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Who Is American Water
We are the largest publicly traded water and wastewater service provider in the United States

- Provides services to approx. 14 million people in more than 30 states and parts of Canada
- Treat and delivers more than one billion gallons of water daily
Our Company

- Subsidiary of American Water Works Co. Inc.
- Roots date back to early 1800s, Incorporated in 1904
- Largest regulated water and wastewater service provider in PA
- Serving approximately 2.2 million people in 36 counties
- More than 1,000 employees
- Customer base:
  - 640,000 water customers
    - 92% residential
    - 7% commercial
    - 1% industrial/other
  - 17,000 wastewater customers
Pennsylvania American Water Service Area

Serving 17 percent of the Commonwealth’s population
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I. The Case for Pump Efficiency

- Drinking water pumping systems – 20% of world’s electrical demand

- Footprint of a water utility includes:
  - Energy use (power)
  - Fossil fuels (natural gas, fuel, oil)

- Carbon footprint – the total set of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

- Carbon footprint reduction – measured in terms of the amount of carbon dioxide removed from the environment
  - $6.8956 \times 10^{-4}$ metric tons CO$_2$ / KWh
  - 1.52 lbs CO$_2$ / KWh

- Increasing efficiency leads to decrease in GHGe, increased sustainability and decreased operational costs
I. The Case for Pump Efficiency

Pennsylvania American Water

• 850+ facilities billed for electricity  
  ▪ Treatment plants, office buildings, pump stations

• Vast majority of electrical use is for pumping (97%)

• Estimated 90% of GHGe are due to pumping

• Identified 10 largest ‘facilities’ - account for 60% of the state energy usage

• Water pumping comprises majority of energy usage at facilities
II. Case Study Approach

- Test efficiencies of pumps at top 10 facilities
  - Wire-to-Water Testing

- Refurbish or replace pumps to obtain better operating efficiencies
  - Reduces energy use
  - Reduces carbon footprint
  - Saves operating expenses
II. Case Study Approach

- Wire-to-Water Testing
  - Considers overall efficiency of the motor and pump
  - Is a measure of the pumping power produced by a unit of electrical power
  - Wire-to-Water Efficiency = Water HP / Wire HP
II. Case Study Approach

• Wire-to-Water Testing
  ▪ Wire Horsepower (HP)
    ◆ Electrical power applied to the motor
    ◆ Wire HP = (Volts x Amps x Power Factor) / 431
  ▪ Power Factor
    ◆ Measure of how the voltage leads or lags the amperage
    ◆ Power factor = Active Power (W) / Apparent Power (VA)
  ▪ Water HP
    ◆ Power transferred to the water by the pump
    ◆ Water HP = [Flow (gpm) x Head (ft)] / 3960
  ▪ Note: Wire-to-water tests indicate the efficiency of the pump and motor; not just the pump
### II. Case Study Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motor Data</th>
<th>Flow Data</th>
<th>Pump Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voltage &amp; FLA</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460/230</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>% Test Flow</th>
<th>Voltage volts (avg.)</th>
<th>Current amps (avg.)</th>
<th>Power Factor</th>
<th>Flow gpm</th>
<th>Suction**</th>
<th>Measure fit of top of water to pressure gauge</th>
<th>Discharge psi</th>
<th>Total Head</th>
<th>Wire hp</th>
<th>Water hp</th>
<th>BHP</th>
<th>W/W Eff.</th>
<th>Pump Eff.</th>
<th>Gallons per KWH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/25/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>268.31</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>242.43</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>225.56</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>198.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2295</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>191.59</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example Wire-to-Water Input

- **Nameplate data**
  - Motor
  - Pump
- **Actual (field) data**
  - Motor
  - Pump
  - Electrical
II. Case Study Approach

• Typical bowl efficiency of new, high efficiency pumps: 83-88%

• Typical wire-to-water efficiency (assuming 95% motor efficiency): 79-84%

• The capital cost of a pump installation is a small percentage of the Life Cycle Cost (LCC)
  ▪ Energy: 85%
  ▪ Maintenance: 10%
  ▪ Capital cost: 5%
II. Case Study Approach

• Define top energy systems we plan to engage with efficiency improvements
  ▪ Top 10 systems = 60% of company’s energy usage
  ▪ Top 4 systems = 40% of company’s energy usage
  ▪ All of the top systems are large pumping facilities (finished water pumping encompasses 75%+ of the energy usage at those facilities)

• Current operating finished water pump efficiencies
  ▪ 50-80% (based on wire-to-water testing)

• Potential finished water pump efficiencies
  ▪ 80-85%
II. Case Study Approach

• Develop a metric and baseline to compare future and past
  
  ▪ Energy Unit Index (EUI)
    ◆ Energy Used (MWh) / Water Pumped (MG)
  
  ▪ Example:
    ◆ Pump requires 100 MWh to pump 25 MG
    ◆ EUI = 4.00
  
    ◆ More efficient pump requires 75 MWh to pump 25 MG
    ◆ EUI = 3.00
II. Case Study Approach

• Evaluate current hydraulics and flow of each system

• View current pump sizing and design

• Analyze cost effectiveness to refurbish vs. replace pumps

• Capital cost and payback analysis

• Comparison of final and initial EUI
III. Methodology

• Preferred operating range (POR):
  - Select pumps that operate within 10% of the best efficiency point (BEP)
    - Average demand and TDH requirements should be near BEP design

• Pump sizing
  - What are the demand characteristics?
  - How are pumps operated?
  - Able to still pump maximum flow (MF) and worst-case pressure conditions
III. Methodology

- **Listen**
  - Cavitation (cracking sound)
  - Vibration
- **Look**
  - Excessive leaking (seals)
- **Vibration Analysis**
  - Accelerometers mounted to pump; software is used to compare to baseline (new pump) data
- **Thermography (Infrared Scanning)**
  - For early detection of ‘hot spots’ – deteriorating motor windings, hot running bearings, etc.
- **Evaluate Current Pump Curve**
  - Created from wire-to-water
  - Compare to new/factory pump curve
III. Methodology
III. Methodology

• Options for Improving Pump Efficiencies
  ▪ Mechanical rehabilitation
    ◆ Pump: replace wear rings, seals, sleeves, gaskets, bearings
    ◆ Motor: rewind motor windings
  ▪ Sandblast and recoat
    ◆ Removes tuberculation and roughness
    ◆ Reduces friction losses through pump
    ◆ Coating adds efficiency and longevity
  ▪ Install VSD
    ◆ Vary flow at set hydraulic conditions (TDH)
    ◆ Can replace throttled valve
    ◆ Inherent 2-5% loss in efficiency
    ◆ What pump flows/efficiencies will the VSD run at?
III. Methodology

- Options for Improving Pump Efficiencies (cont.)
  - Replace pump (and motor)
    - Pump not operating near BEP at ADF
    - TDH/Flow requirements changed
    - Cost of rehabilitation >/= replacement
    - New pump/motor more efficient
  - Trim or replace impeller
IV. Case Study #1

• Treatment plant
  - 6 MGD Plant Capacity
  - 3 MGD ADD

• 3 High Service Pumps (75%+ of plant energy usage)
  - Vintage 1968 – Pump and motors (200 hp)
  - Pump #2 utilized inefficient fluid hydraulic drive

• Pumps designed at 2100 gpm, 240 ft, 82% efficiency
IV. Case Study #1

- Original wire-to-water efficiencies
  - #1: 74%
  - #2: 70%
  - #3: 67%

- Findings
  - TDH/Flow requirements changed
  - Pumps were not operating efficiently on factory curve
  - VSD was needed to maintain adequate service to customers efficiently
IV. Case Study #1

- **Pumps replaced**
  - Replace pumps with correctly-sized pumps
  - Replace motors with premium efficiency 150 hp motors
  - Add electrical VSDs to 2 of 3 pumps

- **Current wire-to-water efficiencies**
  - #1: 80%
  - #2: 80%
  - #3: 81%
  - Original wire-to-water efficiencies – 67%-74%

- **Pumps designed at 2150 gpm, 215 ft, 84% efficiency**
- **Now properly sized – operating more efficiently**
IV. Case Study #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy (MWh)</th>
<th>Flow (MG)</th>
<th>EUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (Jan – Dec)</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (Jan – Dec)</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EUI reduction: 9%
- KWh savings (2011 - 2012): 135,000
- Cost savings: $15,200
- Cost of pump: $36,000
- Payback: ~ 2.5 years
V. Case Study #2

- Relay pump station
  - 35 MGD ADD

- Five relay pumps (>95% of location energy usage)
  - Vintage pumps and motors (1960s)
  - Three 10 MGD pumps
  - Two 20 MGD pumps

- 10 MGD Pumps designed at 7000 gpm, 360 ft, 87% efficiency
V. Case Study #2

- Original Wire-to-Water Efficiencies (10 MGD)
  - #1: 65%
  - #2: 65%
  - #3: 63%

- Findings
  - Normal pump wear reduced efficiencies
  - Pumps were not operating efficiently on factory curve
  - Pumps designed correctly for application
V. Case Study #2

- 2012-2014 pumping refurbishment projects
  - Refurbish pumps
  - Replace motors with premium efficiency motors
  - Project ongoing from 2012-2014

- Current wire-to-water efficiency
  - #3: 85%

- Pumps designed at 7000 gpm, 360 ft, 87% efficiency

- Pumps now running more efficiently and effectively
V. Case Study #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy (MWh)</th>
<th>Flow (MG)</th>
<th>EUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (Jan – Dec)</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td>12,973</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (Mar – Dec)</td>
<td>11,801</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EUI Reduction: 3%
- KWh savings (2011 – 2012): 711,500
- Cost savings: $21,200
- Cost of pump: $150,000
- Payback: ~7 years
  - Pump in service ¾ of year
VI. Case Study #3

- **Treatment Plant**
  - 50 MGD Plant Capacity
  - 35 MGD ADD

- **5 Potable Water Pumps (90%+ of location energy usage)**
  - Vintage pumps and motors (1960s)
  - Three, 10 MGD pumps
  - Two, 20 MGD pumps

- **10 MGD Pumps designed at 7000 gpm, 420 ft, 87% efficiency**
VI. Case Study #3

• Original Wire-to-Water Efficiencies (10 MGD)
   #1: 70%
   #2: 59%
   #3: 77%

• Findings
   Normal pump wear reduced efficiencies
   Pumps were not operating efficiently on factory curve
   Pumps designed correctly for application
   Refurbishment of pumps would cost more than replacement
VI. Case Study #3

• 2012-2014 pumping replacement projects
  ▪ Replace pumps
  ▪ Replace motors with premium efficiency motors
  ▪ Project ongoing from 2012-2014

• Current wire-to-water efficiency
  ▪ #3: 83%

• Pumps designed at 7000 gpm, 420 ft, 85% efficiency
• Pumps now running more efficiently and effectively
**VI. Case Study #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy (MWh)</th>
<th>Flow (MG)</th>
<th>EUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 (Jan – Dec)</td>
<td>27,771</td>
<td>12,973</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 (Mar – Dec)</td>
<td>26,610</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- EUI Reduction: 2%
- KWh savings (2011 – 2012): 1,161,500
- Cost savings: $80,000
- Cost of pump: $200,000
- Payback: ~2.5 years
  - Pump in service \( \frac{3}{4} \) of year.
VII. Conclusions

• **Primary factors that can impact pump efficiency**
  - Incorrect design
  - Changes in hydraulic conditions
  - Normal wear
  - Cavitation
  - Chemical contact
  - Mechanical issues – Seals, bearings, degradation of impeller, vibration
  - Inefficient VSD - Eddy current drives, magnetic drives, hydraulic clutch drives, fluid drives
  - Hydraulic – Tuberculation / Corrosion
  - Motor efficiency
VIII. Recommendations

• Identify your largest energy users
• Determine your efficiencies/costs
• Recognize that each system is different
  ▪ Confirm pump is designed with BEP at ADF
  ▪ Make sure the VSD operates effectively
  ▪ Know hydraulic conditions will vary EUI
    ◆ Higher TDH requires more energy to move water
• Work towards goal systematically
• Consider pump coatings - can increase a pump's efficiency and time between repair
• Monitor pump efficiency continuously
  ▪ Real-time wire-to-water
  ▪ SCADA integration
Questions