequential to the testing (bench-top turbidity and pH) are presented in discussions on Daily QA/QC Results and Results of QA/QC Verification At The Start Of Each Testing Period.

4.5.3 Daily QA/QC Results

The April 18, 2000 data for all arsenic species in the raw feedwater and filtrate streams appear to have been reversed in the Laboratory reports. While this is believed to have been a labeling error, it cannot be substantiated. Because of this suspected sampling error, these data were not included in the Arsenic Data Summary, Table 4-19.

The on-line feedwater turbidity readings were checked daily against the bench-top turbidimeter. The readout from the HF Scientific, Inc., Micro 200 on-line feedwater turbidimeter averaged 1.55 NTU during the verification period of April 9 through April 22, 2000; the average from the Hach 2100P benchtop turbidimeter was 1.75 NTU. The discrepancy between the two turbidimeters (on-line and benchtop) of 1.55 NTU and 1.75 NTU is acceptable and within limits (further discussions in Section 4.5.4.3).

The on-line filtrate turbidity readings were checked daily against the bench-top turbidimeter. The readout from the Great Lakes Model 95T/SS4 on-line filtrate turbidimeter averaged 0.24 NTU during the verification period of April 9 through April 22, 2000; the average from the Hach 2100P benchtop turbidimeter was 0.097 NTU. This discrepancy is further explained in Section 4.5.4.3.

The pH meter was calibrated daily against NIST-traceable pH buffers at 7.00 and 10.00. The pH meter was a Cole Palmer Oaktron® WD-35615 Series. The pH calibration buffers were Oakton pH Singles 7.00 (model #35653-02), and pH Singles 10.00 (model #35653-03). pH was measured from the feedwater, coagulated feedwater and filtrate sample taps.

4.5.4 Results Of QA/QC Verifications At The Start Of Each Testing Period

4.5.4.1 Tubing

The tubing and all water lines used on the treatment system were inspected before verification testing began. The tubing and lines were in good condition and replacements were not necessary. Documentation of this activity was inadvertently omitted from the Laboratory Notebook. The tubing associated with the in-line plant turbidimeters was inspected with every calibration by the personnel of the water treatment plant.

4.5.4.2 Thermometer

Temperatures were measured in accordance with *SM* 2550 on the feed and filtrate streams with a Radio Shack model No. 63-1009A digital indoor-outdoor thermometer. This instrument read in 0.1°C increments and was calibrated by the State of Utah Laboratory as well as in an ice bath and against a NIST-traceable Thermometer (Tel-Tru model 0054-5).

4.5.4.3 Turbidimeters

Both on-line and bench top turbidimeters were used during the KIMCFS ETV test.

Two on-line turbidimeters were utilized:

1) A wall mounted HF Scientific, Inc., Micro 200 turbidimeter was used to continuously measure turbidity of the feedwater. This instrument was cleaned and calibrated at the beginning of the verification testing period by Spiro Water Tunnel Filtration Plant personnel with standards of 0.01, 0.10, 10.0 and 100.0 NTU, and then cleaned and calibrated weekly, or after a significant turbidity spike.
2) A Great Lakes Model 95T/SS4 turbidimeter, mounted on the filtrate stream, was calibrated initially and weekly with standard solutions of 0.04, 0.40 and 4.0 NTU.

A new Hach 2100P bench-top turbidimeter was utilized to measure grab samples of both feedwater and filtrate at least once per day. The instrument calibration was verified on March 15, 2000, with primary standards of 800, 100, 20 and <0.1 NTU, weekly with secondary standards measuring 526, 52.2, 4.87 NTU, and with another secondary standard of 0.4 NTU with every use.

Discrepancies between the on-line and bench-top instruments were noted, particularly in the filtrate samples, as indicated in Table 4-29. Several explanations for these are offered which include:

1) Difference in the analytical techniques between the on-line and bench-top turbidimeters:
   The bench-top turbidimeter uses a glass cuvette to hold the sample; this cuvette can present some optical difficulties for this instrument. The on-line turbidimeter has no cuvette to present a possible interference with the optics of the instrument. The low level of turbidity can create analytical difficulties, particularly for the bench-top instrument. Manufacturer's specifications state that stray light interference is less than 0.02 NTU. Stray light interference approaching this level at the low turbidity levels tested could account for the differences in the readings.
2) Geologic activity in the Spiro Tunnel caused short-term turbidity spikes in the feedwater, which may have affected the accuracy of the on-line plant turbidimeter between routine cleanings. For example, a turbidity spike occurred at 0300 on April 2, 2000, which shut the filtration plant down (the alarm/shutdown turbidity level was set at 5.0 NTU). The turbidimeter was cleaned and returned to service.
3) Although attempts were made to collect bench-top turbidity samples at the same time that on-line turbidimeter readings were made, the logistics of the sampling locations resulting in small time differences may have resulted in slight changes in water quality between these events.
4) After completion of the testing, a quantity of bench-top turbidimeter calibration verification data were recorded with bench-top turbidimeter readings. In addition, some calibration verification readings were taken by filling the same cuvette twice and comparing the two readings of the same standard solution (0.4 NTU). These data are listed in Table 4-32 and summarized in Table 4-33.

Table 4-32. Bench-Top Turbidimeter Calibration Verification Data (using 0.4 NTU standard)

Date	Time	Reading (NTU)
4/24/00	0900	0.37
	1000	0.36
	1200	0.36
	1500	0.34
	2100	0.35
4/25/00	0300	0.35
	0900	0.34
	1500	0.30, 0.36 (same cuvette)
	2100	0.34, 0.33 (same cuvette)
4/26/00	0300	0.33, 0.30 (same cuvette)
	0900	0.31, 0.30 (same cuvette)

Table 4-33. Bench-Top Turbidimeter Calibration Verification Data Summary

	Reading (NTU)
Average	0.34
Minimum	0.30
Maximum	0.37
Standard Deviation	0.02
95% Confidence Interval	0.32, 0.35

4.5.4.4 True Color

True color was measured in accordance with *SM* 2120 at 455nm wavelength with a Hach DR2010 spectrophotometer. Altogether 10 samples were measured; the reading varied from -4 to -1 PtCo color units. The Hach standard solution (500 PtCo color units) was diluted with ultrapure water to produce a solution that should read 1.0 PtCo color units; however, readings on this aliquot varied from –2 to 1.0. The same results were obtained when both ultrapure water and distilled water were tested alone. The conclusions drawn from the above were:

1) The Hach DR2010 unit cannot accurately measure color below a level of 2 PtCo color units.
2) Since the water source is groundwater and low in organics, the true color is expected to be very low, and in this case, is below the accuracy of the instrument.

Further evidence of the low organics concentration is supplied by the fact that TOC concentrations were below the minimum detection limit of 0.5 mg/L and UV_{254} absorbance readings were at or below 0.024 cm^{-1}.

4.5.4.5 Total Chlorine

Total chlorine measurements were made in accordance with *SM* 4500 on a Hach DR2000 spectrophotometer which was standardized with each set of measurements in accordance with the Method. The Test Plan required that the total chlorine be measured during Task 4 activities when samples were collected and other parameters measured.

4.5.4.6 Pressure Gauges

The pressure gauge for this study was glycerin-filled and calibrated against a glycerin-filled NIST-traceable Precision WGG 66/60 gauge, 0-60 psig.

4.5.4.7 Metering Pump

On April 24, 2000, at the completion of the testing, the chemical feed pumps flow and stroke settings were verified and documented in the Laboratory Notebook. Flow rates were verified volumetrically with a graduated cylinder and stopwatch. A 1,000 mL graduated cylinder was used for the pump injecting coagulant (ferric chloride) and the sodium hypochlorite metering pump.

4.5.4.8 Flow Rates

The "bucket and stopwatch" method for calibrating the flow meter was utilized on April 22, 2000.

4.5.5 Off-Site Analysis for Chemical and Biological Samples

QA/QC procedures for laboratory analysis were based on *SM*, 18th Ed., (APHA, 1992) and EPA Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes, (EPA, 1995).

4.5.5.1 Organic Parameters, Total Organic Carbon and UV_{254} Absorbance

Samples for these analyses were collected in glass bottles supplied by the State of Utah Laboratory and delivered to the Laboratory by COA. Although the Test Plan required only one analysis of these parameters, two analyses were made of each during the Task 4 activities and are listed in Table 4-26.

4.5.5.2 Algae (Chlorophyll A) Samples

Samples were collected in opaque containers supplied by the State Laboratory and kept at 0°C in the on-site refrigerator prior to delivery to the laboratory.

4.5.5.3 Inorganic Samples

Inorganic samples were collected, held in the refrigerator at 4°C, and shipped in accordance with *SM* 3010B and C and 1060 and EPA §136.3, 40 CFR Chapter 1. Proper bottles and preservatives, where required (iron and manganese for example) were used. Although the travel time was brief, samples were shipped in coolers at 4°C.

Chapter 5
References

Adin, A. and Rebhum, M. A model to predict concentration and headloss profiles in filtration. *Journal AWWA*, 444-453 (1977).

Amirtharajah, A. "Some theoretical and conceptual views of filtration", *American Water Works Association Seminar Proceedings*, American Water Works Association, Denver CO, 21-26 1988.

Amirtharajah, A. and O' Melia, C.R., Coagulation Processes: Destabilization, Mixing and Flocculation, in Water Quality and Treatment, AWWA, Denver CO. pp. 269-365.

ANSI/AWWA B100-89, *AWWA Standard for Filtering Material*, American Water Works Association, Denver, CO, 1989.

American Public Health Association, American Water Works Association, Water Environmental Federation, *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 18th Edition*, APHA, AWWA, WEF, Washington D.C., 1992.

American Water Works Association, *Operational Control of Coagulation and Filtration Processes, Manual of Water Supply Practices M37*, American Water Works Association, Denver, CO, 1992.

Badger, T.J., Bergemamann, E.P., Smith, P.K., Datta, R. Chromatography Aids in Arsenic Removal, *Water Technology*, 66-71 (1999).

Cheng, R.C., Liang, S, Want, H.C., Beuhler, M.D. Enhanced Coagulation For Arsenic Removal *Journal AWWA*, 79-90 (1994).

Cleasby, John L. Filtration in Water Quality and Treatment *Journal AWWA*, 455-560 (1990).

Cleasby, J. L. Williamson, M.M., & Bauman, E.R. *Effect of filtration rate changes on quality*, American Water Works Association, 869-880 1963.

Cleasby, J.L. *Approaches to a filterability index for granular filters* American Water Works Association, 372-381, Aug. 1969.

Clifford, D., Ghurye, G., Tripp, A., Tong, J., *Field Studies on Arsenic Removal In Albuquerque, New Mexico Using The University Of Houston/EPA Mobile Drinking Water Treatment Research Facility* Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Houston, TX, 1998.

Edwards, M., Chemistry of Arsenic Removal During Coagulation and Fe-MN Oxidation *Journal AWWA*, 64-78 (1994).

Gibbs, J.W., Scanlan, L.P. “Arsenic Removal In The 1990’s: Full Scale Experience From Park City, Utah”, Presentation at the *American Water Works Association, Water Quality Technology Conference*, November 1994.

Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State Public Health and Environmental Managers, *Recommended Standards for Water Works*, (Commonly referred to as the Ten State's Standards, TSS) Health Education Services, Albany NY, 1992.

Kiminski, J.C. Correspondence in *New England Journal. of Medicine* 331 (22): 1529-1530 (1994).

O' Melia, C.R., Gray, K.A., and Tao, C. Polymeric Inorganic Coagulants, AWWARF, Denver, CO, 1989.

Pontius, F.W., Brown, K.G., Chen, C.J. Health Implications of Arsenic in Drinking Water *Journal AWWA*, 52-63 (1994).

Russo, R. POU/POE Technologies Available For Arsenic Removal *Water Technology* 72-77 (1998)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency/NSF International. ETV *Protocol of Equipment Verification Testing For Arsenic Removal*, EPA/NSF, January 18, 2000.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency/NSF International. EPA Test Plan: *NSF Equipment Verification Testing Plan Coagulation and Filtration for Removal of Arsenic*, EPA/NSF, January 18, 2000.