

**Attachment 4 to Sacramento River Source Water Protection Program Comments
on ILRP Administrative Draft Rice WDRs
September 13, 2013**

**ATTACHMENT NO. 3
Table 1
Reference: 2012 ACWA PHG Survey**

**COST ESTIMATES FOR TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES
(INCLUDES ANNUALIZED CAPITAL AND O&M COSTS)**

No.	Treatment Technology	Source of Information	Estimated Unit Cost 2012 ACWA Survey (\$/1,000 gallons treated)
1	Ion Exchange	Coachella Valley WD, for GW, to reduce Arsenic concentrations. 2011 costs.	1.84
2	Ion Exchange	City of Riverside Public Utilities, for GW, for Perchlorate treatment.	0.89
3	Ion Exchange	Carollo Engineers, anonymous utility, 2012 costs for treating GW source for Nitrates. Design source water concentration: 88 mg/L NO ₃ . Design finished water concentration: 45 mg/L NO ₃ . Does not include concentrate disposal or land cost.	0.67
4	Granular Activated Carbon	City of Riverside Public Utilities, GW sources, for TCE, DBCP (VOC, SOC) treatment.	0.45
5	Granular Activated Carbon	Carollo Engineers, anonymous utility, 2012 costs for treating SW source for TTHMs. Design source water concentration: 0.135 mg/L. Design finished water concentration: 0.07 mg/L. Does not include concentrate disposal or land cost.	0.32
6	Granular Activated Carbon, Liquid Phase	LADWP, Liquid Phase GAC treatment at Tujung Well field. Costs for treating 2 wells. Treatment for 1,1 DCE (VOC). 2011-2012 costs.	1.36
7	Reverse Osmosis	Carollo Engineers, anonymous utility, 2012 costs for treating GW source for Nitrates. Design source water concentration: 88 mg/L NO ₃ . Design finished water concentration: 45 mg/L NO ₃ . Does not include concentrate disposal or land cost.	0.72
8	Packed Tower Aeration	City of Monrovia, treatment to reduce TCE, PCE concentrations. 2011-12 costs.	0.39
9	Ozonation+ Chemical addition	SCVWD, STWTP treatment plant includes chemical addition + ozone generation costs to reduce THM/HAA concentrations. 2009-2012 costs.	0.08
10	Ozonation+ Chemical addition	SCVWD, PWTP treatment plant includes chemical addition + ozone generation costs to reduce THM/HAA concentrations, 2009-2012 costs.	0.18

COST ESTIMATES FOR TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES
(INCLUDES ANNUALIZED CAPITAL AND O&M COSTS)

No.	Treatment Technology	Source of Information	Estimated Unit Cost 2012 ACWA Survey (\$/1,000 gallons treated)
11	Coagulation/Filtration	Soquel WD, treatment to reduce manganese concentrations in GW. 2011 costs.	0.68
12	Coagulation/Filtration Optimization	San Diego WA, costs to reduce THM/Bromate, Turbidity concentrations, raw SW a blend of State Water Project water and Colorado River water, treated at Twin Oaks Valley WTP.	0.77
13	Blending (Well)	Rancho California WD, GW blending well, 1150 gpm, to reduce fluoride concentrations.	0.64
14	Blending (Wells)	Rancho California WD, GW blending wells, to reduce arsenic concentrations, 2012 costs.	0.52
15	Blending	Rancho California WD, using MWD water to blend with GW to reduce arsenic concentrations. 2012 costs.	0.62
16	Corrosion Inhibition	Atascadero Mutual WC, corrosion inhibitor addition to control aggressive water. 2011 costs.	0.08

ATTACHMENT NO. 3
Table 2
Reference: Other Agencies

COST ESTIMATES FOR TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES
(INCLUDES ANNUALIZED CAPITAL AND O&M COSTS)

No.	Treatment Technology	Source of Information	Estimated Unit Cost 2012 Other References (\$/1,000 gallons treated)
1	Reduction - Coagulation- Filtration	Reference: February 28, 2013, Final Report Chromium Removal Research, City of Glendale, CA. 100-2000 gpm. Reduce Hexavalent Chromium to 1 ppb.	\$1.47 - \$9.23
2	IX - Weak Base Anion Resin	Reference: February 28, 2013, Final Report Chromium Removal Research, City of Glendale, CA. 100-2000 gpm. Reduce Hexavalent Chromium to 1 ppb.	\$1.50 - \$6.29
3	IX	Golden State Water Co., IX w/disposable resin, 1 MGD, Perchlorate removal, built in 2010.	\$0.46
4	IX	Golden State Water Co., IX w/disposable resin, 1000 gpm, perchlorate removal (Proposed; O&M estimated).	\$1.00
5	IX	Golden State Water Co., IX with brine regeneration, 500 gpm for Selenium removal, built in 2007.	\$6.57
6	GFO/Adsorption	Golden State Water Co., Granular Ferric Oxide Resin, Arsenic removal, 600 gpm, 2 facilities, built in 2006.	\$1.72 - \$1.84
7	RO	Reference: Inland Empire Utilities Agency : Chino Basin Desalter. RO cost to reduce 800 ppm TDS, 150 ppm Nitrate (as NO ₃); approx. 7 mgd.	\$2.25
8	IX	Reference: Inland Empire Utilities Agency : Chino Basin Desalter. IX cost to reduce 150 ppm Nitrate (as NO ₃); approx. 2.6 mgd.	\$1.25
9	Packed Tower Aeration	Reference: Inland Empire Utilities Agency : Chino Basin Desalter. PTA-VOC air stripping, typical treated flow of approx. 1.6 mgd.	\$0.38

10	IX	Reference: West Valley WD Report, for Water Recycling Funding Program, for 2.88 mgd treatment facility. IX to remove Perchlorate, Perchlorate levels 6-10 ppb. 2008 costs.	\$0.52 - \$0.74
11	Coagulation Filtration	Reference: West Valley WD, includes capital, O&M costs for 2.88 mgd treatment facility- Layne Christensen packaged coagulation Arsenic removal system. 2009-2012 costs.	\$0.34
12	FBR	Reference: West Valley WD/Envirogen design data for the O&M + actual capitol costs, 2.88 mgd fluidized bed reactor (FBR) treatment system, Perchlorate and Nitrate removal, followed by multimedia filtration & chlorination, 2012. NOTE: The capitol cost for the treatment facility for the first 2,000 gpm is \$23 million annualized over 20 years with ability to expand to 4,000 gpm with minimal costs in the future. \$17 million funded through state and federal grants with the remainder funded by WVWD and the City of Rialto.	\$1.55 - \$1.63

ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Table 3

Reference: 2010 ACWA Cost of Treatment Table, Costs Revised for 2012

COST ESTIMATES FOR TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES

(INCLUDES ANNUALIZED CAPITAL AND O&M COSTS)

No.	Treatment Technology	Source of Information	Estimated 2012* Unit Cost (\$/1,000 gallons treated)
1	Granular Activated Carbon	Reference: Malcolm Pirnie estimate for California Urban Water Agencies, large surface water treatment plants treating water from the State Water Project to meet Stage 2 D/DBP and bromate regulation, 1998	0.53-1.00
2	Granular Activated Carbon	Reference: Carollo Engineers, estimate for VOC treatment (PCE), 95% removal of PCE, Oct. 1994,1900 gpm design capacity	0.24
3	Granular Activated Carbon	Reference: Carollo Engineers, est. for a large No. Calif. surf. water treatment plant (90 mgd capacity) treating water from the State Water Project, to reduce THM precursors, ENR construction cost index = 6262 (San Francisco area) - 1992	1.16
4	Granular Activated Carbon	Reference: CH2M Hill study on San Gabriel Basin, for 135 mgd central treatment facility for VOC and SOC removal by GAC, 1990	0.45-0.66
5	Granular Activated Carbon	Reference: Southern California Water Co. - actual data for "rented" GAC to remove VOCs (1,1-DCE), 1.5 mgd capacity facility, 1998	2.08
6	Granular Activated Carbon	Reference: Southern California Water Co. - actual data for permanent GAC to remove VOCs (TCE), 2.16 mgd plant capacity, 1998	1.35
7	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Malcolm Pirnie estimate for California Urban Water Agencies, large surface water treatment plants treating water from the State Water Project to meet Stage 2 D/DBP and bromate regulation, 1998	1.56-2.99
8	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Boyle Engineering, RO cost to reduce 1000 ppm TDS in brackish groundwater in So. Calif., 1.0 mgd plant operated at 40% of design flow, high brine line cost, May 1991	3.69
9	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Boyle Engineering, RO cost to reduce 1000 ppm TDS in brackish groundwater in So. Calif., 1.0 mgd plant operated at 100% of design flow, high brine line cost, May 1991	2.27
10	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Boyle Engineering, RO cost to reduce 1000 ppm TDS in brackish groundwater in So. Calif., 10.0 mgd plant operated at 40% of design flow, high brine line cost, May 1991	2.46
11	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Boyle Engineering, RO cost to reduce 1000 ppm TDS in brackish groundwater in So. Calif., 10.0 mgd plant operated at 100% of design flow, high brine line cost, May 1991	1.90
12	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Arsenic Removal Study, City of Scottsdale, AZ - CH2M Hill, for a 1.0 mgd plant operated at 40% of design capacity, Oct. 1991	6.17

COST ESTIMATES FOR TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES
(INCLUDES ANNUALIZED CAPITAL AND O&M COSTS)

No.	Treatment Technology	Source of Information	Estimated 2012* Unit Cost (\$/1,000 gallons treated)
13	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Arsenic Removal Study, City of Scottsdale, AZ - CH2M Hill, for a 1.0 mgd plant operated at 100% of design capacity, Oct. 1991	3.64
14	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Arsenic Removal Study, City of Scottsdale, AZ - CH2M Hill, for a 10.0 mgd plant operated at 40% of design capacity, Oct. 1991	2.73
15	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: Arsenic Removal Study, City of Scottsdale, AZ - CH2M Hill, for a 10.0 mgd plant operated at 100% of design capacity, Oct. 1991	1.69
16	Reverse Osmosis	Reference: CH2M Hill study on San Gabriel Basin, for 135 mgd central treatment facility with RO to remove nitrate, 1990	1.70-2.99
17	Packed Tower Aeration	Reference: Analysis of Costs for Radon Removal... (AWWARF publication), Kennedy/Jenks, for a 1.4 mgd facility operating at 40% of design capacity, Oct. 1991	0.98
18	Packed Tower Aeration	Reference: Analysis of Costs for Radon Removal... (AWWARF publication), Kennedy/Jenks, for a 14.0 mgd facility operating at 40% of design capacity, Oct. 1991	0.52
19	Packed Tower Aeration	Reference: Carollo Engineers, estimate for VOC treatment (PCE) by packed tower aeration, without off-gas treatment, O&M costs based on operation during 329 days/year at 10% downtime, 16 hr/day air stripping operation, 1900 gpm design capacity, Oct. 1994	0.26
20	Packed Tower Aeration	Reference: Carollo Engineers, for PCE treatment by Ecolo-Flo Enviro-Tower air stripping, without off-gas treatment, O&M costs based on operation during 329 days/year at 10% downtime, 16 hr/day air stripping operation, 1900 gpm design capacity, Oct. 1994	0.27
21	Packed Tower Aeration	Reference: CH2M Hill study on San Gabriel Basin, for 135 mgd central treatment facility - packed tower aeration for VOC and radon removal, 1990	0.42-0.69
22	Advanced Oxidation Processes	Reference: Carollo Engineers, estimate for VOC treatment (PCE) by UV Light, Ozone, Hydrogen Peroxide, O&M costs based on operation during 329 days/year at 10% downtime, 24 hr/day AOP operation, 1900 gpm capacity, Oct. 1994	0.51
23	Ozonation	Reference: Malcolm Pirnie estimate for CUWA, large surface water treatment plants using ozone to treat water from the State Water Project to meet Stage 2 D/DBP and bromate regulation, <i>Cryptosporidium</i> inactivation requirements, 1998	0.12-0.24
24	Ion Exchange	Reference: CH2M Hill study on San Gabriel Basin, for 135 mgd central treatment facility - ion exchange to remove nitrate, 1990	0.57-0.74

Note: *Costs were adjusted from date of original estimates to present, where appropriate, using Engineering News Record (ENR) building costs index (20-city average) from Dec 2012.