Water Treatment Operator

TRAINING HANDBOOK



Third Edition

Nicholas Pizzi and
William C. Lauer

American Water Works Association

Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Blank Page

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook

Third Edition

Nicholas G. Pizzi
William C. Lauer

American Water Works Association

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Copyright © 2002, 2005, 2013 American Water Works Association

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information or retrieval system, except in the form of brief excerpts or quotations for review purposes, without the written permission of the publisher.

Disclaimer

This book is provided for informational purposes only, with the understanding that the publisher, editors, and authors are not thereby engaged in rendering engineering or other professional services. The authors, editors, and publisher make no claim as to the accuracy of the book's contents, or their applicability to any particular circumstance. The editors, authors, and publisher accept no liability to any person for the information or advice provided in this book or for loss or damages incurred by any person as a result of reliance on its contents. The reader is urged to consult with an appropriate licensed professional before taking any action or making any interpretation that is within the realm of a licensed professional practice.

ISBN: 978-1-58321-861-7

Project Manager/Senior Technical Editor: Melissa Valentine
Cover Design: Melanie Yamamoto
Production: Janice Benight Design Studio

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pizzi, Nicholas G.
[Water treatment operator handbook]
Water treatment operator training handbook / by Nicholas G. Pizzi and William C. Lauer. -- Third edition.
pages cm
Previous edition published as: Water treatment operator handbook, 2005.
Includes index.
ISBN 978-1-58321-861-7
1. Water treatment plants--Handbooks, manuals, etc. 2. Water--Purification--Handbooks, manuals, etc. I. Lauer, Bill. II. Title.
TD434.P579 2013
628.1'62--dc23

2013009995

American Water Works Association

Printed on Recycled Paper

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Contents

Preface ix

Chapter 1: Regulated Contaminants and Treatment Challenges 1
- Types of Water Systems 1
- Disinfection By-Product and Microbial Regulations 3
- Operational Views of Certain Contaminants 19
- Regulatory changes 22
- Bibliography 22

Chapter 2: Source Water 25
- Sources of Water 26
- Source Water Protection Program 31
- Source Water Quality Considerations 34
- Bibliography 36

Chapter 3: Well Design and Operation 37
- Types and Operation of Wells 37
- Parts of a Well 39
- Operations and Maintenance 40
- Reasons for Well Abandonment 43
- Bibliography 44

Chapter 4: Pretreatment 45
- Variation in Source Water Quality 45
- Process Design 47
- Bibliography 50

Chapter 5: Coagulation and Flocculation 51
- Coagulation 52
- Common Coagulant Aids 53
- Coagulation Chemical Feed Systems 54
- Process Operations and Maintenance 58
- Flocculation 63
- Bibliography 66

Chapter 6: Sedimentation 67
- Process Design 68
- Types of Basins 70
- High-Rate Processes 72
- Operations and Maintenance 77

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Safety 79
Residuals 79
Turbidity Testing 85
Bibliography 85

Chapter 7: Filtration 87
Slow Sand Filters 87
Rapid Sand Filters 89
Diatomaceous Earth Filters 91
Granular Bed Designs 92
Granular Bed Operation and Optimization 95
Bibliography 112

Chapter 8: Disinfection 113
Basics of Chemical Disinfection 113
Chlorine Feed Equipment 120
Chlorine Dioxide 120
Chloramination 121
Ozone 123
Ultraviolet Light 124
Disinfection By-Products 126
Bibliography 127

Chapter 9: Softening 129
Water Hardness 129
Precipitative Softening Process 131
Bibliography 145

Chapter 10: Specialized Treatment Processes 147
Aeration 147
Adsorption (GAC) 148
Iron and Manganese Removal 150
Fluoridation of Water 152
Activated Alumina Fluoride Removal Process 157
Adsorptive Media 158
Electrodialysis Demineralization 158
Precoat Filtration (Diatomaceous Earth) 160
Corrosion and Scaling Control 161
Ion Exchange 162
Bibliography 164

Chapter 11: Membrane Systems 165
Reverse Osmosis 165
Nanofiltration 167

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Ultrafiltration 168
Microfiltration 168
Post-treatment 169
Future Considerations 170
Bibliography 170

Chapter 12: Testing and Laboratory Procedures 171
Reasons for Testing 171
Sampling 171
Quality Assurance/Quality Control 174
Bibliography 189

Chapter 13: Instrumentation and Control Equipment 191
Process Control 191
Bibliography 205

Chapter 14: Safety and Security Practices 207
Treatment Plant Safety 207
Safety Regulations 207
Confined Space Rules 208
General Plant Safety 211
Lab Safety 217
General Safety 217
Plant Security 217
Bibliography 222

Chapter 15: Record Keeping and Reporting 223
Process Records 223
Reporting 227
Plant Performance Reports 228
Bibliography 229

Appendix A: Sample Material Safety Data for Chlorine 231

Appendix B: Math and Calculation Methods 239
Practical Unit Conversions for Water 239
Practical Water Treatment Plant Example Problems 241

Appendix C: Water Chemistry 251

Appendix D: Metric Conversions 257

Glossary 263

Index 279

About the Authors 293

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

First Edition Preface

The people who operate water treatment plants make an important contribution to the public health of the community in which they work. A safe drinking water supply is essential to all representative groups within the sphere of influence of the treatment plant. Therefore, the water plant operator should be a trained professional who is capable of performing the tasks necessary to provide the safest possible water.

Trained professional: the phrase implies two principles. First, this is a person who conforms to technical and ethical standards of a discipline, perhaps on the level of a permanent career. Second, this person is trainable and has been trained to perform at a level that leads to professionalism. This book is written with those principles in mind.

An ethical paradigm is in action here. Performing the role of water plant operator places a premium on allegiance to the consumer, the regulator, and the employer. Often, operators believe the demands made on them by the three are in conflict. Many operator training programs are available to people in the field, but few of them offer training in ethics. Occasionally, we read about an operator who has made a questionable ethical choice. Public response to these incidents is a predictable loss of confidence in the drinking water industry. Usually, when operators make the right choice, it is a result of their training. Unfortunately, the right choices that operators make are not often written about.

The US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has published guidelines for the certification and qualification of the men and women who operate the water treatment plants in this country.* These guidelines provide a legal framework for operator certification, one that underscores the opinions previously stated. To add weight to the seriousness of the rule, the USEPA administrator is directed to withhold 20 percent of the funds a state is otherwise entitled to receive in its Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act if the state does not meet goals or commitments. This action is an inducement to perform.

*Federal Register, USEPA, FRL-6230-8, Final Guidelines for the Certification and Recertification of the Operators of Community and Nontransient Noncommunity Public Water Systems, Feb. 5, 1999, p. 5916.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

The rule requires, at a minimum, that all owners of public water supplies place the direct supervision of their water system under the responsible charge of an operator(s) holding a valid certification equal to or greater than the classification of the treatment facility. It further requires that all operating personnel making process-control decisions about water quality or quantity that affect public health be certified. Finally, it requires that a designated certified operator be available for each operating shift.

The rule is populated with many phrases that begin with "must": the state must classify water systems; operators must pass an exam; exam questions must be validated; operators must have a minimum level of schooling; licenses must be renewed; the state must establish training requirements; the state must include ongoing stakeholder involvement.

What drives this rule and its associated requirements? The recognition that the water treatment plant is a barrier against the passage of pathogen-infested or otherwise harmful water and that those who own and operate them should be accountable for the water they produce. The concept of the multiple-barrier approach to water plant operation has evolved from such recognition. Programs such as the Partnership for Safe Water and other efforts attempt to instill a systematic approach to this discipline and to encourage tenacity for ongoing process improvement through optimization. These programs provide a framework for operators who wish to improve their skills and knowledge of the profession.

It is hoped that this third edition will help operators in their search for professionalism.

I would like to thank the following water utility professionals who served as reviewers of this book. Their time is appreciated and their expertise acknowledged.

Christine A. Owen, PhD, Water Quality Assurance Officer, Tampa Bay Water, Clearwater, Fla.

Michael J. Pickel, PE, BS Civil Engineering, Environmental Programs Manager, Philadelphia Water Department, Philadelphia, Pa.

David A. Visintainer, MSCE, Director of Public Utilities and Water Commissioner, City of St. Louis Water Division, St. Louis, Mo.

Melinda L. Raimann, BSEd, CUSA, Assistant Commissioner, Cleveland Division of Water, Cleveland, Ohio

David J. Rexing, BA Chemistry, MBA, Water Quality Research and Development Manager, Southern Nevada Water Authority, Las Vegas, Nev.

Jan C. Routt, BS Microbiology, Director of Water Quality, Kentucky-American Water Company, Lexington, Ky.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

I would also like to thank the following individuals for their assistance in developing the outline for this book. Their contribution was thorough and helped to make this work a comprehensive tool for operators: David Talley, Bill Lauer, Joe McDonald, Nelson Yarlott, and Gay Porter De Nileon.

Nicholas G. Pizzi

* * *

Third Edition Preface

Nick Pizzi is my friend and colleague. When AWWA asked me to consider authoring the third edition of this book, the first thing I did was to contact Nick. He explained that he had decided not to participate in the revision and that he was confident that I would provide professional and current information.

Even though I did not work with Nick on this new edition, his hand is evident throughout. Before making his decision not to do this revision, he had provided suggestions for updates and I have included them. Also, I did not tamper with Nick's style. His words reveal a passion for operations excellence that I can only hope to appreciate.

My approach was to update the many references and illustrations to make them current. I also reviewed the operator certification knowledge requirements included in the Associated Boards of Certification (ABC) Need-to-Know criteria. Several state certification boards' (e.g., California, Pennsylvania, and Texas) operator requirements were also added where there were differences. Any topics in these certification requirements that were not already included in the book were added.

The result of these additions and revisions make this book an indispensable reference for all water treatment plant operators and plant managers. The book is equally useful for certification exam studies and as a reference for operations personnel.

I want to thank David Plank, Melissa Valentine, and Alan Roberson at AWWA for their help and support during the publication process. Most of all I want to thank Nick Pizzi for his outstanding book, which I was allowed to supplement.

William C. Lauer

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Chapter 1

Regulated Contaminants and Treatment Challenges

Regulations that govern US water supply and treatment are developed by the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA). Most states administer USEPA regulations after adopting regulations that are no less stringent than federal rules; and in some cases, states have adopted stricter regulations or have developed regulations for additional contaminants not regulated by USEPA.

This chapter discusses current and anticipated USEPA regulations and the challenges that operators face in their efforts to comply with the regulations. Water system operators should consult their local and state regulatory agencies to verify applicable regulations that may be different than the federal regulations listed in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a discussion of selected contaminants that are commonly found in water, their significance, and the methods for their removal.

TYPES OF WATER SYSTEMS

The SDWA defines a public water system (PWS) as a supply of piped water for human consumption that has at least 15 service connections, or serves 25 or more persons 60 or more days each year. By that definition, private homes, groups of homes with a single water source but having fewer than 25 residents, and summer camps with their own water source that operate less than 60 days per year are not PWSs. They may, however, be subject to state or local regulations. Such systems may also be subject to state and local well construction and water quality requirements.

PWSs are classified into three categories based on the type of customers served:

- *Community PWS:* a system whose customers are full-time residents
- *Nontransient noncommunity PWS:* an entity having its own water supply, serving an average of at least 25 persons who do not live at the location but who use the water for more than 6 months per year

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

- *Transient noncommunity PWS*: an establishment having its own water system, where an average of at least 25 people per day visit and use the water occasionally or for only short periods of time

The rationale for these classifications is based on the differences in exposure to contaminants experienced by persons using the water. Most chemical contaminants are believed to potentially cause adverse health effects from long-term exposure. Short-term exposure to low-level chemical contamination may not carry the same risk as long-term exposure.

Therefore, the monitoring requirements for both community and noncommunity water systems apply to all contaminants that are considered a health threat. The transient and nontransient noncommunity systems must only monitor for nitrite and nitrate, as well as biological contamination (those that pose immediate threat from brief exposure). The remaining community systems, about 52,000 in the United States, have more stringent and frequent monitoring requirements.

Before examining the specific regulations that govern contaminants, the operator needs to know the difference between the two concepts used in the contaminant monitoring process: the maximum contaminant level goal (MCLG) and the maximum contaminant level (MCL).

- The MCLG is set for most substances at a level where there are no known, or anticipated, health effects. For those substances that are suspected carcinogens, the MCLG is set at zero.
- The MCL is set as close as feasible to the MCLG for substances regulated under the SDWA. The MCL is a level that is reasonably and economically achievable. This is the enforceable regulated level. Water systems that exceed an MCL must take steps to install treatment to reduce the contaminant concentration to below the MCL. Where USEPA has found it impractical to set an MCL, a treatment technique (TT) has been established instead of an MCL.

With these concepts in mind, the various regulations can be examined. This discussion is not meant to be all-inclusive. Because the regulatory process is an ever-evolving one, the reader is cautioned that some of the stated facts presented in this discussion may have changed since the writing of this chapter. For up-to-date information, it is best to contact the local office of the regulatory authority in the district or state where the utility operates.

Table 1-1 contains some of the more common regulated contaminants and their respective MCL or treatment technique (TT) descriptions. These are provided for illustration only and are not intended to be used for regulatory purposes (see the official USEPA regulatory information on the agency website).

Operations personnel are expected to know the regulatory limits for compounds encountered in their water supply. However, the number and variety of regulated substances make it unlikely that operators would know all of the regulatory limits. Operators must rely on current references for the most accurate information. These are available from the regulatory agency responsible for the location of the treatment plant.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Table 1-1 Selected USEPA drinking water standards

Contaminant	MCL or TT (mg/L)*
Total coliform	5 percent (monthly positives)
Turbidity	0.3 ntu monthly or 1 ntu†
Chlorite	1.0
HAA5	0.060
TTHM	0.080
Chloramines (as Cl_2)	4.0
Chlorine (as Cl_2)	4.0
Chlorine dioxide (as ClO_2)	0.8
Arsenic	0.010
Copper	TT, Action level = 1.3
Cyanide (as free cyanide)	0.2
Fluoride	4.0
Lead	TT; Action Level = 0.015
Mercury (inorganic)	0.002
Nitrate (measured as nitrogen)	10
Nitrite (measured as nitrogen)	1
Radium 226 and 228 (combined)	5 pCi/L
Uranium	10 µg/L

*The listed standards are numerical representations of the current USEPA drinking water standard and do not include the sample frequency or location and other important compliance information. For a complete definition of the standards consult USEPA Drinking Water Standards.

†Turbidity less than or equal to 0.3 nephelometric turbidity units (ntu) for the combined filter effluent for 95% of the monthly samples. At no time can turbidity be above 1 ntu.

DISINFECTION BY-PRODUCT AND MICROBIAL REGULATIONS

Drinking water treatment, including use of chemical disinfectants such as chlorine, ozone, and chlorine dioxide, has been an important step in protecting drinking water consumers from exposure to harmful microbial contaminants. However, these chemical disinfectants can also react with organic and inorganic substances in the water to produce by-products that may be harmful to drinking water consumers, particularly some susceptible segments of the population. Therefore, drinking water treatment using chemical disinfectants involves a delicate balancing act, i.e., adding enough disinfectant to control harmful microorganisms but not enough to produce unacceptably high levels of regulated disinfection by-products (DBPs).

The USEPA has enacted several regulations impacting microbial control and production of DBPs in groundwater and surface water supplies for small and large public drinking water systems. These rules are referred to collectively as the Microbial/Disinfection By-Products (M/DBP) Rules. Microbial protection for consumers of drinking water from public supplies is considered

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

by provisions of current or pending rules listed below and discussed in more detail later in this chapter:

- Filter Backwash Recycling Rule (FBRR)
- Ground Water Rule (GWR)
- Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR)
- Long-Term 1 Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT1ESWTR)
- Long-Term 2 Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2ESWTR)
- Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection By-products Rule (Stage 1 DBPR)
- Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfection By-products Rule (Stage 2 DBPR)
- Surface Water Treatment Rule (SWTR)
- Total Coliform Rule (TCR)

Provisions of the Disinfectants and Disinfection By-products Rule (DBPR) are intended to protect drinking water consumers against the unintended public health consequences associated with consumption of treated drinking water containing residual disinfectants and DBPs produced from degradation of these residual disinfectants or reaction of disinfectants with organic and inorganic DBP precursors.

More details regarding the DBPR, including the current Stage 1 and 2 DBPR, are described in this chapter. Also included in the DBPR description is a brief discussion of some currently unregulated DBPs that are being heavily researched and may be the subject of future regulation. In the following discussion, the DBPR will be discussed first, followed by the microbial protection rules (SWTR, GWR, and TCR/DSR).

DBPR

The Stage 1 and 2 DBPR requirements discussed in the following sections focus first on two specific contaminants (TTHM and HAA5), and then on other aspects of these regulations dealing with control or removal of DBP precursors ("enhanced coagulation"), bromate, chlorite, and residual disinfectants.

Stage 1 DBPR—HAA5 and TTHM Provisions

The Stage 1 DBPR was published in 1998 and established an MCL of 0.080 mg/L for TTHM (the sum of four trihalomethanes, which are chloroform, bromodichloromethane, dibromochloromethane, and bromoform) and 0.060 mg/L for HAA5 (the sum of five specific haloacetic acids, which are mono-, di-, and tri-chloroacetic acids plus mono- and dibromoacetic acids). Although the MCLs for TTHM and HAA5 were officially written as 0.080 mg/L and 0.060 mg/L, respectively, the limits are commonly referred to as "80/60," or 80 µg/L and 60 µg/L. Although the numerical value of each MCL is an important consideration, an understanding of the methodology used to calculate the compliance value in order to compare it to this MCL is a subtle and equally important consideration in understanding compliance with the DBPR.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

For TTHM and HAA5, the compliance value is determined by monitoring the distribution system. Compliance monitoring locations need to be representative of the distribution system. Systems serving >10,000 persons that use surface water sources are required to monitor at least four locations per plant, meaning that distribution systems fed by more than one treatment plant must have at least four monitoring locations designated for each plant entry point.

The compliance monitoring location for systems with only one monitoring point must be representative of maximum residence time in the distribution system. A minimum of one out of every four compliance monitoring locations for systems with more locations must also be representative of maximum residence time. The other locations must be far enough away from the plant entry points to be representative of average residence time in the distribution system.

Unlike acute toxicity risks, for which the exposure could be a single glass of water, cancer risks like those believed to be linked to TTHM and HAA5 involve longer periods of exposure (daily glasses of water spanning decades). For chronic exposures such as these, exposure to an excessively high concentration of a given cancer-causing agent will not necessarily result in the consumer getting cancer from this source. Conversely, a consumer exposed to a lower concentration every day for a lifetime could be more likely to develop cancer. Therefore, regulation of DBPs to reduce cancer risks is *not* based on limiting exposure to a single incident (i.e., not a "single hit"), but rather is aimed at reducing the repeated exposure over time. In other words, DBP exposure needs to be evaluated on an average basis over time.

Under the Stage 1 DBPR, the compliance value for TTHM and HAA5 is determined by calculating a running annual average (RAA) during the previous 12 months for each DBP for all monitoring locations at each plant. Most systems are required to monitor quarterly (i.e., 4 times per year), although small groundwater systems (<10,000 persons) may be allowed to sample once a year. Typically, the RAA is based on 4 monitoring locations sampled quarterly, meaning RAA will be the average of 16 monitoring results each for HAA5 and TTHM.

Table 1-2 illustrates one facility's calculations of RAA for HAA5 that were used for Stage 1 compliance (this table also shows calculation of values for Stage 2 DBPR, which will be discussed later). It is important to reemphasize that compliance is based solely on the RAA, not on a single quarterly result at any one monitoring location. Consequently, it is *not* correct to refer to a single quarterly monitoring result above 60 µg/L for HAA5 or above 80 µg/L for TTHM as being above the MCL. Therefore, even though several individual monitoring values in Table 1-2 are greater than 60 µg/L, the facility is in compliance with the HAA5 MCL because the RAA is 45 µg/L for HAA5.

Utility personnel should be consistent and rigorous in their use of terminology when dealing with the general public or with state and local health officials, and should ensure that all people participating in these discussions are consistent in applying the MCL only to RAA values and do not make the

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

common mistake of referring to a single quarterly monitoring value as being "above the MCL."

Stage 2 DBPR—HAA5 and TTHM Provisions

The Stage 2 DBPR, published in 2006, is now in effect. This rule tightened requirements for DBPs, but compliance is not achieved by modifying the numerical value of the MCLs or by requiring monitoring of new constituents. Instead, the rule makes compliance more challenging than under the Stage 1 DBPR by (1) changing the way the compliance value is calculated and (2) changing the compliance monitoring locations to sites representative of the greatest potential for THM and HAA formation. These changes were made to ensure uniform compliance with the DBP standards across all areas of the distribution system, i.e., compliance is required at each sampling location.

The compliance value in the Stage 2 DBPR is called the *locational running annual average* (LRAA), and it is calculated by separately averaging the four quarterly samples at each monitoring location. Compliance is based on the maximum LRAA value (see Table 1-2). Furthermore, the Stage 2 DBPR included several interim steps that led to the replacement of many existing Stage 1 DBPR monitoring locations with new locations representative of the greatest potential for consumer exposure to high levels of TTHM and HAA5.

The Stage 2 DBPR required that facilities maintain compliance with the Stage 1 DBPR using the existing monitoring locations during the first three years after the final version of the Stage 2 DBPR was published. In the time period between the third and sixth year after the Stage 2 DBPR was published, compliance continues to be based on maintaining 80/60 (TTHM and HAA5) or lower for RAA; it also includes a requirement for maximum LRAA at existing Stage 1 monitoring locations. The long-term goal of the Stage 2 DBPR was to identify locations within the distribution system with the greatest potential for either TTHM or HAA5 formations and then base compliance on the LRAA at or below 80/60 for each of these locations. Many of these locations were identified during the initial distribution system evaluation (IDSE).

Table 1-2 Example RAA and LRAA calculations for Stage 1 and 2 DBPR

		Sampling Location, µg/L			
Year	**Quarter**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
1	3rd	52	68	63	66
1	4th	35	42	38	41
2	1st	47	49	42	43
2	2nd	18	42	45	37
LRAA		38	50	47	47
Maximum LRAA			50		
RAA			45		

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

The IDSE included monitoring, modeling, and/or other evaluations of drinking water distribution systems to identify locations representative of the greatest potential for consumer exposure to high levels of TTHM and HAA5. The goal of the IDSE was to evaluate a number of potential monitoring locations to justify selection of monitoring locations for long-term compliance (i.e., Stage 2B) with the Stage 2 DBPR.

One item to note regarding the Stage 2 DBPR as it applies to TTHM and HAA5 is that the goal was to find the locations in the distribution system where average annual levels of these DBPs are highest. TTHM formation increases as contact time with free or combined chlorine increases, although formation in presence of combined chlorine is limited. Therefore, establishing points in the distribution system with highest potential for TTHM formation is related to points with maximum water age. Utilities that have not performed a tracer study in the distribution system to determine water age should consider doing so.

By contrast, peak locations for HAA5 are more complicated because microorganisms in biofilm attached to distribution system pipe surfaces can biodegrade HAA5. Consequently, increasing formation of HAA5 over time is offset by biodegradation, eventually reaching a point where HAA5 levels decrease over time, even to the point where they drop to zero. Figure 1-1 shows gradual reduction in HAA5 formation over time in a distribution system, followed by eventual decrease of HAA5 as water age increases (water age measured in tracer test). In chloramination systems, HAA5 formation is limited. In fact, ammonium chloride is added as a quenching agent in HAA5 compliance samples in order to halt HAA5 formation prior to analysis (*Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater,* latest edition). Therefore, little additional HAA5 formation occurs after chloramination to offset HAA5 biodegradation occurring in the distribution system.

Enhanced Coagulation Requirement of the Stage 1 and 2 DBPR

The enhanced coagulation requirement has been developed to promote optimization of coagulation processes in conventional surface water treatment systems as required to improve removal of organic DBP precursors. The focus of the SWTR is separate from that of the enhanced coagulation requirement, with the former directed toward optimizing particle removal and the latter toward optimizing removal of natural organic matter (DBP precursors). Both promote efforts by water utilities to properly control and optimize coagulation processes and reduce DBP formation.

The enhanced coagulation requirements require treatment plants to remove specific percentages of total organic carbon (TOC) based on their source water TOC and alkalinity levels. Facilities must meet the enhanced coagulation requirements unless they meet any of the following exemptions (USEPA Stage 1 DBPR Guidance):

1. The PWS's source water TOC level is <2.0 mg/L, calculated quarterly as a running annual average.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013



Figure 1-1 Formation and decay of HAA5 in a distribution system (time estimated by fluoride tracer test—T_{100})

2. The PWS's treated water TOC level is <2.0 mg/L, calculated quarterly as a running annual average.
3. The PWS's source water TOC level is <4.0 mg/L, calculated quarterly as a running annual average; the source-water alkalinity is >60 mg/L (as $CaCO_3$), calculated quarterly as a running annual average; and either the TTHM and HAA5 running annual averages are no greater than 0.040 mg/L and 0.030 mg/L, respectively; or the PWS has made a clear and irrevocable financial commitment to use technologies that will limit the levels of TTHMs and HAA5 to no more than 0.040 mg/L and 0.030 mg/L, respectively.
4. The PWS's TTHM and HAA5 running annual averages are no greater than 0.040 mg/L and 0.030 mg/L, respectively; and the PWS uses only chlorine for primary disinfection and maintenance of a residual in the distribution system.
5. The PWS's source water specific ultraviolet absorption at 254 nm (SUVA), prior to any treatment and measured monthly, is ≤2.0 L/mg-m, calculated quarterly as a running annual average.
6. The PWS's finished-water SUVA, measured monthly, is ≤2.0 L/mg-m, calculated quarterly as a running annual average.

Additionally, alternative compliance criteria for softening systems include the following:

7. Softening that results in lowering the treated water alkalinity to <60 mg/L (as $CaCO_3$), measured monthly and calculated quarterly as a running annual average.

Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

8. Softening that results in removing at least 10 mg/L of magnesium hardness (as $CaCO_3$), measured monthly and calculated quarterly as a running annual average.

Utilities that cannot meet these avoidance criteria should know their enhanced coagulation endpoint, identified as the coagulant dosage and/or pH value that, when achieved, no longer produces significant TOC reduction. Specifically, when the source water TOC is not reduced by at least 0.3 mg/L with an incremental dosage increase of 10 mg/L alum (or equivalent ferric salt) and the pH value of the source reaches a value listed in Table 1-3, the enhanced coagulation endpoint has been reached.

If a utility is not exempt, a number of steps have to be evaluated relating to TOC removal, alkalinity of source water, range of source water TOC, required TOC removal for given source water characteristics, and several other factors.

Bromate

The bromate MCL from the Stage 1 DBPR remained at 0.010 mg/L for the Stage 2 DBPR. Bromate can be present in systems using ozone that have bromide present at the ozone application point. Bromate is also potentially formed during manufacture and storage of sodium hypochlorite. Consequently, systems using ozone for oxidation or disinfection are required to monitor once a month at distribution system entry point for bromate, but systems without ozone are not required to perform this monitoring. Systems that use ozone and that also add sodium hypochlorite will need to closely monitor the quality of these sodium hypochlorite products for bromate content.

Chlorite

Similar to bromate, chlorite monitoring is required only for systems using chlorine dioxide as an oxidant or disinfectant. Chlorite is a degradation product of chlorine dioxide. Chlorate is also a degradation product of chlorine dioxide but is not currently regulated. Chlorite and chlorate are potential degradation products of sodium hypochlorite, but systems using sodium hypochlorite are not required to monitor for chlorite unless they also use chlorine dioxide.

Table 1-3 Target pH values for coagulation when TOC removal rates are not sufficient

Alkalinity	pH Value
0–60	5.5
>60–120	6.3
>120–240	7.0
>240	7.5

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Monitoring for chlorite is more complicated than for bromate because chlorine dioxide will degrade and chlorite formation will increase over time. Therefore, chlorite monitoring requirements include daily monitoring at the distribution system entry point and monthly samples at three locations in the distribution system (first customer, average residence time, maximum residence time). Unlike the health risks for bromate, TTHM, and HAA5, the risk for chlorite requires compliance based on average of the three chlorite-monitoring locations each month. The Stage 1 DBPR MCL for chlorite is 1.0 mg/L.

Residual Disinfectants

The maximum residual disinfectant level (MRDL) for combined or total chlorine is 4.0 mg/L as Cl_2. These are based on the same data used to monitor minimum free and combined chlorine levels in the distribution system as required by the SWTR, using the same monitoring locations used for the TCR. Chlorine dioxide residual also has an MRDL of 0.8 mg/L as ClO_2, based on daily samples at the treatment plant.

Surface Water Treatment Rule

IESWTR and LT1ESWTR

The goal of the IESWTR is to limit human exposure with harmful organisms, including *Cryptosporidium*, by promoting achievement of particle and turbidity removal targets for surface water treatment systems. Among IESWTR requirements that apply to surface water treatment plants are the following:

- Combined filter effluent turbidity must be ≤0.3 ntu for 95 percent of samples collected each month, including none with >1 ntu (compliance based on combined filter effluent samples collected at four-hour intervals during entire month).
- Utility must monitor each individual filter for turbidity at 15-minute intervals and must report results, including a filter profile (graphical representation of filter performance), if either of the following two conditions are met: (1) turbidity in any filter for two consecutive 15-minute intervals exceeds 1 ntu or (2) turbidity during first four hours of a given filter run exceeds 0.5 ntu for two consecutive 15-minute samples. Results must be reported within 10 days of the end of the month.
- Any newly constructed finished water reservoirs must include covers to keep out dust, debris, birds, etc.
- Utility must complete sanitary survey every three years. Existing surveys conducted after December 1995 can be used if they meet minimum requirements. Variances can be granted to decrease frequency to five years. The IESWTR explicitly requires that sanitary surveys include efforts to evaluate and control *Cryptosporidium*, in addition to other target organisms.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

- Systems where the average of quarterly TTHM or HAA5 values exceeds 64 and 48 µg/L, respectively, need to complete disinfection profiling and benchmarking. *Profiling* involves determination of $C \times T$ values for each segment of treatment plant (see later discussion). *Benchmarking* involves determining lowest monthly average during 12-month monitoring of *Giardia* and virus inactivation. This procedure is required for any systems that are considering a major change to their disinfection practice. Consultation with the primacy agency is also required before any disinfection change.
- Turbidity monitoring records must be maintained for a minimum of three years.

Facilities in compliance with these requirements, chiefly the turbidity monitoring provisions, are designated by the IESWTR to have provided 2-log virus removal, 2.5-log *Giardia* removal, and 2-log *Cryptosporidium* removal. Literature and other information cited in the IESWTR final rule indicate that these credits are conservative, and most facilities meeting these requirements are probably achieving far greater levels of virus, *Giardia*, and *Cryptosporidium* removal than the minimum credits previously cited. The level of *Cryptosporidium* protection cited is sufficient to meet all requirements of the IESWTR, but the rule requires a total of 3.0 credits for *Giardia* and 4.0 credits for viruses. The additional credits (0.5-log for *Giardia* and 2-log for viruses) are required to be achieved by disinfection with free chlorine, chloramines, ozone, or chlorine dioxide by meeting *CT* requirements described later in this chapter.

Provisions of the IESWTR apply to large systems (>10,000 persons) using surface water sources. However, similar provisions are applied to smaller surface water systems (<10,000 persons), as outlined in the LT1ESWTR. The objectives of the LT1ESWTR and IESWTR are identical, though some of the compliance deadlines and other regulatory provisions are slightly different based on greater financial and personnel resources for larger systems.

Sanitary Surveys

Sanitary surveys are a requirement of the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR). A sanitary survey is "an onsite review of the water source, facilities, equipment, operation, and maintenance of the public water system for the purpose of evaluating the adequacy of such source, facilities, equipment, operation, and maintenance for producing and distributing safe drinking water." Surveys are usually performed by the state primacy agency and are required of all surface water systems and groundwater systems under the direct influence of surface water.

These surveys are typically divided into eight main sections, although some state primacy groups may have more.

1. Water sources
2. Water treatment process
3. Water supply pumps and pumping facilities

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

4. Storage facilities
5. Distribution systems
6. Monitoring, reporting, and data verification
7. Water system management and operations
8. Operator compliance with state requirements

Sanitary surveys are required on a periodic basis usually every three years. Surveys may be comprehensive or focused according to the regulatory agency requirements.

CT Requirements

Every water system that uses surface water as a source must meet treatment technique requirements for the removal and/or inactivation of *Giardia*, viruses, *Legionella*, and other bacteria. Because these pathogens are not easily identified in the laboratory on a routine basis, USEPA has set quality goals in lieu of MCLs in this instance. Meeting SWTR treatment technique goals demonstrates all or part of the required microbial protection, as previously noted, but additional protection is required through the use of approved disinfection treatment chemicals. The effectiveness of disinfection depends on the type of disinfectant chemical used, the residual concentration, the amount of time the disinfectant is in contact with the water, the water temperature, and, when chlorine is used, the pH of the water.

According to USEPA, a combination of the residual concentration, C, of a disinfectant (in milligrams per liter) multiplied by the contact time, T (in minutes), can be used as a measure of the disinfectant's effectiveness in killing or inactivating microorganisms. For water plant operators, this means that high residuals held for a short amount of time or low residuals held for a long period of time will produce similar results. Water plants are required to provide this computation daily, and it must always be higher than the required minimum value.

LT2ESWTR

The Long-Term 2 Enhanced SWTR (LT2ESWTR) supplements SWTR requirements contained in the IESWTR for large surface water systems (>10,000 persons) and the Long-Term 1 Enhanced SWTR (LT1ESWTR) for small systems (<10,000 persons). Details of the rules can be reviewed in the *Federal Register* or at the USEPA website (http://water.epa.gov/drink/index.cfm). One of the key elements of the LT2ESWTR was the use of *Cryptosporidium* monitoring results to classify surface water sources into one of four USEPA-defined risk levels called "bins." Facilities in the lowest bin (bin 1) are required to maintain compliance with the current IESWTR. Facilities in higher bins (bins 2 to 4) are required to either (1) provide additional *Cryptosporidium* protection from new facilities or programs not currently in use at a facility or (2) demonstrate greater *Cryptosporidium* protection capabilities of existing facilities and programs using a group of USEPA-approved

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

treatment technologies, watershed programs, and demonstration studies, referred to collectively as the *Microbial Toolbox*.

Implementation of the LT2ESWTR was phased over many years according to system size. Four separate size categories were established (schedules 1–4 with 4 being the smallest <10,000 population) for implementing the rule. The rule for schedule-4 systems allows filtered supplies to perform initial monitoring for fecal coliform to determine if *Cryptosporidium* monitoring is required.

Filter Backwash Recycle Rule (FBRR)

The FBRR currently applies to systems of all sizes and is intended to help utilities minimize potential health risks associated with recycle, particularly associated with respect to *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium*. Other contaminants of concern in the recycle stream include suspended solids (turbidity), dissolved metals (especially iron and manganese), and dissolved organic carbon. Plants that control recycle will also help minimize operational problems.

Prior to the FBRR, no USEPA regulation governed recycle. Regulations within the United States regarding recycle had been established by the states, if at all. State regulatory approaches varied from a requirement of equalization of two backwashes in Illinois to 80 percent solids removal prior to recycle and maintaining recycle flows at less than 10 percent of raw water flow in California. Virginia discourages recycling.

Key components of the FBRR include (1) recycle must reenter the treatment process *prior* to primary coagulant addition, (2) direct filtration plants must report their recycle practices to the state and may need to treat their recycle streams, and (3) a self-assessment must be done at those plants that use direct recycle (i.e., no separate equalization and/or treatment of recycle stream) and that operate fewer than 20 filters. The goal of the self-assessment is to determine if the design capacity of the plant is exceeded due to recycle practices.

GWR

The USEPA promulgated the final Ground Water Rule (GWR) in October 2006 to reduce the risk of exposure to fecal contamination that may be present in public water systems that use groundwater sources. The rule establishes a risk-targeted strategy to identify groundwater systems that are at high risk for fecal contamination. The GWR also specifies when corrective action (which may include disinfection) is required to protect consumers who receive water from groundwater systems from bacteria and viruses.

A sanitary survey is required, by the state primacy agency, at regular intervals depending on the condition of the water system as determined in the initial survey. Systems found to be at high risk for fecal contamination are required to provide 4-log inactivation of viruses. Increased monitoring for fecal contamination indicators may be required by the regulatory authority.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

TCR and RTCR

The Total Coliform Rule (TCR) was finalized in 1989. The objective of the TCR is to promote routine surveillance of distribution system water quality to search for contamination from fecal matter and/or disease-causing bacteria. All points in a distribution system cannot be monitored, and complete absence of fecal matter and disease-causing bacteria cannot be ensured. The TCR is a regulatory approach for the implementation of monitoring programs sufficient to verify that public health is being protected as much as possible, as well as allowing utilities to identify any potential contamination problems in their distribution system. The rule requires monthly sampling at each distribution sampling point.

If a routine monthly sample is total coliform (TC) positive, the utility must determine fecal coliform (FC) or *Escherichia coli* (EC) in the same sample and also must perform verification monitoring by collecting a second sample and reanalyzing TC and FC/EC within 24 hours. The system is not in compliance if either of the following occurs: (1) if analysis and reanalysis of a given sampling location are TC positive (TC[+]) both times and FC[/EC+] at least one of these times or (2) if more than 5 percent of all monthly samples for a 12-month period are TC[+].

The TCR, and the Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR) that was finalized in 2013, impact all systems. The RTCR requires public water systems that are vulnerable to microbial contamination to identify and fix problems. The RTCR also established criteria for systems to qualify for and stay on reduced monitoring, thereby providing incentives for improved water system operation.

The RTCR also changed monitoring frequencies for some systems. It links monitoring frequency to water quality and system performance and provides criteria that well-operated small systems must meet to qualify and stay on reduced monitoring. It also requires increased monitoring for high-risk small systems with unacceptable compliance history and establishes some new monitoring requirements for seasonal systems such as state and national parks.

The RTCR rule further establishes an MCLG and an MCL for *E. coli* and eliminated the MCLG and MCL for total coliform, replacing it with a treatment technique for coliform that requires assessment and corrective action. The rule establishes an MCLG and an MCL of zero for *E. coli*, a more specific indicator of fecal contamination and potentially harmful pathogens than total coliform. USEPA has removed the MCLG and MCL of zero for total coliform. Many of the organisms detected by total coliform methods are not of fecal origin and do not have any direct public health implication.

Under the treatment technique for coliform, total coliform serves as an indicator of a potential pathway of contamination into the distribution system. A PWS that exceeds a specified frequency of total coliform occurrence must conduct an assessment to determine if any sanitary defects exist and,

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

if found, correct them. In addition a PWS that incurs an *E. coli* MCL violation must conduct an assessment and correct any sanitary defects found.

The rule eliminated monthly public notification requirements based only on the presence of total coliforms. Total coliforms in the distribution system may indicate a potential pathway for contamination but in and of themselves do not indicate a health threat. Instead, the rule requires public notification when an *E. coli* MCL violation occurs, indicating a potential health threat, or when a PWS fails to conduct the required assessment and corrective action.

Lead and Copper Rule

Regulation

The objective of the Lead and Copper Rule (LCR) is to control corrosiveness of the finished water in drinking water distribution systems to limit the amount of lead (Pb) and copper (Cu) that may be leached from certain metal pipes and fittings in the distribution system. Of particular concern are pipes and fittings connecting the household tap to the distribution system service line at individual homes or businesses, especially because water can remain stagnant in these service lines for long periods of time, increasing the potential to leach Pb, Cu, and other metals. Although the utility is not responsible for maintaining and/or replacing these household connections, they are responsible for controlling pH and corrosiveness of the water delivered to the consumers.

Details of the LCR include the following:

- The LCR became effective Dec. 7, 1992.
- The action level for Pb is 0.015 mg/L and for Cu is 1.3 mg/L.
- A utility is in compliance at each sampling event (frequency discussed below) when <10 percent of the distribution system samples are above the action levels for Pb and Cu (i.e., 90th percentile value for sampling event must be below action level).
- Utilities found not to be in compliance must modify water treatment until they are in compliance. The term *action level* is used rather than *MCL* because noncompliance (i.e., exceeding an action level) triggers a need for modifications in treatment.

After identifying sampling locations and determining initial tap water Pb and Cu levels at each of these locations, utilities must also monitor other water quality parameters (WQPs) at these same locations as needed to monitor and evaluate corrosion control characteristics of treated water. The only exemptions from analysis of these WQPs are systems serving less than 50,000 people for which Pb and Cu levels in initial samples are below action levels.

Pb, Cu, and WQPs are initially collected at 6-month intervals, and then this frequency can be reduced if action levels are not exceeded and optimal water treatment is maintained. Systems that are in noncompliance and are

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

performing additional corrosion-control activities must continue to monitor at six-month intervals, plus they must collect WQPs from distribution system entry points every two weeks.

Each utility must complete a survey and evaluate materials that comprise their distribution system, in addition to using other available information, to target homes that are at high risk for Pb/Cu contamination.

Revisions to the Lead and Copper Rule were enacted in 2007. These clarifications to the existing rule were made in seven areas:

- Minimum number of samples required
- Definitions for compliance and monitoring periods
- Reduced monitoring criteria
- Consumer notice of lead tap water monitoring results
- Advanced notification and approval of long-term treatment changes
- Public education requirements
- Reevaluation of lead service lines

Consult your local regulatory agency for those revisions that are applicable to your system.

Phase I, II, and V Contaminants

Regulations

The Phase I, II, and V regulations were finalized in 1989, 1992, and 1995, respectively, and include various inorganic and organic contaminants. Sampling and reporting frequency vary with constituent, though sampling is typically required once every three years after the initial sampling period. Variances or waivers are possible for a number of constituents based on analytical results and/or a vulnerability assessment.

Public Notification Rule

USEPA has implemented a regulation called the *Public Notification Rule*. This rule is separate from the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) Rule. The Public Notification Rule includes requirements for reporting certain water quality monitoring violations and other water quality incidents, as well as requirements for the timing, distribution, and language of the public notices. For example, the Public Notification Rule includes requirements that some incidents be reported within 24 hours, others within 30 days, and others included as part of the annual CCR. Some of these reporting requirements are more stringent than those currently required by USEPA. The regulation also includes requirements regarding how notices are to be distributed/broadcast (i.e., TV, radio, newspaper, hand delivery, regular mail, etc.), the format of the notices, the wording of certain items in the notice, and the need to include information in languages other than English.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Public notification according to the rule might include:

- Templates, or model notices, to be available for adaptation for certain potential incidents.
- Consolidated and updated lists of phone numbers and contacts for government (local, county, state), regulatory agencies, hospitals, radio and TV, newspapers, etc., that should be contacted per requirements of the Public Notification Rule.
- Checklists and flow diagrams outlining activities that would need to be completed for certain potential events outlined in the regulation.
- Identification of key personnel and what their roles and responsibilities would be to respond as required by the regulation.
- A plan to periodically review and update all lists, templates, and other aspects of a response plan every year or when/if the Public Notification Rule is modified by future federal or state regulations.

Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule

The 1996 amendments to the SDWA require USEPA to establish criteria for a monitoring program for currently unregulated contaminants to generate data that USEPA can use to evaluate and prioritize contaminants that could potentially be regulated in the future. USEPA has developed three cycles of the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR):

1. UMCR1 in 1999
2. UMCR2 in 2007
3. UCMR3 in 2012

Failing to (1) perform required sampling and analysis, (2) use the appropriate analytical procedures, or (3) report these results are violations of the UCMR. However, the numerical results of these analytical efforts cannot result in a violation because none of the constituents in the UCMR are currently regulated (i.e., no MCLs, action levels, or other standards apply).

Although the UCMR contaminants have no standards associated with them, the data from this monitoring will need to be reported in the annual CCR. Therefore, the CCR will need to address implications of any constituents found above detection limits. Reporting UCMR results in the CCR would also fulfill the notification requirements for "unregulated contaminants" included in the recently promulgated Public Notification Rule.

Note that the UCMR is an ongoing part of the regulatory development process that will be repeated every five years. Utilities will be performing similar mandatory sampling for a new list of constituents every five years.

The third Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR3) was signed by USEPA Administrator Lisa P. Jackson on April 16, 2012. As finalized, UCMR3 will require monitoring for 30 contaminants using USEPA and/or consensus organization analytical methods during 2013-2015. Together USEPA, states, laboratories, and public water systems (PWSs) will participate in UCMR3.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Operator Certification

Amendments to the 1996 SDWA required USEPA to develop national guidance for operator certification. The final rule was published on Feb. 5, 1999, and became effective on Feb. 5, 2001. State operator certification programs were required to address nine baseline standards, including operator qualifications, certification renewal, and program review. Indirect impacts of the rule on most water utilities include availability of Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) money and perhaps some slight modifications in paperwork/record-keeping requirements.

Arsenic

The MCL for arsenic was reduced from 50 µg/L to 10 µg/L in the *Federal Register* published on Jan. 22, 2001. This was the second time USEPA has established an MCL that was higher than the technically feasible level (3 µg/L), with the first being the uranium rule in 2000. The original SDWA required the MCL to be set as close to the health goal (zero for arsenic and all other suspected carcinogens) as technically feasible. Amendments to the SDWA allowed USEPA the discretion to set the MCL above the technically feasible level.

The final rule, including the revised MCL, became effective three years after the rule was published.

Radionuclides Rule

The Radionuclide Rule was published in December 2000. In the final rule, USEPA maintained the gross alpha MCL at 15 pCi/L MCL, 4 mrem/yr for beta emitters, 4 mrem/yr for photon emitters, and 5 pCi/L for combined radium 226 and 228 isotopes, and an MCL for uranium of 30 µg/L.

Analytical Methods

Each of the individual USEPA regulations contains their own information regarding analytical methods approved for compliance monitoring. These and other approved analytical methods are compiled in a final rule titled "Analytical Methods for Chemical and Microbiological Contaminants and Revisions to Laboratory Certification Requirements" published Dec. 1, 1999. These analytical methods were approved for compliance monitoring effective Jan. 3, 2000. The USEPA-approved methods include analytical procedures developed by USEPA, plus procedures developed by others that USEPA endorses, including specific procedures developed by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) and some specific procedures included in *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, published jointly by the American Public Health Association (APHA), AWWA, and the Water Environment Federation (WEF).

Currently, only approved analytical methods can be used for compliance monitoring. In the future, USEPA hopes to implement a performance-based

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

measurement system that will allow utilities to use alternative screening methods instead of requiring only USEPA-approved reference methods. The 1996 SDWA Amendments require USEPA to review new analytical methods that may be used for the screening and analysis of regulated contaminants. After this review, USEPA may approve methods that may be more accurate or cost-effective than established methods for compliance monitoring. These screening methods are expected to provide flexibility in compliance monitoring and may be better and/or faster than existing analytical methods.

The approval of new drinking water analytical methods can be announced through an expedited process in the *Federal Register*. This allows laboratories and water systems more timely access to new alternative testing methods than the traditional rulemaking process. If alternate test procedures have the same or better performance of the approved methods, they can be considered for approval using the expedited process.

OPERATIONAL VIEWS OF CERTAIN CONTAMINANTS

Turbidity

Turbidity is the measure of the amount of particulate material in water. It is measured by detecting the amount of light scattered by the particles in a water sample. Turbidity is used as an indicator of water quality and as an indicator of the efficiency of certain removal processes such as coagulation and filtration. Adequate removal of turbidity is an important step in the process of removing pathogens. Although the turbidity measurement provides no information about the nature of the particles it measures, turbidity is considered very important and is thus regulated as a treatment technique. Optimization efforts, such as those found in the Partnership for Safe Water, are designed around the optimization of turbidity removal. High turbidity levels can make the disinfection process less efficient by creating higher disinfectant demand. Higher turbidities may also protect coliforms from disinfection by absorbing or encasing them.

Pathogen passage can be related to turbidity events (spiking) in the finished water. The minimization of the frequency and magnitude of spiking should be a top priority in water treatment. Operators should view any event of individual filter turbidity spiking as a potential for the passage of harmful pathogens into the water column. Each event should be analyzed for cause, and a plan for the elimination of the cause(s) should be implemented. Most filter-spiking events can be traced to operator involvement, unless plant inadequacies exist that make it impossible for water to be treated at times.

TOC

TOC is a composite measure of the organic content of the water. It is important for water suppliers to measure this contaminant because its presence

Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

and amount correlate to the production of DBPs. TOC can be removed in the coagulation/settling/filtration process, and removal efficiencies for this contaminant are regulated.

The challenge for treatment plant operators is to strike a balance between removal of TOC with traditional pH-lowering methods (more coagulant, more acid) and the need to maintain compliance levels with the LCR. Also, site-specific requirements for residuals disposal can be affected by the use of more coagulant for TOC removal. Especially difficult are the choices that operators consider when, although they are in compliance with DBP MCLs, they know they can achieve better results with more TOC removal through addition of more coagulant.

Waterborne Pathogens

Disease-causing organisms, called *pathogens*, include all of the problem-causing bacteria, viruses, protozoa, and algae. Well-known diseases caused by these organisms include typhoid fever, cholera, Legionnaires' disease, peptic ulcers, hepatitis, giardiasis, cryptosporidiosis, gastroenteritis—the list goes on. All of these pathogens can be found in natural surface water supplies and therefore can invade the treated water supply in sufficient numbers that will cause disease in the consumer. Even groundwater supplies may come under the influence of surface water and therefore be contaminated. Typically, pathogen exposure presents an acute risk rather than a chronic risk, and the detected presence of them or their surrogates will bring on boil-water notices. Given that some consumers are temporarily or permanently less immune than other consumers, pathogen removal is among the most important tasks confronting the water plant operator.

Bacteria, which are organisms that can cause severe illness in people, are usually minimized by conventional water treatment processes. They can exist in wide variations of temperature and water quality ranges, and some bacteria can pass through the water treatment plant and find their way to the consumer in small numbers. *Legionella* is such an example of an organism that can occur in the finished waters of systems employing full treatment. Of particular interest to water plant operators is the group of bacteria called *coliforms*. These organisms are used as indicator bacteria because they are easily cultured in the laboratory and can be an indicator of the presence of other more-difficult-to-culture bacteria.

Viruses, which are smaller organisms than bacteria, can also cause a number of debilitating diseases, including hepatitis and polio. They are difficult to culture, even in the most sophisticated laboratories. Fortunately, most viruses are removed or inactivated by conventional water treatment practices. The lime-softening process is very effective against viruses because of the high pH employed, and maintaining proper *CT* values improves disinfection of viruses.

Protozoa are larger than bacteria and can be very resistant to disinfection because of their ability to form spores or cysts that have tough outer

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

casings. The notable protozoa that water plant operators deal with are *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium*. These two organisms are found in nature and are typically removed in the filtration process. *Giardia* can be inactivated by sufficient $C \times T$ values employing chlorine, but *Cryptosporidium* is considered to be resistant to chlorine at levels far greater than those typically used in water treatment plants. The IESWTR regulates these two organisms (see text in this chapter) by requiring treatment techniques. When the treatment techniques are met, the utility is given "credit" for removal of *Cryptosporidium* and removal/inactivation of the *Giardia*. This credit must be achieved continually as the plant operates. Failure to meet the treatment technique results in boil-water notices.

Algae do not typically pose a health concern for humans, although some may produce neurotoxins and hepatoxins that can be of concern. The more frequent problems caused by algae are taste-and-odor episodes and filter-clogging episodes. Algae are difficult to coagulate and filter, and it is common for them to pass through filters in high numbers. Because of this, it is often more practical to prevent algae from growing than it is to remove them once they are in the plant.

Inorganic Chemical Contaminants

The inorganic chemical contaminants found in water supplies may be found as naturally occurring in the source or they may appear in the water through contact with the piping and storage components of the system. The chemical treatment process can also add to inorganic contamination. These chemicals in water can present chronic health problems at low levels and can also cause acute distress when ingested in high doses.

Many inorganic chemical contaminants have MCLs associated with them. Of notable exception are lead and copper, which carry action levels, as explained previously in the chapter. Most are regulated at the entry point to the distribution system, again with lead and copper being the exception. Iron and manganese are of special interest to the operator because of the staining problems they can create on fixtures. Removal of these nuisance contaminants is detailed in chapters 4 and 10. Nitrates are regulated with an MCL of 10 mg/L because they are believed to cause problems with the circulatory systems of infants.

Fluoride (see chapter 10) is an inorganic constituent with an interesting role in the water treatment business. Its presence in water is required by most states and communities (there are exceptions), but it is also a regulated contaminant. Adding to the confusion is the fact that fluoride carries with it both an MCL and an SMCL. The water plant operator, therefore, is confronted with the problem of adding a regulated contaminant to the water and then carefully controlling the amount that is added. The MCL for fluoride is 4.0 mg/L, and the SMCL is 2.0 mg/L. High levels of fluoride can cause mottling of the enamel of the teeth. Still higher levels can be poisonous to humans.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

DBPs

Chlorine has played the primary role in disinfection of PWSs, but chlorine dioxide, ozone, and chloramines are also used. The use of these disinfectants can cause the formation of DBPs, as previously discussed. A number of these by-products are probably carcinogens and may cause other toxic effects. The rules governing the limitation of the DBPs set limits based on chronic exposure and tend to be regulated as averages for occurrence. The challenge for operators is to maintain adequate disinfection levels for microbiological protection while providing a water that is low in the by-products created in the disinfection process.

Chief among the DBPs (where chlorination is used) is the occurrence of THMs (see chapter 8), but the HAAs are also currently regulated. In time, other DBPs are expected to be regulated as health-effects data are brought forth.

When ozone is used as a primary disinfectant, there are potential concerns with bromate and formaldehyde production.

REGULATORY CHANGES

There is no doubt that regulations will continue to change based on results of research and a better understanding of the health consequences of various contaminants. Water plant operators must keep abreast of the latest developments and be prepared to adjust to these regulations. Water system operators will occasionally be presented with a dilemma when new research indicates that an unregulated contaminant may be harmful and it is found (perhaps in a very low concentration) in their water supply. What should the water utility tell its customers about this situation? Each utility should develop a communications plan and have it ready for this almost inevitable circumstance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AWWA. 2010. Principles and Practices of Water Supply Operations—*Water Treatment*, 4th ed. Denver, Colo.: American Water Works Association

Brown, R.A. 2004. Environmental Engineering and Technology Inc., Internal communication to author. December.

Edzwald, J.K., ed. 2011. *Water Quality and Treatment*, 6th ed. New York: American Water Works Association and McGraw-Hill.

Pizzi, N.G., and M. Rodgers. 2000. Testing Your Enhanced Coagulation Endpoint. *Opflow*, 26(2).

USEPA. Office of Groundwater and Drinking Water, website, http://water.epa.gov/drink/index.cfm

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

USEPA. 1993. *Guidance Manual for Compliance With the Filtration and Disinfection Requirements for Public Water Systems Using Surface Water Sources*, Appendix E. Science and Technology Branch, Criteria and Standards Division, Office of Drinking Water, USEPA.

USEPA. Guidance on Ground Water Rule (GWR). http://www.epa.gov/ogwdw/disinfection/gwr/pdfs/fs_gwr_finalrule.pdf

USEPA. Guidance on Total Coliform Rule. http://www.epa.gov/safewater/disinfection/tcr/pdfs/RTCR%20draft%20fact%20sheet%2061710.pdf

USEPA Final Implementation Guidance for the Stage 1 Disinfectants/Disinfection Byproducts Rule. http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/rulesregs/sdwa/stage1/upload/s1dbprimplguid.pdf

USEPA LT2ESWTR Toolbox Guidance Manual. http://www.wqts.com/pdf/2003-01_LT2_ESWTR_Toolbox.pdf

USEPA. 1999. Guidance Manual for Conducting Sanitary Surveys of Public Water Systems; Surface Water and Ground Water Under the Direct Influence (GWUDI). Washington D.C: USEPA. June 22, 2009. http://www.epa.gov/OGWDW/mdbp/pdf/sansurv/sansurv.pdf

USEPA. 2004. Assessing Capacity Through Sanitary Surveys. Washington D.C.: USEPA: Drinking Water Academy. June 22, 2009. http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwa/electronic/presentations/pwss/assesscapacity.pdf

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Chapter 2

Source Water

The earth's water is ancient. All that is on the surface of the earth, and all that is hidden below ground, has existed since the beginning of time. This water moves in a constant cycle from the surface of the earth to the atmosphere by the processes of evaporation and transpiration and moves back to the earth by the processes of condensation and precipitation. Some of the water that falls back to earth percolates into the soil and becomes groundwater, while other water stays on the surface in lakes and streams. This constant recycling of water is called *the hydrologic cycle* (Figure 2-1). This cycle is important to water plant operators because the sources of supply that they draw from can only be replenished by the hydrologic cycle. Knowledge of this replenishment process provides a sense of how fragile the cycle really is and the need for conservation and stewardship of this precious resource.

Source water assessment is crucial when choosing treatment options that are designed into a water plant. The reliability of the processes that are ultimately chosen will be based on the historical water quality of the source when available. If the source is newly developed, great care must be taken to characterize it before the design concepts are realized. The resulting design must provide the water plant with the capability to provide consistent water quality that meets all applicable regulations and standards or goals.

Source water management techniques help operators because water management tends to minimize problems that may occur later in the treatment plant. It is often easier and more economical to protect the supply source from contamination than it is to deal with the contamination after it enters the plant. Source water protection, which is discussed later in this chapter, is the first barrier of a multiple-barrier approach to water quality.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013



Figure 2-1 The hydrologic cycle

SOURCES OF WATER

Groundwater

Water that has percolated into the soil or seeped into the ground from streams and other surface sources is called *groundwater*. Water will continue to seep downward into soil until it reaches an impervious rock or clay formation. It then fills the voids of the soil or sand above the impervious cap and is referred to as an *aquifer*. If more water percolates through the soil, excess will accumulate in a zone of saturation, the top of which is called the *water table* (Figure 2-2). As long as water continues to fall into this area faster than it is taken away, the aquifer will yield a source of supply. Aquifers can be quite large, holding billions of gallons of underground water. Nevertheless, large cities and populations are capable of using this source so quickly that the water table can drop. In arid regions of the southwestern United States, this is a serious problem as the population migrates to these areas and makes more demands for water. Without adequate rainfall to replenish the aquifer, supply dwindles and conservation measures must be implemented.

Excessive withdrawal may impact the water quality of the aquifer. Examples are chronic seawater infiltration in the New York and New Jersey areas, as well as coastal Florida and California. Excessive amounts of iron and manganese can also be drawn into the influence of a well if it is operated at higher than normal rates.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013



Figure 2-2 Schematic of a water table showing saturated zone

Groundwater occurs in two different kinds of aquifers: *unconfined and confined*. An unconfined aquifer, sometimes called a *water-table aquifer*, has an upper surface that is free to rise and fall with incoming and outgoing water (Figure 2-3). Wells constructed to draw from these sources can vary in their ability to yield a specific flow. A confined aquifer has an upper impermeable layer or a layer with low permeability. These aquifers are recharged at an elevation higher than the main portion of the aquifer. They are called *artesian aquifers* (Figure 2-4), and the water in them is usually under pressure. When these pressurized water tables intersect with the ground surface, they are called *springs*.

The nature and physical properties of the aquifer are important to the operator. The soil that holds the water will be porous to some degree. The more porous the soil, the more it will hold per unit volume. Also, the size of the soil particles will greatly influence the water's ability to move through the aquifer. Large-grained, sandy aquifers will allow water to move more freely than will smaller-sized sands, and pumping costs will be less. Some aquifers are made of limestone or fractured rock, and channels develop in them through which water can flow.



Figure 2-3 Schematic of an unconfined aquifer

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013



Figure 2-4 Schematic of an artesian aquifer

Though it is tempting to think of groundwater as free from microbial contaminants, it can become contaminated in many ways or come under the influence of contaminated surface waters. In 1989, the Surface Water Treatment Rule (SWTR) mandated that groundwater under the influence of surface water be treated similarly to surface water and that operators provide treatment techniques for microbiological contamination. In May 2000, the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) proposed the Ground Water Rule, which targets the nation's groundwater supplies. It passed into legislation in October 2006. USEPA is determining, among other things, the amount of risk due to fecal contamination of these sources. Systems that are shown to be at risk for fecal contamination will be required to provide 4-log inactivation of viruses (99.99% removal). The USEPA is conducting surveys of the more than 147,000 groundwater systems in the United States and is looking at eight critical components to protect the public health. Corrective actions are required for any system with a significant deficiency or source water fecal contamination. The system must implement one or more of the following correction action options:

- correct all significant deficiencies,
- eliminate the source of contamination,
- provide an alternative source of water, or

Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

- provide treatment that reliably achieves 99.99 percent (4-log) inactivation or removal of viruses.

The 1986 Amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) called on each state to develop a wellhead protection program (WPP). This legislation established a national program to encourage states to develop systematic and comprehensive programs to protect public water supply wells fed by groundwater and well fields within their jurisdiction from contamination. (Certain WPP components are required to be implemented by states under the Source Water Assessment Program [SWAP], which was a part of the 1996 SDWA Amendments.) States encourage municipalities to participate and to exercise individual discretion in developing methods for protecting groundwater used for drinking water. The Source Water Protection Program (SWPP) incorporates surface water systems and is very similar to the WPP.

Watershed Sanitary Surveys

Sanitary surveys were discussed in chapter 1. However, some states require separate surveys that are focused on watershed issues. These are often incorporated into broader sanitary surveys but not always. Watershed surveys assess the adequacy of supply and examine the potential for contamination and may suggest protection strategies. Determining the capacity to sustain a viable, safe, water supply is a major outcome of these surveys.

Surface Water

Water found in lakes and streams is referred to as *surface water*. The availability and quality of this source of supply varies greatly by location. All surface supplies are assumed to be microbiologically or biologically contaminated to some degree and require some form of treatment prior to human consumption. The source for most surface supplies comes from precipitation—either rain or snow. Because the atmosphere contains a considerable amount of suspended impurities from volcanic activity and wind-blown soil, rain and snow become contaminated as they fall to earth. The amounts and types of impurities will vary by region.

When precipitation collects in lakes and streams, it becomes further contaminated as it travels over the terrain. It dissolves hardness-bearing minerals and can be subject to runoff conditions that may bring biological constituents to the water. As it passes over areas with organic content, the water collects natural organic matter (NOM), which is a precursor to disinfection by-products (DBPs).

Surface water can be soft or hard and may require different treatment for this characteristic. All surface water supplies require filtration and disinfection unless they can show certain avoidance criteria for filtration, as outlined in the SWTR and Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (see chapter 1). All surface supplies must be disinfected.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Water Impoundment Management

Some utilities construct impoundment reservoirs or use water from naturally occurring reservoirs that are fed from surface streams or that catch precipitation. Constructed reservoirs serve several useful purposes. They can store amounts of water in excess of daily demand and therefore act as a hedge against drought conditions. They can serve as pretreatment reservoirs when aeration systems or chemical treatment are added, or they may be used simply as large settling ponds prior to treatment. Reservoirs also allow the operator to draw water from nearby streams for storage. In this way, water can be pumped from the stream on days when water quality is excellent. When quality is poor, such as after a rainstorm or when there is an upstream spill, pumping can be discontinued if the reservoir is large enough to store sufficient water for treatment. When conditions return to normal, pumping from the stream can resume.

Reservoirs can also be a source of water quality problems because they are exposed to the elements. Sunlight penetration into the depths of the reservoir can promote algal growth, which causes taste-and-odor problems. Runoff from the ground can bring with it chemical and biological contaminants. Extreme wet and dry conditions affect water quality. For example, heavy precipitation can resuspend bottom sediments and increase turbidity. This can load the treatment plant with huge amounts of solids, making treatment expensive and management of residuals difficult. Drought conditions can cause stagnation and minimize the otherwise healthy dilution of contaminants because of low water levels.

The depth of a lake or reservoir is subject to two conditions that can impact source water quality. The location of the intake with respect to these depths is important. The first condition, known as the trophic cycle, involves three stages where nutrients and biological activity influence water quality. The *oligotrophic* stage is associated with low nutrients and limited algal production and biological activity. The *mesotrophic* stage involves a moderate amount of these constituents, and the *eutrophic* stage is rich in nutrients and biological activity. This eutrophic stage is associated with low oxygen levels, high turbidity and color, and NOM. Because oxygen is depleted, usually by algae, an anoxic condition can develop. This creates a reducing environment where insoluable iron and manganese bottom deposits can become soluble ions. If this water is brought into the plant, water quality problems can occur that can require treatment.

The second condition that can impact source water quality is *thermal stratification*. Layers of the lake or reservoir, called *limnion*, develop due to temperature differences. Oxygen depletion can take place within these layers and cause problems similar to those described previously. In colder climates, water at the top of a lake or reservoir can cool to around 39.4°F (4°C), a temperature at which water reaches its greatest density. This cooler, denser water sinks and forces the warmer water at the bottom to the top. This mixing can be so violent that the bottom of the lake or reservoir is

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

riled, causing poor-quality, high-turbidity water to be brought into the plant. Operators refer to this phenomenon as *lake turnover* It can occur each fall and spring. Some operators have witnessed this phenomenon in uncovered sedimentation basins.

River bank filtration is considered groundwater under the direct influence of surface water. Treatment plants with this source of supply receive water of changing quality similar to the river but often the quality is more stable. The filtration of the soil either in the bottom or adjacent to the river provides beneficial pretreatment. In some situations, the degree of pretreatment has been assessed and the regulatory agency has granted some treatment credit to this process. This is site specific and at the discretion of the regulatory agency.

Direct river intakes often challenge water supply sources. Although there are advantages to drawing water directly from a river, such as contamination incidents that may flow downstream quickly beyond the intake, water quality can change rapidly compared to supplies from impoundments. Many possible contaminant situations may impact water quality: chemical spills from industrial discharges, river shipping accidents, floods, droughts, and surface runoff.

Operators who work at treatment plants with this source of supply need to be alert to these possibilities. Online, continuous monitoring is often used to provide warning of changes that may require adjustments to the water treatment system. Many treatment plants with direct river intakes have procedures in place to shut down production if certain conditions develop. Protecting the public water supply is of primary importance.

SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

A utility's watershed management program is the first barrier of protection against pathogen intrusion. Such a program can also protect drinking water quality by minimizing DBP precursors and protecting against algal growths that cause taste-and-odor problems. Deterioration of a watershed not only results in more costly treatment requirements at the plant but also can erode public confidence. If a consumer perceives that the watershed providing drinking water is not managed well, the consumer may seek alternative sources.

In an ideal setting, water utilities would own all of the land that comprises the watershed for their source. In fact, land ownership was the principal method of protecting source water in early protection programs. Currently, some utilities can still claim virtual ownership of their source's watershed; New York, Boston, Portland, Seattle, and San Francisco are among those. These utilities have avoided filtration requirements due in part to the high quality of their source water, which is a direct result of extensive land ownership and watershed management programs.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

However, there is concern about microbial contaminants that are resistant to chlorination.By understanding the watershed and its sources of contamination, both active and potential, drinking water utilities can become advocates for improving their watershed and source water. Using tools such as those provided under the Clean Water Act (CWA) to achieve water quality goals, operators can develop a watershed protection program. In effect, Storm Water Pollution Prevention (SWPP) plans are simply an old idea that has received new attention to help guard against "new" threats. In general, a good watershed management program contains the following components:

- Identification and characterization of the source
- Characterization of potential impacts to the source
- Determination of the intake's vulnerability to contaminants
- Established protection goals
- Development of protection strategies
- Program implementation
- Program monitoring and evaluation

Many utilities have initiated SWPPs, including the Philadelphia Water Department. Philadelphia's experiences are described as an example SWPP. In colonial times, Philadelphia drew its water from wells, but by the mid-eighteenth century, the expanding city of nearly 30,000 had polluted this first source. Tanneries, which used unlined pits as part of the industrial process, and the large number of privies in the city had rendered the groundwater undrinkable. In 1799, after a series of yellow fever epidemics, Philadelphia decided to draw from the then "uncommonly pure waters of the Schuylkill River" by building the city's first waterworks at Centre Square (where City Hall stands today). In 1815, the city opened the Fairmount Waterworks to distribute water from the Schuylkill River throughout the city. As Philadelphia grew during the first half of the nineteenth century, its water supply was expanded to draw more water from the Schuylkill River to meet demand. The city then made efforts to ensure the purity of its source water. In addition to taking legal action to close upstream industries, Philadelphia began purchasing land along the banks of the Schuylkill River and Wissahickon Creek, a major tributary. This land was eventually set aside as a public park.

This watershed management experiment was successful for four decades, but upstream development eventually overwhelmed the city's program. With increased upstream industrial growth, particularly the coal mining industry, the Civil War, and population growth spurred by successive waves of immigrants, water quality continued to decline. By the 1880s and 1890s, Philadelphia experienced the worst typhoid and cholera epidemics of any American city as a result of deteriorated water quality. In 1900, the city decided to filter its water supply; by 1913, all of Philadelphia's drinking water was both filtered and chlorinated at five plants on the Schuylkill and Delaware rivers. An unfortunate by-product of this decision to invest in treatment plants, however, was a de-emphasis on source water protection. Not coincidentally, the period following construction of the water treatment

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

plants saw considerable deterioration of the Schuylkill and Delaware rivers. This deterioration occurred in most major rivers across the country.

Eventually, Congress passed the CWA in 1972. In the 40 years since the passing of the CWA, most of the country's rivers and streams have been rehabilitated due to an emphasis on installing controls at municipal and industrial point source discharges, e.g., wastewater treatment technologies.

However, because of the threat from emerging pathogens such as *Cryptosporidium* and the realization that nonpoint sources such as urban and agricultural runoff now merit serious attention, Philadelphia and other cities around the country now realize that watershed management programs are critical to the long-term protection of public health. Watershed management programs represent the best opportunity for reaching beyond a city's limits and focusing on point sources to further enhance the source water. Consequently, in 1999, Philadelphia established a new SWPP to formalize and coordinate many ongoing research efforts, such as *Cryptosporidium*, geosmin, MIB (2-methylisoborneol), and bromide occurrence studies. The program also enabled the water department to have a single, cohesive voice when dealing with upstream stakeholders.

The Philadelphia Source Water Program began by collecting and analyzing data relating to existing water quality trends within the watershed. Additionally, the program began to actively complete total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) in the watershed by supplying sampling data and analyses, funding flow monitoring gauging stations, and providing technical assistance to the agencies conducting the TMDLs.

Another major milestone for the program was partnering with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to implement the 1996 SDWA-mandated SWAPs for Philadelphia's three treatment plants and 47 others within their watershed. DEP contracted with the Philadelphia Source Water Protection Program to perform SWAPs for 42 surface water intakes on the Schuylkill River. Additionally, DEP contracted with Philadelphia to conduct eight assessments on the tidal portion of the Delaware River, including Philadelphia's Baxter Water Treatment Plant.

The general approach (see Figure 2-5) for the assessments was to first identify all potential sources, if possible; develop and apply a screening procedure to narrow down the list to important sources; prioritize the important sources; and then follow up with data collection and reality checking of the top-priority sources.

The process for the Schuylkill River, for example, started with development of a database of more than 3,500 potential sources. The data was collected from various national databases such as the Permit Compliance System; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Information System; Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Information System; the Toxic Release Inventory; Envirofacts; Right to Know Network; and Business Pro. Based on contaminant information for each source, the sources were assigned one or more of 10 pollutant categories.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013



Source: Philadelphia Water Department.

Figure 2-5 Source prioritization flow diagram used by Philadelphia Water Department

Additionally, nonpoint sources are entered into the evaluation using a variation of the USEPA Storm Water Management Model, which utilizes land use coverage data for 300 subwatersheds to estimate annual loadings of contaminants as the result of stormwater runoff. Geographic screening is accomplished using delineated time-of-travel zones (A, B, or C) for each water plant intake. Finally, a computerized decision-support model (EVAMIX) is used to prioritize sources based on stakeholder-defined weighting criteria to determine top-priority source rankings. All high-ranking sources are flagged for follow-up data collection in later phases to verify results.

SOURCE WATER QUALITY CONSIDERATIONS

Many possible water quality issues confront water treatment facilities. Recognizing these challenges and being prepared to effectively adjust to them is the primary task for water plant operations personnel. It is the reason for extensive education and training. When the water quality changes and the treatment plant systems must be adjusted, experience and training are called on to meet the threat.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

A treatment challenge is presented when the source water quality *changes*. A steady predictable water quality, even if it is not the greatest, can often receive effective treatment. The treatment system can be refined over time and excellent drinking water quality can be produced from even highly impaired waters.

Both surface and groundwater can change and potentially create a situation where water quality is at risk. Some of the water quality issues that may result from changes in source water quality are:

Bacteriological—e.g., fecal contamination
Biological—e.g., zebra mussels, algae
Chemical—e.g., radioactive substances, spills
Physical—e.g., temperature, pH
Agricultural—e.g., pesticides, fertilizer
Groundwater conditions—e.g., wellhead contamination
Lake stratification—e.g., taste and odor, iron or manganese

Direct river intakes can be very challenging water supply sources. Conditions can change quickly, so operators must be alert to these conditions. Treatment for known changes should be documented and plant adjustments rehearsed to ensure that acceptable drinking water quality is maintained.

Lake or other impoundments often stabilize water quality for lengthy periods. However, changes can occur, such as lake stratification and turnover. Another common cause of water quality changes in lakes is the growth of algae and other aquatic organisms. Some of these organisms can create disagreeable taste and odors. Others may contribute chemical by-products that can be toxic. Treatment of these conditions is best performed in the lake and controlled, if possible, to avoid these problems. Control of nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus compounds have been used to reduce algae and aquatic weed growth. In most instances, however, chemical control of algae is necessary. Copper sulfate is often the chemical used at a generic application rate of 1.1 lb/ac-ft. Also, strategies have been employed to reduce stratification by mixing or oxygen (air) application. These practices are often successful in reducing potential water quality problems but not eliminating them completely.

Groundwater sources can be contaminated by surface runoff entering an unprotected wellhead. This sort of incident can be serious because the well may not be monitored for this unforeseen occurrence. Disinfection strategies that include continuous monitoring and pacing chemical addition can be an effective defense when demand increases expectantly.

Understanding the characteristics of the water supply source and preparing treatment practices to combat quality changes are the best ways to maintain high quality water production. Treatment plant systems must be adjusted to meet changing water source conditions. Water plant operators should have proven plan in place to deal effectively with water source quality changes.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Water Works Association (AWWA). 2011. *Water Quality and Treatment*, 6th ed. James K. Edzwald, ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

AWWA. 2010. *Algae Source to Treatment (M57), Manual of Water Supply Practice.* Denver, Colo.: American Water Works Association.

Pickel, Michael. 2001. Philadelphia Water Department, Internal communication to author. July.

Principles and Practices of Water Supply Operations—*Source Water*, 4th ed. Denver, Colorado: American Water Works Association (2010)

Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Chapter 3

Well Design and Operation

Exploration and site selection are important issues when developing well water sources because each well system is unique. Optimal production and use of a well source are possible only by planning in detail, properly testing and evaluating the data gathered, properly selecting pumping equipment, and properly operating the well field.

A well should be located so as to produce the maximum yield possible while still being protected as much as possible from contamination. State and federal geographical databases, which include information about water quality and availability, should be surveyed so that pertinent data can be examined for site location. Other information sources include landowners in the surrounding area and local commercial well-drilling contractors. Commonsense examination of the topography can lead to discovery of a well water source. It is likely to be present under valleys rather than under hills and it may exist where greenery is more lush and where streams or springs abound. It may be necessary to use exploration methods such as seismic testing, computer modeling, and test wells to confirm suspicions that water may be present.

The USEPA has implemented the Groundwater Rule, which requires proof of disinfection (for many groundwater systems) on a daily basis for the water drawn from the well prior to distribution to customers. Well-water system operators must comply with the $C \times T$ requirements that surface water systems have used for years. Some groundwater supplies have been granted a waiver from the filtration and disinfection requirements. These systems must monitor for certain contaminants to continue to qualify for the waiver.

TYPES AND OPERATION OF WELLS

A well functions in a way similar to the way a dam or reservoir captures surface water. An aquifer stores water, while a well provides a way to access the reserve of water. The well pump is not unlike the dam gate. It controls the flow of water from the reservoir. All wells work similarly in theory, but special considerations and differences are found from one well type to another. The following is a list of well types.

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub

Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013

Dug Well

A dug well is capable of providing large amounts of water from shallow groundwater sources. They are literally dug by hand with pick and shovel; larger wells are dug with a backhoe. After excavation, the hole is lined with cement if the soil is unstable. Because they are large in diameter, dug wells are more difficult to protect from surface contamination.

Bored Well

With suitable soils, a well can be developed quickly by boring with an auger. These wells are limited to a 3-ft (1-m) diameter and may penetrate 25 to 60 ft (8 to 19 m). Bored wells are not common in public water supplies.

Driven Well

Driven wells consist of a pointed well screen, which is called a *drive point*, and lengths of pipe, which are attached to the point. Driven wells usually do not exceed 4 in. (10 cm) in diameter, nor do they probe deeper than 40 ft (13 m). For these reasons, they are not often used for public water supplies.

Jetted Well

Where soil permits, a special cutting tool that uses high-pressure water pumped through a cutting knife is used to "jet" a well hole. The casing is attached to the jet and is laid in place as the unit cuts into the ground. This system is not often used for public water supplies.

Drilled Well

Drilling of a well is the most common type of well development method for the public water industry. The method is versatile, can accommodate extreme depths, and can produce diameters that are commonly 4 ft (1.3 m) or more. Drilling methods include

- Cable tool method
- Rotary hydraulic method
- Reverse-circulation rotary method
- California method
- Rotary-air method
- Down-the-hole hammer method

Radial Well

Radial wells are special service wells that are commonly used near the shore of a lake or river to obtain large amounts of relatively good-quality water. Water quality can improve as the water travels through the sand or gravel bed in the stream and into the well. There is an interest in these wells because utilities may receive some removal credits for contaminants through

AVA Documents
Document Sharing Hub
Full document details: AWWA Water Treatment Operator Training Handbook 2013