November, 2013
NSF 13/40/EPADWCTR
EPA/600/R-13/250

Environmental Technology Verification Report

Reduction of Microbial Contaminants in Drinking Water by Ultraviolet Technology

ETS UV Technology
ETS UV Model UVL-200-4

Prepared by

NSF International

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

ETV ETV ETV

NOVEMBER 2013

Environmental Technology Verification Report

Reduction of Microbial Contaminants in Drinking Water by Ultraviolet Light Technology

ETS UV Technology
(A joint venture of Engineered Treatment Systems and atg UV Technology)

ETS UV MODEL UVL-200-4

Prepared by:

NSF International
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

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

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

Notice

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, through its Office of Research and Development, funded and managed, or partially funded and collaborated in, the research described herein. It has been subjected to the Agency's peer and administrative review and has been approved for publication. Any opinions expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency, therefore, no official endorsement should be inferred. Any mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

Table of Contents

Verification Statement .... VS-i
Title Page i
Notice ii
Table of Contents iii
List of Tables iv
List of Figures v
Abbreviations and Acronyms v
Chapter 1 1
Introduction 1
1.1 ETV Program Purpose and Operation 1
1.2 Purpose of Verification 1
1.3 Verification Test Site 2
1.4 Testing Participants and Responsibilities 2
Chapter 2 4
Equipment Description 4
2.1 General Information ETS UV Technology 4
2.2 ETS *Model UVL-200-4* UV System Description 4
2.3 ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* Specifications and Information 6
Chapter 3 8
Methods and Procedures 8
3.1 Introduction 8
3.2 UV Sensors Assessment 9
3.3 Headloss Determination 10
3.4 Power Consumption Evaluation 10
3.5 Feed Water Source and Test Rig Setup 10
3.6 Installation of Reactor and Lamp Burn-in 13
3.7 Collimated Beam Bench Scale Testing 13
3.8 Full Scale Testing to Validate UV dose 18
3.9 Analytical Methods 22
3.10 Full Scale Test Controls 24
3.11 Power Measurements 25
3.12 Flow Rate 25
3.13 Evaluation, Documentation and Installation of Reactor 25
Chapter 4 27
Results and Discussion 27
4.1 Introduction 27
4.2 Sensor Assessment 27
4.3 Collimated Beam Dose Response Data 28
4.4 Development of Dose Response 29
4.5 MS and Operational Flow Test Data 41
4.6 Set Line for a Minimum RED of 40 mJ/cm^2 47
4.7 Deriving the Validation Factor and Log Credit for *Cryptosporidium* 48

4.8 Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) for MS2 as the Target Organism 55
4.9 Water Quality Data 57
4.10 Headloss 61
4.11 Power Measurement 61
Chapter 5 62
Quality Assurance/Quality Control 62
5.1 Introduction 62
5.2 Test Procedure QA/QC 62
5.3 Sample Handling 62
5.4 Chemistry Laboratory QA/QC 62
5.5 Microbiology Laboratory QA/QC 62
5.6 Engineering Lab - Test Rig QA/QC 64
5.7 Documentation 65
5.8 Data Review 65
5.9 Data Quality Indicators 67
Chapter 6 69
References 69

Appendices

Attachment 1 *Model UVL-200-4* Operating Manual and Technical Data
Attachment 2 Sensor Certificates and Sensor Information
Attachment 3 Standard 55 Annex A - Collimated Beam Apparatus and Procedures
Attachment 4 UVT Scans of Feed Water

List of Tables

Table 2-1. Basic UV Chamber Information 6
Table 2-2. Low Pressure Lamp Information 6
Table 2-3. UV Lamp Sleeve Information 6
Table 2-4. UV Sensor Information 7
Table 3-1. Test Conditions for Validation 20
Table 3-2. Analytical Methods for Laboratory Analyses 22
Table 4-1. Sensor Assessment Data First Set of Test Runs (June 2012) 28
Table 4-2. UV Dose Response Data from Collimated Beam Tests at 79% UVT (June 2012) 31
Table 4-3. UV Dose Response Data from Collimated Beam Tests at 97% UVT (June 2012) 33
Table 4-4. UV Dose Response Data from Collimated Beam Tests at 79% UVT with Outlier Removed (June 2012) 35
Table 4-5. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Operational Data 42
Table 4-6. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Concentration Results 43
Table 4-7. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Log Concentration for Influent and Effluent Samples 44
Table 4-8. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Log Inactivation Results 45

Table 4-9. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Observed RED Results..46
Table 4-10. RED Bias Factor for Each Set Point for *Cryptosporidium*......................................49
Table 4-11. Uncertainty of the Validation (U_{Val}) and B_{RED} Values for *Cryptosporidium*............52
Table 4-12. Validation Factors and Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) for *Cryptosporidium* 53
Table 4-13. Validation Factors and Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) based on MS2 56
Table 4-14. Temperature and pH Results 58
Table 4-15. Total Chlorine, Free Chlorine, and Turbidity Results..58
Table 4-16. Iron and Manganese Results...59
Table 4-17. HPC, Total Coliform, and *E. coli* Results 60
Table 4-18. Headloss Data..61
Table 4-19. Power Measurement Results 61
Table 5-1. Trip Blank Results..64
Table 5-2. MS2 Stability Test Results 64
Table 5-3. Flow Meter Calibration Results..65
Table 5-4. Reactor Control and Reactor Blank MS2 Results 66
Table 5-5. Completeness Requirements 68

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4*. 5
Figure 3-1. Schematic of NSF test rig. 12
Figure 3-2. Photograph of the *Model UVL-200-4* Test Setup..13
Figure 4-1. Collimated beam dose versus log N UVT 79% with outlier removed (June 2012)....37
Figure 4-2. Collimated beam dose versus log N UVT 97% (June 2012) 38
Figure 4-3. Dose response - log I versus dose - UVT 79% with outlier removed (June 2012).....39
Figure 4-4. Dose response - log I versus dose - UVT 97% (June 2012) 40
Figure 4-5. Set Line for Model UVL-200-4 For Validated Dose of >40 mJ/cm2 based on MS2 47
Figure 4-6. Set line for Minimum 3.0 log *Cryptosporidium* Inactivation for ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* 54
Figure 4-7. Set line for Minimum 40 mJ/cm^2 Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) based on MS2 for ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* 56

Abbreviations and Acronyms

A_{254}	Absorbance at wavelength 254 nm
ASTM	American Society of Testing Materials
ATCC	American Type Culture Collection
ATG	atg UV Technology
°C	degrees Celsius
CFU	Colony Forming Units
cm	Centimeter
DWS	Drinking Water Systems

DVGW	Deutscher Verein des Gas- und Wasserfaches e.V. - Technisch - wissenschaftlicher Verein - German Technical and Scientific Association for Gas and Water
EPA	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
ETS	Engineered Treatment Systems
ETS UV	ETS UV Technology - joint venture of ETS and atg
ETV	Environmental Technology Verification
°F	Degrees Fahrenheit
gpm	gallons per minute
in	inch(es)
h	hours
HPC	Heterotrophic Plate Count
L	Liter
lbs	pounds
LIMS	Laboratory Information Management System
log I	log base 10 Inactivation
LSA	Sodium Lignin Sulfonic Acid
LT2ESWTR	Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
m	meter
min	minute
mJ	milli-joules
mg	Milligram
mL	Milliliter
MS2	MS2 coliphage ATCC 15597 B1
NaOH	Sodium Hydroxide
ND	Non-Detect
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
nm	Nanometer
NRMRL	National Risk Management Research Laboratory
NSF	NSF International (formerly known as National Sanitation Foundation)
NTU	Nephelometric Turbidity Unit
ONORM	Österreichisches Normungsinstitut Austria Standard
ORD	Office of Research and Development
pfu	Plaque Forming Units
Protocol	Generic Protocol
psig	Pounds per Square Inch, gauge
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
QAPP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
QMP	Quality Management Plan
RED	Reduction Equivalent Dose
RED_{meas}	Measured Reduction Equivalent Dose - from test runs
RED_{Val}	Validated Reduction Equivalent Dose - based on selected pathogen and uncertainty

RPD	Relative Percent Deviation
SM	Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPt	Set Point Condition
T1	Bacteriophage T1 strain
T7	Bacteriophage T7 strain
TQAP	Test / Quality Assurance Plan
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TSA	Tryptic Soy Agar
TSB	Tryptic Soy Broth
UVT	ultraviolet transmittance
µg	microgram
µm	microns
UVDGM-2006	Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidance Manual - 2006
USEPA	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
U_{DR}	uncertainty of collimated beam data
U_{SP}	uncertainty of set point
U_S	uncertainty of sensor
U_{VAL}	uncertainty of validation

Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 ETV Program Purpose and Operation

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

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

The USEPA has partnered with NSF International (NSF) under the ETV Drinking Water Systems Center (DWS) to verify performance of drinking water treatment systems that benefit the public and small communities. It is important to note that verification of the equipment does not mean the equipment is "certified" by NSF or "accepted" by USEPA. Rather, it recognizes that the performance of the equipment has been determined and verified by these organizations under conditions specified in ETV protocols and test plans.

1.2 Purpose of Verification

The purpose of the ETV testing was to validate, using the set line approach, the UV dose delivered by the ETS UV Technology (ETS UV) *Model UVL-200-4* Water Purification System (*Model UVL-200-4*) as defined by these regulatory authorities and their guidelines and regulations:

- Water Supply Committee of the Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State and Provincial Public Health and Environmental Managers otherwise known as The Ten States Standards 2012 ;
- The Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH) and its guidelines; and
- The New York Department of Health (NYDOH) and its code.

Another purpose was to use the same data set to calculate the log inactivation of a target pathogen such as *Cryptosporidium* using the *Generic Protocol for Development of Test / Quality Assurance Plans for Validation of Ultraviolet (UV) Reactors,* August 2011 10/01/EPADWCTR (GP-2011) which is based on *Ultraviolet Design Guidance Manual For the Long Term 2*

Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, Office of Water, US Environmental Protection Agency, November 2006, EPA 815-R-06-007 (UVDGM-2006).

The setline approach was based on validation testing at three set points (a set point is defined as a single flow rate and irradiance output that delivers the targeted UV dose). The results of the three set point tests were used to develop a setline that defines the maximum flow rate - minimum irradiance output required to ensure the UV dose is achieved. The microorganism used for this validation test was MS2 coliphage virus (MS2). The target UV dose was a measured Reduction Equivalent Dose (RED_{meas}) of ≥40 mJ/cm^2 . This dose was calculated based on the understanding of dose calculations used internationally and by the Ten States Standards. The RED_{meas} was then adjusted based on the uncertainty of the measurements to calculate a MS2 based validated dose (RED_{val}) where the RED bias is set equal to one (1.0) in accordance with the unique approach of the State of New York. The RED_{meas} data were also adjusted for uncertainty and the *Cryptosporidium* RED bias factors from the UVDGM-2006 Appendix G. The data were used to estimate the log inactivation of *Cryptosporidium* so that a regulatory agency could grant log credits under the USEPA's Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2ESWTR).

ETS UV selected flow rates of 15, 20, and 25 gpm as the target flow rates based on their system design for *Model UVL-200-4*.

Based on the result of the three set points, a setline was developed for this unit. During full-scale commercial operation, federal regulations require that the UV intensity as measured by the UV sensor(s) must meet or exceed the validated intensity (irradiance) to ensure delivery of the required dose. Reactors must be operated within the validated operating conditions for maximum flow rate - minimum irradiance combinations, UVT, and lamp status [40 CFR 141.720(d)(2)]. Under the UV setline approach, UV Transmittance (UVT) does not have to be measured separately. The intensity readings by the sensor take into account changes in the UVT and the setline establishes the operating conditions over a range of flow rates used during the validation test.

This verification test did not evaluate cleaning of the lamps or quartz sleeves, nor any other maintenance and operational issues.

1.3 Verification Test Site

UV dose validation testing was performed at the NSF Testing Laboratory in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The NSF laboratory performs all of the testing activities for NSF certification of drinking water treatment systems, and pool and spa treatment systems.

1.4 Testing Participants and Responsibilities

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

1.4.1 NSF International

NSF is an independent, not-for-profit organization dedicated to public health and safety, and to protection of the environment. Founded in 1944 and located in Ann Arbor, Michigan, NSF has been instrumental in the development of consensus standards for the protection of public health and the environment. The USEPA partnered with NSF to verify the performance of drinking water treatment systems through the USEPA's ETV Program.

NSF performed all verification testing activities at its Ann Arbor, MI location. NSF prepared the test/QA plan (TQAP), performed all testing, managed, evaluated, interpreted, and reported on the data generated by the testing, and reported on the performance of the technology.

Contact: NSF International
789 N. Dixboro Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
Phone: 734-769-8010
Contact: Mr. Bruce Bartley, Project Manager
Email: bartley@nsf.org

1.4.2 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

USEPA, through its Office of Research and Development (ORD), has financially supported and collaborated with NSF under Cooperative Agreement No. R-82833301. This verification effort was supported by the DWS Center operating under the ETV Program. This document has been peer-reviewed, reviewed by USEPA, and recommended for public release.

1.4.3 ETS UV Technology

ETS UV supplied the UV test unit for testing, required reference sensors, detailed specifications on the equipment, UV lamps, lamp sleeves, and duty sensors, and written and verbal instructions for equipment operation. ETS UV also provided logistical and technical support, as needed.

Contact: Engineered Treatment Systems, LLC
P.O. Box 392
W9652 Beaverland Parkway
Beaver Dam, Wisconsin
Phone: 1-877-885-4628
Email: info@ets-uv.com

atg UV Technology
Genesis House, Richmond Hill
Pemberton
Wigan, WN5 8AA
United Kingdom
Phone: +44(0) 1942216161
Website: www.atguv.com

Chapter 2
Equipment Description

2.1 General Information ETS UV Technology

ETS UV was founded in January 2005 in a joint venture between atg UV Technology (atg) and Engineered Treatment Systems (ETS) to accommodate the growing demand for ultraviolet disinfection and photolysis across the US pools and recreational water markets. Systems are manufactured at the Beaver Dam production facility located in Beaver Dam, Wisconsin. Production of ultraviolet disinfection systems for the US market began in January 2008. In 2009, the second phase of ETS UV became operational. Based in Ohio, ETS UV Industrial & Municipal offers low and medium pressure UV systems for municipal drinking water, wastewater and industrial UV treatment applications.

The atg UV Technology companyis based in the North West of England, serving an international customer base. Since being founded in 1981 as Willand UV System, atg indicated that they have served a number of markets including municipal drinking water and wastewater disinfection, industrial processes and manufacturing, offshore and marine industries and swimming pool applications.

ETS is based in Beaver Dam Wisconsin. ETS states that it has over three decades of experience and over 1500 successful case studies in the custom design and production of UV disinfection systems for a range of applications.

2.2 ETS *Model UVL-200-4* UV System Description

The ETS UV Water Purification System that was validated in this test is the *Model UVL-200-4*. This unit is rated by ETS UV for a maximum flow rate of 55 gpm. The system uses 1 low-pressure lamp and one intensity sensor mounted in a stainless flow chamber. Figure 2-1 presents a picture of the system. Additional specifications for the unit are presented below. ETS UV provided an operating manual and a technical data book, which included schematics and tables with parts and dimensions for the reactor, the sensors, the lamps and the quartz sleeves. All specifications and information were provided to NSF by ETS UV in advance of the testing. ETS also provided additional information for the UV sensor (spectral data, measuring angle, measuring range, and output range) and for UV lamps (lamp life, irradiance output, power requirements, aging data, etc.) as required for the validation test.

NSF performed a normal technical review of the sensor specifications, UV lamp and quartz sleeve specifications, and general review of the reactor chamber and overall system as required by the GP-2011.

The operating manual, technical book and other supplemental specifications for the sensor, lamp, quartz sleeve, and control system provided by ETS UV are included in Attachments 1 and 2 of this report for reference.

Figure 2-1 ETS UV System UVL-200-4

2.3 ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* Specifications and Information

ETS UV has provided the following information about their UV reactor:

Table 2-1. Basic UV Chamber Information

Manufacturer/Supplier	ETS UV
Type or model	Model UVL-200-4
Description	Single Lamp Low Pressure UV Disinfection System
Year of manufacture	2008 and onwards
Maximum flow rate	55 gpm
Net dry weight	52.14 lbs
Volume	0.2637 cubic feet
Electrical Power	2 phase 220 VAC, 60Hz; 2 amp single pole, earth ground.
Operating Power consumption	< 400 watts
Maximum Pressure	10 bar
Ambient water temperature	32 to 113 degrees ^{o}F
Max Cleaning Temperature	158 degrees ^{o}F (unit turned off)
Inlet pipe size	2 inch

Table 2-2. Low Pressure Lamp Information

Type	Low-pressure
Model	LP200-SS19
Number of lamps per reactor	1
UV emission at wavelengths ranging from 240-290 nm	See Lamp spectral graph in Attachment 1.
Lamp Life	12,000 hrs
Power supply unit's name, make and serial numbers	EVG – Ziegler Electronic Devices Gmbh EVG160-200W/ 2A Electronic Ballast
Ballast	Magnetic Choke with Starter
Irradiance @1m (W/cm)	100
UV Output (W)	200
Operating Lamp Watts (W)	180
Lamp Current and Voltage	2.5 Amps; 90 Volts
Arc length (mm)	1058

Table 2-3. UV Lamp Sleeve Information

Type or model	GE 214 Clear Fused Quartz
Quartz material	Clear Fused Quartz
Pressure resistance (kPa)	7000

Table 2-4. UV Sensor Information

Type / model	UV-Technik SUV20.1 A2Y2C
Measuring field angle	‘o’ Norm 160 degree
Number of sensors per reactor and placement	1
Signal output range in mA (mV)	4 - 20 mA
Measuring range- W/m^2 Output signal	0 - 20 W/m^2

Additional UV sensor spectral information provided by ETS UV prior to the start of testing demonstrated the sensor met the requirements of the *Generic Protocol for Development of Test/Quality Assurance Plans for Validation of Ultraviolet (UV) Reactors, NSF International, 7/2010* (GP-2010) and the GP-2011. The GP-2010 and the updated GP-2011 are based on the USEPA's UVDGM-2006 requirements. The sensor meets the GP-2010 and GP-2011 requirement that >90% of the response is between 200 - 300 nm. The sensor information is included in Attachment 2.

Chapter 3
Methods and Procedures

3.1 Introduction

A Test Quality Assurance Plan (TQAP) was prepared to detail the experimental design for this validation work. The experimental design was based on the GP-2010 and GP-2011 as derived from the USEPA's UVDGM-2006. The TQAP is available from NSF upon request.

The approach used to validate UV reactors is based on biodosimetry which determines the log inactivation of a challenge microorganism during full-scale reactor testing for specific operating conditions of flow rate, UV transmittance (UVT), and UV intensity (measured by the duty sensor). A dose-response equation for the challenge microorganism (MS2 coliphage for this test) is determined using a collimated beam bench-scale test. The observed log-inactivation values from full-scale testing are input into the collimated beam derived-UV dose-response equations to estimate a "Reduction Equivalent Dose (RED_{meas})". The RED_{meas} value can then be adjusted for uncertainties and biases to produce a validated dose (RED_{Val}) for the reactor for the specific operating conditions tested.

The methods and procedures were designed to accomplish the primary objective of the validation test of the *Model UVL-200-4*, which was to develop a set line based on three set points (each set point is a specific flow rate-UV intensity combination) that would ensure a RED_{meas} of at least 40mJ/cm^2 based on MS2 as defined by the Ten States Standards 2012. Test procedures were also designed so that the RED_{meas} could be adjusted based on the uncertainty of the measurements to calculate a MS2 based validated dose (RED_{Val}) in accordance with the unique approach of the State of New York. The RED_{meas} data were also adjusted for uncertainty and the *Cryptosporidium* RED bias factors from the UVDGM-2006 Appendix G.

The GP-2010 required the use of a second less sensitive challenge organism as part of the validation. The bacteriophage "T7" was initially included in the GP-2010 as a result of research suggesting it could be a surrogate test microorganism with UV sensitivity similar to the UV sensitivity of *Cryptosporidium* (Fallon et.al, JAWWA, 99.3, March 2007). The GP-2010 technical advisory panel had reservations about using any test microorganism other than MS2 which has an excellent record of quality control response for collimated beam regression curves (Figure A.1 in the UVDGM-2006). The ETV GP-2010 technical advisory panel opinion was that other test microorganisms simply did not yet have the record of quality control limits as did MS2.

In 2010 during some initial validation studies, NSF attempted to use the bacteriophage T7. The strain referenced by the JAWWA study (ATCC 11303-B7) was not available through ATCC. In fact ATCC said verbally that the strain mentioned was not in fact T7 and not available. With the counsel of the EPA, NSF agreed to try bacteriophage T7 ATCC strain BAA-1103-B38.

Comments in 2011 on the GP-2010 also provided reasons not to specify only T7: "However, T7 cannot be produced at nearly as high a titer as T1, so in the validation of high-flow reactors, replacing all the bacteriophage T1 test conditions with T7 test conditions would consume an unacceptable volume of raw phage stock." Consequently the GP-2010 technical advisory panel

recommended the use of any organism other than MS2 will be optional and the use of MS2 will be mandatory for all types of reactors. The use of a challenge organism other than MS2 will be determined by the consensus of stakeholders.

For the retesting done for this project, NSF chose to only use MS2 based on the concerns raised about T7 by reviewers and the changes made in the 2011 ETV UV Protocol. Instead, it was decided to illustrate how MS2 data were being used to satisfy many different regulatory requirements while using essentially the same data. The basic biodosimetry data were used to calculate the log inactivation of *Cryptosporidium*, the 40mJ/cm^2 dose (RED_{meas}) requirement found in the Ten States Standards 2012 and the NIPH guidelines, and the "validated" dose approach (RED_{Val}) based on MS2 used by the NYDOH.

UV reactor validation included:

1. Obtain the technical specifications for the system as provided by ETS UV
2. Assessment of the UV sensors
3. Collimated beam laboratory bench scale testing
4. Full scale reactor testing
5. Calculations to determine the RED
6. Adjust the RED for uncertainty in UV dose and calculate a validated dose for *Cryptosporidium*

The target UV dosage validated was a RED_{meas} of 40 mJ/cm^2, based on MS2. ETS UV selected flow rates of 15, 20, and 25 gpm as the target flow rates based on their system design for *Model UVL-200-4* and the results of screening tests and initial data from 2010.

3.2 UV Sensors Assessment

The *Model UVL-200-4* duty sensor was evaluated according to the UV sensor requirements in the GP-2010 and GP-2011 prior to the verification testing. All UV intensity sensors (the duty and two reference sensors) were new sensors and specifications provided with the sensors showed they were designed in accordance with the DVGW guideline W 294 (June, 2006) and the ÖNORM M5873-1 standard (June, 2002), respectively. Evidence of calibration of the sensors within the last 12 months, traceable to a standard of the Physikalisch Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB) in Braunschweig, was provided by ETS UV as provided to them by the sensor manufacturer (*uv-technik)*.

The validation testing requires confirmation of the duty sensor spectral response to assess whether the sensors are germicidal (see UVDGM-2006 Glossary for the definition of germicidal) with a defined spectral response of at least 90% between 200 and 300 nm. The technical specifications of the ETS UV sensor and representation of sensitivity to the germicidal wavelength was provided by ETS UV and found to meet the requirements. The technical specifications of the ETS UV sensor and representation of sensitivity to the germicidal wavelength is included in Attachment 2.

During validation testing, the duty UV sensor measurement was compared to two reference sensor measurements to assure the duty sensor was within 10% of the average of the two reference sensor measurements.

The following steps were used to check the uncertainty of the duty and reference UV sensors. The sensors were checked before and after the validation testing.

1. Step 1: Water was passed through the reactor at the maximum UV transmittance (UVT) and the maximum lamp power setting to be used during validation testing.

2. Step 2: Using two recently calibrated (at a minimum annually) reference UV sensors, each reference sensor was installed on the UV reactor at the sensor port. The UV intensity was measured and recorded.

   Step 2 was repeated using the duty UV sensor.

3. Step 3: Steps 1 and 2 were repeated at maximum UVT and lamp power decreased to the minimum level expected to occur during validation testing.

4. Step 4: For a given lamp output and UVT value, the difference between the reference and duty UV sensor measurements were calculated as follows:

   The absolute value of $[(S_{duty} / S_{Avg\ Ref}) - 1]$

   where:

   S_{duty} = Intensity measured by a duty UV sensor,
   $S_{Avg\ Ref}$ = Average UV intensity measured by all the reference UV sensors in the same UV sensor port with the same UV lamp at the same UV lamp power.

3.3 Headloss Determination

Headloss through the unit was determined over the range of expected flow rates, in this case from 10 gpm to 25 gpm. The inlet pressure near the inlet flange and the outlet pressure near the outlet flange were measured at several flow rates. Measurements were recorded for flow rates of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 gpm. These data are reported in Section 4.10.

3.4 Power Consumption Evaluation

The amperage and voltage used by the unit were measured during all reactor test runs.

Power data are presented in Section 4.11.

3.5 Feed Water Source and Test Rig Setup

The water source for this test was City of Ann Arbor Michigan municipal drinking water. The water was de-chlorinated using activated carbon, as confirmed by testing in the laboratory. For the lowered UVT conditions, the chemical Sodium Lignin Sulfonic Acid (LSA) was used to lower the UV transmittance to the UVTs of ≤79%, ≤90% and ≤94%. LSA was added to the

supply tank before each set of the lowered UVT runs and was well mixed using a recirculating pump system. UVT was measured continuously using an in-line UVT meter (calibrated daily) to confirm that proper UVT was attained. UVT measurements were also confirmed by the collection of samples during each test run and analysis by a bench top spectrophotometer.

NSF used a UV test rig and system setup that is designed to conform to the specifications as described in the GP-2011 and UVDGM-2006. Figure 3-1 shows a basic schematic of the NSF test rig and equipment setup. The schematic is reproduced for informational purposes and is copyright protected. A photograph of the actual setup is shown in Figure 3-2.

The feed water pump to the test unit was a variable speed pump. Flow rate was controlled by adjusting the power supplied to the pump and by a control valve. A magnetic water flow meter was used to monitor flow rate. The meter was calibrated and easily achieved the required accuracy of $\pm$ 5%. A chemical feed pump (injector pump) was used to inject MS2 coliphage upstream of an inline static mixer. The inline mixer ensured sufficient mixing of the microorganism prior to the influent sampling port, which was located upstream of the 90° elbow installed directly on the inlet to the unit. The effluent sampling port was located downstream of a 90° elbow that was installed directly on the outlet port of the unit and downstream of a second in-line mixer. This use of an in-line mixer met the UVDGM-2006 requirement to ensure good mixing of the treated water prior to the effluent sampling port.



Figure 3-1 Schematic of NSF test rig©

Figure 3-2 Photograph of the *Model UVL-200-4* Test Setup

3.6 Installation of Reactor and Lamp Burn-in

The UV reactor and the reactor inlet and outlet connections were installed at the NSF laboratory in accordance with the ETS UV installation and assembly instructions. Two 90 degree elbows, one upstream and one downstream of the unit, were used in the test rig setup to eliminate stray UV light. Figure 3-2 shows a photograph of the test rig setup, which conforms with the GP-2011. The UV lamp was new and therefore the system was operated for 100 hours with the lamps turned on at full power prior to the start of the test.

There is one duty sensor and one lamp in the *Model UVL-200-4*. Therefore, the lamp positioning check requirements (checking each lamp and placing the lowest output lamp closest to the sensor) were not required for this validation.

3.7 Collimated Beam Bench Scale Testing

The collimated beam procedure involves placing a sample collected from the test rig and containing MS2 in a petri dish and then exposing the sample to collimated UV light for a predetermined amount of time. The UV dose is calculated using the measured intensity of the

UV light, UV transmittance of the water, and exposure time. The measured concentration of microorganisms before and after exposure provides the "response," or log inactivation of the microorganisms from exposure to UV light. Regression analysis of measured log inactivation for a range of UV doses produces the dose-response curve.

Appendix C of the UVDGM-2006 provides guidance on how to conduct the collimated beam bench-scale testing and to produce a UV dose-response curve. Based on the UVDGM-2006 guidance, the following sections describe the details of the collimated beam testing.

3.7.1 Test Microorganism (Challenge)

MS2 coliphage ATCC 15597-B1 was used in collimated beam bench scale testing and for the full-scale reactor dose validation tests. MS2 coliphage ATCC 15597-B1 is a recommended microorganism for UV lamp validation tests. Further reasons for selecting this microorganism for UV validation are based on its inter-laboratory reproducibility (UVDGM-2006), ease of use and culturing, and demonstrated performance of MS2 in validation testing.

3.7.2 Test Conditions

The collimated beam tests were performed in duplicate at the minimum and maximum UVT test conditions. For this validation the testing occurred over two days. The lowered UVT test runs were performed on the first day. The intensity readings at each UVT (79%. 90%, 94%) were recorded during test run with full lamp power. Collimated beam tests were run on the minimum UVT water (79%) with duplicate runs being performed. On the second day using high UVT water (97%), the power was reduced to achieve the same intensity as measured for each of the lowered UVT waters on day one. The *Model UVL-200-4* does not have a variable power control as part of the normal control system. ETS UV provided a variable power controller that allowed the lamp power to be lowered to achieve the measured intensities in water for the test run. . Collimated beam tests were run on day two on the high UVT water (97%) with duplicate runs being performed. Thus, for this validation test, there are two sets of duplicate collimated beam test data, one at lowest UVT (79%) and one at the high UVT (water not adjusted with LSA).

UV doses covered the range of the targeted RED dose, which in this case is 40mJ/cm^2. UV doses were set at 0, 20, 30, 40, and 60 and 80 mJ/cm^2. The samples are clustered close to the 40mJ/cm^2 target dose with two doses above and below the target of 40 mJ/cm^2.

The collimated beam radiometers were calibrated to ensure that the measured UV intensity met the criteria of an uncertainty of 8 percent or less at a 95-percent confidence level.

3.7.3 Test Apparatus

NSF uses a collimated beam apparatus that conforms to NSF/ANSI Standard 55 section 7.2.1.2. and the UVDGM-2006. A description of the apparatus is presented in NSF/ANSI Standard 55© Annex A, which is presented in Attachment 3.

3.7.4 Collimated Beam Procedure

NSF collected two (2) one liter samples from the influent sampling port of the test rig for collimated beam testing. Each bottle was used for one of the replicates for the collimated beam test. The MS2 spiked water was collected directly from the test rig each day during the test runs. Therefore, the collimated beam test water and microorganism culture was the same as used in the full scale reactor tests.

NSF microbiological laboratory personnel followed the “Method for Challenge Microorganism Preparation, Culturing the Challenge Organism and Measuring its Concentration” in Annex A of NSF/ANSI Standard 55. Please note that all reproduced portions of NSF/ANSI Standards are copyright protected.

For collimated beam testing of a water sample containing challenge microorganisms, NSF’s laboratory followed this procedure:

1. Measure the A_{254} of the sample.
2. Place a known volume from the water sample into a petri dish and add a stir bar. Measure the water depth in the petri dish.
3. Measure the UV intensity delivered by the collimated beam with no sample present using a calibrated radiometer using a calibrated UV sensor. The UV sensor is placed at the same distance from the radiometer as the sample surface.
4. Calculate the required exposure time to deliver the target UV dose described in the next section.
5. Block the light from the collimating tube using a shutter or equivalent.
6. Center the petri dish with the water sample under the collimating tube.
7. Remove the light block from the collimating tube and start the timer.
8. When the target exposure time has elapsed, block the light from the collimating tube.
9. Remove the petri dish and collect the sample for measurement of the challenge microorganism concentration. Analyze immediately or store in the dark at 4 ºC (for up to 6 hours). Multiple dilutions are used to bracket the expected concentration range (e.g. sample dilutions of 10X, 100X, 1000X). Plate each dilution in triplicate and calculate the average microbial value for the dilution from the three plate replicates that provide the best colony count.
10. Re-measure the UV intensity and calculate the average of this measurement and the measurement taken in Step 3. The value should be within 5 percent of the value measured in Step 3. If not, recalibrate radiometer and re-start at Step 1.
11. Using the equation described in the next section, calculate the UV dose applied to the sample based on experimental conditions. The calculated experimental dose should be similar to the planned target dose.
12. Repeat Steps 1 through 11 for each replicate and target UV dose value. Repeat all steps for each water test condition replicate.

The UV dose delivered to the sample is calculated using the following equation:

$$D_{CB} = E_s * P_f * (1-R) * [L * (1-10^{-A_{254} * d})/(d + L) * A_{254} * d * \ln(10)] * t$$

Where:

D_{CB} = UV dose (mJ/cm^2)
E_s = Average UV intensity (measured before and after irradiating the sample) (mW/cm^2)
P_f = Petri Factor (unitless)
R = Reflectance at the air-water interface at 254 nm (unitless)
L = Distance from lamp centerline to suspension surface (cm)
d = Depth of the suspension (cm)
A_{254} = UV absorbance at 254 nm (unitless)
t = Exposure time (s)

To control for error in the UV dose measurement, the uncertainties of the terms in the UV dose calculation met the following criteria:

- Depth of suspension (d) $\leq$ 10%
- Average incident irradiance (E_s) $\leq$ 8%
- Petri Factor (P_f) $\leq$ 5%
- L/(d + L) $\leq$ 1%
- Time (t) $\leq$ 5 %
- $(1 - 10^{-ad})/ad \leq$ 5%

Further details and definitions of these factors are available in the collimated procedure and technical papers as referenced in the GP-2011 and UVDGM-2006. The QC data for these factors are presented in Section 5.5.3.

3.7.5 Developing the UV Dose-response Curve

The collimated beam tests produced:

- UV Dose in units of mJ/cm^2,
- Concentration of microorganisms in the petri dish prior to UV exposure (N_o) as plaque forming units (pfu)/mL, and
- Concentration of microorganisms in the petri dish after UV exposure (N) as pfu/mL.

The procedure for developing the UV dose response curves was as follows:

1. For each UV test condition (high or low UVT water) and its replicate and for each day of testing, log N (pfu/mL) was plotted vs. UV dose (mJ/cm^2). A best fit regression line was determined and a common N_o was identified as the intercept of the curve at UV dose = 0. A separate equation was developed for each UVT condition (lowest and highest) for each day of testing at that condition. In this test there were two days of testing, so there were two sets of data.

2. The log inactivation (log I) was calculated for each measured value of N (including zero-dose) and the common N_o identified in Step 1 using the following equation:

$$\log I = \log(N_o/N)$$

Where:
N_o = The common N_o identified in Step 1 (pfu/mL);
N = Concentration of challenge microorganisms in the petri dish after exposure to UV light (pfu/mL).

3. The UV dose as a function of log I was plotted for each day of testing and included water from both high and low UVT test conditions.

4. Using regression analysis an equation was derived that best fit the data, forcing the fit through the origin. The force fit through the origin is used rather than the measured value of N_o, because any experimental or analytical error in the measured value is carried to all the data points, adding an unrelated bias to each measurement. Using the y-intercept of the curve eliminates error carry through. The regression equation was then used to calculate the RED_{meas} for each full scale test sample.

The full set of collimated beam data and all calculations and regression analyses are presented in Sections 4.3 and 4.4.

The regression analysis was used to derive an equation that best fits the data with a force fit through the origin. Both linear and a polynomial equations were evaluated to determine the best fit of the data. The regression coefficient, R^2, was determined for each trend line and was considered acceptable if it was 0.9 or greater and for "r" +/- 0.95 or greater. The equation coefficients for each day were also evaluated statistically to determine which terms were statistically significant based on the P factor. All coefficients were found to be significant (i.e. $P < 0.05$).

For this validation a single curve corresponding to one day's worth of full scale reactor testing was used to calculate RED_{meas} values for that day. The higher UVT dose response curve was used for the high UVT test run with reduced power and the lower UVT dose response curve was used for the test run when the UVT of the test water was lowered with LSA.

3.7.6 Collimated Beam Data Uncertainty

The collimated beam data was fit to a polynomial regression and the uncertainty of the dose response equation based on a 95% confidence interval (U_{DR}) was calculated as follows:

$$U_{DR} = t * [SD / \text{UV Dose}_{CB}] * 100\%$$

Where:
U_{DR} = Uncertainty of the UV dose-response fit at a 95% confidence level
UV $Dose_{CB}$ = UV dose calculated from the UV dose-response curve for the challenge microorganism
SD = Standard deviation of the difference between the calculated UV dose response and the measured value

t = t-statistic at a 95% confidence level for a sample size equal to the number of test condition replicates used to define the dose-response.

The U_{DR} calculations are included in Section 4.4

3.8 Full Scale Testing to Validate UV dose

3.8.1 Evaluation, Documentation and Installation of Reactor

ETS UV provided technical information on *Model UVL-200-4* and basic information on the UV lamps, sensor, and related equipment. An operating manual and a technical specification book were provided prior to the start of testing. All documentation and equipment data were reviewed prior to the start of testing. The equipment was described in Section 2. Attachments 1 and 2 include the manuals, specifications, and sensor data provided by ETS UV.

3.8.2 Test Conditions for UV Intensity Set-Point Approach

The purpose of this testing was to determine a RED_{meas} dose of $\geq$40 mJ/cm^2 at three set points that were then used to establish a set line based on the three UV intensity and flow rate pairs. ETS UV specified the target flow rates (15, 20, 25 gpm) and UV target intensity levels (7, 11, 13 W/m^2) based on the results of tests performed at NSF prior to the validation tests. The intensity targets were based on the expected intensity at UVT's of 79%, 90%, and 94%.

During full-scale commercial operation, regulations require that the UV intensity as measured by the UV sensor must meet or exceed the validated intensity and that the flow rate be at or below the validated flow rate to ensure delivery of the required dose. Reactors must be operated within the validated operating condition for maximum flow rate and minimum irradiance. Under the UV set point approach, UVT does not have to be measured separately. The intensity readings by the sensor take into account changes in the UVT.

A set point represents a given flow rate with testing with two conditions (lowered UVT-max lamp power; high UVT-reduced lamp power). The first test condition involved reducing the UVT until the UV intensity measured by the unit UV sensor equaled the target UV intensity set point. The second test condition was run with high UVT (unadjusted UVT) and with the power reduced until the unit UV intensity measured by the sensor was equal to the target UV intensity set point. Three target flow rate - intensity set points (15 gpm-7.0 W/m^2, 20 gpm-11 W/m^2, and 25 gpm - 13 W/m^2) were tested under the two conditions and each condition was performed in duplicate. The three set points were then used to develop a set line that defines operating conditions of flow rate and intensity that achieve a RED of >40 mJ/cm^2.

The LT2ESWTR requires validation of UV reactors to determine a log inactivation of *Cryptosporidium* or other target pathogen so that States may use the data to grant log credits. Therefore, in addition to determining the setline to achieve a minimum RED_{meas} of 40 mJ/cm^2, additional calculations (adjusting RED_{meas} for uncertainty and RED bias) were performed to demonstrate the log inactivation of *Cryptosporidium*.

A reactor control test (MS2 injection with the lamp off) was run at the low flow rate (15 gpm) and with high UVT water, which demonstrated that there was no reduction of MS2 with the

lamps off. A reactor blank was also run on each day of testing. The reactor blank was run with no phage injection at the low flow rate with high UVT water to demonstrate the testing system was low in MS2 concentration and other microorganisms. Reactor blank and control samples were collected in triplicate at the influent and effluent sampling locations and submitted for MS2 analyses.

Trip blanks were prepared and analyzed for each day of testing. The microbiology laboratory took two samples from the challenge solution prepared for one of the test runs. The first sample remained in the microbiology laboratory and the second sample traveled with challenge solution to the engineering laboratory and then was returned with the samples collected from the test run. Both samples were analyzed for MS2 and the results were compared to determine any change that might have occurred during transport of the samples. As with stability testing, trip blanks are important when samples must be shipped or carried long distance with the inherent holding time before delivery to the lab. At NSF the test rig and laboratory are in the same building and the trip is "down the hall". Therefore travel related impacts are of less concern, but trip blanks were run as part of the QC plan for these tests.

Table 3-1 shows a summary of the test conditions that were run for the validation test. A Sample and Analysis Management Program was also prepared and was provided to the NSF engineering and microbiology laboratories for use during the testing and for setting up the sample and analysis in the NSF sample management system.

Five sets of samples were collected at the influent and effluent sample ports for MS2 analysis during each test condition and its duplicate. The delivered dose was calculated for each of the five samples and then the average of the five results was calculated to determine an average delivered dose (RED).

Flow rate, intensity, and UVT data (from the NSF in-line UVT monitor) were collected at each of the five sample collection times for all test runs. These data were averaged to determine the average flow rate, UVT, and intensity for each test condition and it’s duplicate.

In addition, samples for pH, turbidity, temperature, total and residual chlorine, *E coli,* and HPC were collected at the influent and effluent sample ports once during each test run. Samples for iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) analyses were collected once during each test run at the influent sample port to provide additional basic water quality data. Samples were also collected at the influent and effluent for UVT analysis by the chemistry laboratory bench scale spectrophotometer to confirm the in-line UVT measurements.

Samples of the low and high UVT waters were collected at the influent and effluent locations for UVT scans. The samples were scanned for UVT measurements in the range of 200 to 400 nm.

Table 3-1. Test Conditions for Validation with MS2 Phage.

Validation Test	Flow Rate	UV Transmittance UVT (%)	Lamp Power	Intensity Sensor Reading
Condition 1	15 gpm	79%	Maximum	Record actual reading
	20 gpm	90%		
	25 gpm	94%		
Condition 2	15 gpm	>95%	Lowered to achieved intensity from Condition 1	Set to equal Condition 1 by lowering lamp power
	20 gpm	>95%		
	25 gpm	>95%		
Condition 3 (reactor control)	15 gpm	>95%	Turned off	Not applicable
Condition 4 (reactor blank)	15 gpm	Daily Source water - ether high or low UVT	Full Power	Record

Condition 1 and 2 performed in duplicate
Reactor blanks run for each day of testing
UVT scan of feed water with and without UVT adjustment
Trip blanks and method blanks run for each day of testing

3.8.3 Preparation of the Challenge Microorganisms

The challenge microorganism (MS2) used to validate UV reactors was cultured and analyzed by NSF's microbiology laboratory as specified in *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*. NSF personnel followed the method for "Culture of challenge microorganisms" in Annex A of NSF/ANSI Standard 55 as presented in Attachment 3.

Propagation resulted in a highly concentrated stock solution of essentially monodispersed phage whose UV dose-response follows second-order kinetics with minimal tailing. Over the range of RED values demonstrated during validation testing, the mean UV dose-response of the MS2 phage stock solution was within the 95-percent prediction interval of the mean response in Figure A.1 in Appendix A of the UVDGM-2006. Over a UV dose range of 0 to 120 millijoules per centimeter squared (mJ/cm^2), the prediction intervals of the data shown in Appendix A of the UVDGM-2006 are represented by the following equations:

$$\textit{Upper Bound: } \log I = -1.4 \times 10^{-4} \times \textit{UV Dose}^2 + 7.6 \times 10^{-2} \times \textit{UV Dose}$$
$$\textit{Lower Bound: } \log I = -9.6 \times 10^{-5} \times \textit{UV Dose}^2 + 4.5 \times 10^{-2} \times \textit{UV Dose}$$

City of Ann Arbor tap water was filtered using activated carbon to remove any residual chlorine (confirmed by chemical analysis for total chlorine of the test water), organic surfactants and dissolved organic chemicals that may be UV absorbers. The filtered challenge water was then tested for the following parameters and found acceptable if the result is non-detectable or as otherwise indicated below:

- Total chlorine,
- Free chlorine,
- UV_{254} ,

- UVT > 95%
- Total iron,
- Total Manganese,
- Turbidity ≤ 0.3 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTU);
- Total coliform (<1 cfu/100mL),
- Heterotrophic plate count (<100 cfu/mL).

3.8.4 Conduct Testing – Measuring UV Dose

During full-scale reactor testing, the reactor was operated at each of the test conditions for flow rate, UVT, and lamp power as described in section 3.8.2. The following steps were taken to assure meeting data quality objectives:

1. Steady-state conditions were confirmed before injecting the challenge microorganism. Confirmation of steady state involved monitoring UV sensor measurements and the UVT to assure the test water and reactor met the test conditions such as UVT reading of 90%. After typically 3-5 minutes of operation and confirmation that UVT, sensor readings, and flow rate were steady, the injection pump was started and steady state conditions were achieved by waiting until the injection pump was at a steady flow rate based on measurements of weight loss of solution over 15 second time intervals. In all cases, sampling did not start until at least 2 minutes after the injection pump was started.
2. MS2 was injected into the feed water upstream of the reactor to achieve a greater than $1x10^5$ pfu/mL so that a minimum of a 4 log reduction could be measured during the runs.
3. Sample taps remained open over the duration of the test.
4. Samples were collected in accordance with standards of good practice as defined by *Standard Methods* Section 9060.
5. Five (5) sample pairs were collected during approximately ten to twelve minutes of continuous flow at steady conditions. Each set of influent and effluent grab samples were collected as close in time as possible. The five sets of samples were spread out over the 10- to 12-minute continuous flow run.
6. Sample volumes for assessing the challenge microorganism concentrations in the influent and effluent were collected in 125 mL bottles.
7. Samples were collected in bottles that had been cleaned and sterilized by the NSF micro laboratory.
8. Collected samples were delivered directly to the microbiological lab located in the same building after each sampling period. Sample analyses were generally started immediately, but if samples could be stored in the refrigerator, in the dark, they were analyzed a couple of hours later. All MS2 analyses were started within 4-6 hours of the time the sample was collected.

The following measurements and recordings were taken during each test run:

1. The flow rate through the reactor, UV sensor reading and on-line UVT measurements were recorded when each sample was collected during each run, yielding a minimum of five measurements for each test run.

2. Water chemistry and other microbiological grab samples were collected once per test condition after one of the challenge organism samples were collected. Samples for temperature, pH, *E. coli*, and Heterotrophic Plate Count were collected at the influent and effluent locations, and samples for iron, manganese, turbidity and residual chlorine were collected at the influent location.
3. A sample for UVT was collected and measured by a UV spectrophotometer for each influent sample and at least one effluent sample.
4. A sample of the influent and effluent water was collected at the beginning of each test day and a UVT scan performed over the range of 200 to 400 nm.
5. The electrical power consumed by the system was recorded.

Chapter 4 describes the calculations and presents the data for determining the RED_{meas} and the validated dose (RED_{Val}) at a each set point.

3.9 Analytical Methods

All laboratory analytical methods for water quality parameters are listed in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2. Analytical Methods for Laboratory Analyses.

Parameter	Method	NSF Reporting Limit	Lab Accuracy (% Recovery)	Lab Precision (%RPD [1])	Hold Time (days)	Sample Container	Sample Preservation
Temperature	SM[2] 2550	-	-	-	-	-	-
pH	SM[2 4500-H^+		$\pm$0.1 SU of buffer	$\pm$0.1 SU	(3)	NA	None
E. coli / Total Coliform	SM 9223	1 CFU /100mL	-	-	24 h	500 mL plastic	1% Tween 80
Iron	EPA 200.7	20 µg/L	70-130	10%	180 days	125 mL polyethylene	Nitric acid
Manganese	EPA 200.8	1 µg/L	70-130	10%	180 days	125 mL polyethylene	Nitric acid
Turbidity	SM[2 2130	0.1 NTU	95-105	-	(3)	NA	None
MS2	Top Agar Overlay	1 pfu/mL	-	-	24 h[4]	125 mL plastic	1% Tween 80
Absorbance UV 254	SM 5910B	NA	60-140	≤ 20	2	1 L plastic	None
Residual chlorine	SM 4500-Cl D	0.05 mg/L	90-110	≤10%	(3)	NA	None
HPC	SM 9215	1 CFU/mL	-	-	24 h	125 mL plastic	1% Tween 80

(1) RPD = Relative Percent Deviation
(2) SM = Standard Methods
(3) Immediate analysis required
(4) h = hours

3.9.1 Sample Processing, and Enumeration of MS2:

MS2 sample processing and enumeration followed the procedures used in NSF / ANSI Standard 55.

3.9.2 Percent UVT measurements:

The percent UVT for laboratory measurements was calculated from A_{254}. The equation for UVT using A_{254} is:

$$UVT(\%) = 100 * 10^{-A_{254}}$$

The on-line UVT analyzer provided immediate data throughout all test runs. The on-line analyzer was calibrated every day of operation. A primary standard was used before the first day of testing began. Daily calibration was performed on all test days using a certified secondary standard. Before the start of each day's testing, a sample was taken to the laboratory and analyzed with the on-line analyzer to ensure the data were comparable and within acceptable quality control limits for accuracy.

All UVT measurements used a 1-cm path length and are reported on a 1-cm path length basis. Spectrophotometer measurements of A_{254} were verified using NIST-traceable potassium dichromate UV absorbance standards and holmium oxide UV wavelength standards. The UV spectrophotometer internal QA/QC procedures outlined in the UVDGM-2006 were used to verify calibration. UV absorbance of solutions used to zero the spectrophotometer were verified using reagent grade organic-free water certified by the supplier to have zero UV absorbance.

The measurement uncertainty of the spectrophotometer must be 10 percent or less. To achieve this goal, the following procedures were used to verify:

1. The spectrophotometer read the wavelength to within the accuracy of a holmium oxide standard (typically ± 0.2 nm at a 95-percent confidence level.
2. The spectrophotometer read A_{254} within the accuracy of a dichromate standard (e.g., 0.281 ± 0.005 at 257 nm with a 20 mg/L standard). and
3. That the water used to zero the instrument has an A_{254} value that was within 0.002 cm^{-1} of a certified zero absorbance solution.

3.9.3 Analytical QA/QC Procedures

Accuracy and precision of sample analyses were ensured through the following measures:

- pH – Three-point calibration (4, 7, and 10) of the pH meter was conducted daily using traceable buffers. The accuracy of the calibration was checked daily with a pH 8.00 buffer. The pH readings for the buffer were within 10% of its true value. The precision of the meter was checked daily using duplicate synthetic drinking water samples. The difference of the duplicate samples was within ± 0.1 SU.

- Temperature – The thermometer used to give the reportable data had a scale marked for every 0.1ºC. The thermometer is calibrated yearly using a Hart Scientific Dry Well Calibrator Model 9105.

- Total chlorine – The calibration of the chlorine meter was checked daily using a DI water sample (blank), and three QC standards. The measured QC standard values were within 10% of their true values. The precision of the meter was checked daily by duplicate analysis of synthetic drinking water samples. The RPD of the duplicate samples was less than 10%.
- Turbidity – The turbidimeter was calibrated as needed according to the manufacturer's instructions with formazin standards. Accuracy was checked daily with a secondary Gelex standard. The calibration check provided readings within 5% of the true value. The precision of the meter was checked daily by duplicate analysis of synthetic drinking water samples. The RPD of the duplicate samples was less than 10% or had a difference of less than or equal to 0.1 NTU at low turbidity levels.

3.9.4 Sample Handling

All samples were labeled with unique identification numbers. These identification numbers were entered into the NSF Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS), and were used on the NSF lab reports for the tests. All challenge organism samples were stored in the dark at 4 ± 2 °C and processed for analysis within 4-6 hours.

3.10 Full Scale Test Controls

The following quality-control samples and tests for full-scale reactor testing were performed:

- *Reactor controls* – Influent and effluent water samples were collected with the UV lamps turned off. The change in log concentration from influent to effluent should correspond to no more than 0.2 $\log_{10}$.
- *Reactor blanks* – Influent and effluent water samples were collected with no addition of MS2 to the flow passing through the reactor. Blanks were collected once on each day of testing. The reactor blank is acceptable when the MS2 concentration is less than 0.2 $\log_{10}$.
- *Trip controls* – Trip controls were collected to monitor any change in MS2 during transport to the laboratory (in the same building).
- *Method blanks* – A sample bottle of sterilized reagent grade water was analyzed using the MS2 assay procedure. The concentration of MS2 in the method blank was non-detectable.
- *Stability samples* – Influent and effluent samples at low and high UVT prior to the introduction of MS2, These samples were used to assess the stability of MS2 concentration and its UV dose-response over the time period from sample collection to completion of the MS 2 assay. The MS2 were added to achieve a concentration of 1,000 plaque forming units (pfu)/L in the samples containing test water at the lowest and highest UVT. A sample was analyzed immediately (called time 0) and then 4 hours, 8 hours and 24 hours after time 0. All analyses were performed in triplicate. While stability samples were performed during the test, they are not directly applicable in this case as all sample analyses for MS2 were started within a couple of hours of collection.

3.11 Power Measurements

The voltmeter and ammeter meter used to measure UV equipment had traceable evidence of being in calibration (e.g., have a tag showing that it was calibrated). Calibrations of meters were performed at least yearly and within the past year.

3.12 Flow Rate

During validation testing, the QC goal was that the accuracy of flow rate measurements should be within ±5 percent of the true value. Flow meter accuracy was verified by monitoring the draw down volume in the supply tanks over time. The supply tanks have been calibrated using the catch and weigh technique. The flow meter was within 1.6% of the true value. Flow meter calibration data are presented in Section 5.6.

3.13 Evaluation, Documentation and Installation of Reactor

ETS UV provided technical information on the *Model UVL-200-4* and basic information on the UV lamps, sensor, and related equipment. An operating manual was provided prior to the start of testing. Additional information on the lamp output (confirmation of spectral output) was provided prior to the start of the validation test. All documentation and equipment data was reviewed prior to the start of testing. The following documentation was reviewed and found to conform to the GP-2011 and UVDGM-2006 requirements:

Reactor Specifications

- Technical description of the reactor's UV dose-monitoring strategy, including the use of sensors, signal processing, and calculations (if applicable).
- Dimensions and placement of all critical components (e.g., lamps, sleeves, UV sensors, baffles, and cleaning mechanisms) within the UV reactor
- A technical description of lamp placement within the sleeve
- Specifications for the UV sensor port indicating all dimensions and tolerances that impact the positioning of the sensor relative to the lamps

Lamp specifications

- Technical description
- Lamp manufacturer and product number
- Electrical power rating
- Electrode-to-electrode length
- Spectral output of the lamps (specified for 5 nm intervals or less over a wavelength range that includes the germicidal range of 250 – 280 nm and the response range of the UV sensors)

Lamp sleeve specifications

- Technical description including sleeve dimensions
- Material of construction
- UV transmittance at 254 nm

Specifications for the reference and the duty UV sensors

- Manufacturer and product number
- Technical description including external dimensions

Sensor measurement properties

- Working range
- Spectral and angular response
- Linearity
- Calibration factor
- Temperature stability
- Long-term stability

Installation and operation documentation

- Flow rate and pressure rating of the reactor
- Assembly and installation instructions
- Electrical requirements, including required line frequency, voltage, amperage, and power
- Operation and maintenance manual including cleaning procedures, required spare parts, and safety requirements.

Chapter 4
Results and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

ETS UV specified target flow rates of 15, 20, and 25 gpm. The intensity initial targets were 7, 11 and 13 W/m^2 based on the expected intensities at UVTs of 79%, 90%, and 94% with the lamp at full power. These points were projected to deliver a RED_{meas} and RED_{Val} of $\geq$40 mJ/cm^2.

The main validation tests were run on two days, June 20 and June 21, 2012. All of the results of the validation set point tests are presented herein. The first day of testing was dedicated to the test conditions and duplicate runs where the UVT of the feed water was lowered to the target levels (<79%, <90%, and <94%) and the lamps were operated at full power. The second day of testing was dedicated to the test conditions and duplicates where high UVT feed water (>95% target) was used and the lamp power was reduced to achieve the target intensity level. The test conditions and detail on the test rig setup, sampling procedures, and unit operation are described in Chapter 3 Methods and Procedures.

All tests were conducted at the NSF laboratory in Ann Arbor, MI, and all analyses were performed by the NSF microbiological and chemistry laboratories at this location.

4.2 Sensor Assessment

The *Model UVL-200-4* duty sensor was evaluated according to the UV sensor requirements in the EPA's UVDGM-2006 prior to and after the verification testing. All UV intensity sensors (the duty and two reference sensors) were new sensors and specifications provided with the sensors showed they were designed in accordance with the DVGW guideline W 294 (June, 2006) and the ÖNORM M5873-1 standard (June, 2002), respectively. Evidence of calibration of the sensors traceable to a standard of the Physikalisch Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB) in Braunschweig, was provided by ETS UV as provided to them by the sensor manufacturer *uv-technik*. Certificates are presented in Attachment 2.

The same duty sensor was used for monitoring intensity (irradiance) for all test runs. This sensor measured the intensity from the single low pressure lamp in the unit. The control panel provided direct readings of intensity in W/m^2. This direct reading was based on converting the 4-20 mA output signal to intensity based on the calibration certificate provided with the sensor. Attachment 2 includes the certificates for the two reference sensors and one duty sensor, plus the spectral data for the sensor.

The duty sensor was compared against two reference sensors to demonstrate that the duty sensor was within 10% of the average of the two reference sensors. This evaluation was conducted before and after the validation test runs using the procedure described in the GP-2011 and the UVDGM-2006. Table 4-1 presents the results of the sensor assessment. These data demonstrate that the duty sensor was within 10 percent of the average of the two reference sensors. The two reference sensors showed a variance of 2.7% at 100% power and a range of 2.7% to 3.0% at 60% power.

Table 4-1. Sensor Assessment Data First Set of Test Runs (June 2012)

Sensor	Intensity at 100% power Before testing (W/m^2)	Intensity at 100% power After testing (W/m^2)	Intensity at ~60% Power Before testing (W/m^2)	Intensity at ~60% Power After testing (W/m^2)
Reference #1 W4164	13.22	14.56	4.26	4.81
Reference #2 W4166	13.94	15.38	4.52	5.03
Average of Reference Sensor	13.58	14.97	4.39	4.92
Duty Sensor W4165	13.57	15.08	4.37	4.94
Deviation of Duty Sensor from Reference	<0.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%
	UVT = 95.5%	UVT = 97%	UVT = 95.5 %	UVT = 97%

The test results shown in the later tables and the sensor assessment data collected before and after the test were performed to demonstrate the intensity was stable throughout the testing as a function of ballast power and UVT. This indicates that lamp output was constant and no fouling occurred to the lamp sleeves and sensor windows.

4.3 Collimated Beam Dose Response Data

Collimated Beam dose response data were generated for both low and high UVT waters in accordance with the procedures described in Section 3.7.4. The collimated beam tests were run on the minimum UVT water (79%) and on the high UVT (97%) water used for the minimum power test runs. All collimated beam tests were performed in duplicate.

UV doses covered the range of the targeted RED_{meas} dose, which in this case was >40 mJ/cm^2. UV target doses were set at 0, 20, 30, 40, 60 and 80 mJ/cm^2. As discussed in Section 4.5, the actual RED_{meas} for four test runs slightly exceeded the maximum collimated beam dose of 80 mJ/cm^2. RED_{meas} cannot be quantitatively determined if calculated RED_{meas} exceeds the top range of the collimated beam data. These data are presented as calculated, but any RED_{meas} values above 80 mJ/cm^2 should be used as estimates only.

The collimated beam samples were collected directly from the test rig during the normal testing runs. A one liter bottle of the seeded influent water (MS2 injection pumping run during the test run) was collected to provide the two samples for duplicate analyses. Using this approach, the dose response data reflect the identical conditions to the biodosimetric flow tests for sample matrix, UVT, and MS2 concentration. The collimated beam samples were irradiated on the same day as sample collection, and were plated in triplicate along with the flow test samples.

Therefore analytical conditions for the dose response data were also identical to those for the flow test samples.

The collimated beam results are presented in Tables 4-2 and 4-3. These data were calculated as the average of the three individual results obtained at each dose level.

4.4 Development of Dose Response

The development of the UV dose response curves for use with flow tests to establish the RED_{meas} is a three step process.

1. For each collimated beam test and its replicate for each day of testing, the log N (pfu/mL) was plotted vs. UV dose (mJ/cm^2). Figures 4-1 and 4-2 show the curves for the low and higher UVT waters.

2. A separate equation (second order polynomial) was developed for each UVT condition (low and high). Therefore, there are two sets (low and high UVT) of data with each set containing collimated test performed in duplicate. A common N_o was identified for each data set as the intercept of the curve at UV dose = 0.

3. The log inactivation (log I) was then calculated for each day for each measured value of N (including zero-dose) and the common N_o identified in Step 1 using the following equation:

$$\log I = \log (N_o/N)$$

Where:

N_o = the common N_o identified in Step 1 (pfu/mL);

N = Concentration of challenge microorganisms in the petri dish after exposure to UV light (pfu/mL).

Tables 4-2 and 4-3 show the calculated values for log inactivation (LI).

Finally, the UV dose as a function of log I was plotted for each set of data. Figures 4-3 and 4-4 show the curves for dose as a function of log inactivation. Using regression analysis an equation was derived that best fit the data, forcing the fit through the origin. In each case the equation was a second order polynomial, which is the most common for MS2 collimated beam data. The regression equation was then used to calculate the RED_{meas} for each full scale flow test samples. RED_{meas} calculations and full scale data is presented in Section 4.5.

The polynomial equation coefficients for each day were evaluated statistically to determine if the terms were significant based on the P factor. All coefficients were found to be significant (P factor <0.05) for all the dose response curves.

A Grubbs' test was run to determine if any replicates should be omitted from the development of the dose response curve. The Grubbs' test results show that no replicates should be omitted from the data set. However, one data point, replicate 2 at the 20.88 mJ/cm^2 dose for the 79% UVT water was very close to being a statistical outlier (Grubbs statistics was 2.4 and this data point had a value of 2.3). The Grubbs's statistics are shown in Tables 4-2 and 4-3.

A summary of the statistics for uncertainty for the collimated beam dose response data is presented at the end of Tables 4-2 and 4-3. The dose response uncertainty (U_{DR}) of the collimated beam results for the high UVT water is less than 30% (U_{DR} = 18.14%) at the 1-log inactivation level, which is the QC goal. However, the data from the low UVT water shows a U_{DR} of 38.95%. Further examination of the data shows that the primary cause of the increased uncertainty of the dose response equation above the objective of <30% is the data point at a 20.88 mJ/cm^2 dose for replicate 2. As shown in the Grubbs' test above, this data was very close to being a statistically significant outlier. The data were analyzed with this data point removed and the uncertainty of the dose response equation dropped to 26.73%. Given that this data point has a high Grubbs statistic and by far the highest residual in the statistical tests; the data point was considered an outlier and removed from the dose response equation. Table 4-4 shows the recalculated dose response data and equation coefficient with the replicate 2 data point at the 20.88 mJ/cm^2 dose removed. The revised dose response equation is the one used for the calculations of RED_{meas} in the next section. At 2-log inactivation (a dose of approximately 40 mJ/cm^2 RED) the U_{DR} was 12.43% and 8.36%.

It should be noted that if the RED_{meas} data are calculated using the data with the outlier included, the RED_{meas} for these six flow test runs calculated using that set of collimated beam data is still well above the required target dose of 40 mJ/cm^2.

Also shown in Figures 4-3 and 4-4 are the QC limits for MS2 taken from the UVDGM-2006. The results show that the MS2 results are within the boundaries established for MS2.

Table 4-2. UV Dose – Response Data from Collimated Beam Tests at 79% UVT (June 2012)

UVT (%)	Rep	Target UV Dose (mJ/cm^2)	Actual UV Dose	UV Dose^2	Avg pfu/ml	Avg Log(pfu)	Log I	Log I^2	$_{RED}$ Dose	Residual (mJ/cm^2)	G	Outlier?
79.0	1	0	0.00	0	5,430,000	6.73	-0.17	0.029	-2.59	2.6	0.8	OK
		20	20.76	431	249,000	5.40	1.17	1.366 **P**	20.31	0.4	0.1	OK
		30	31.23	975	81,000	4.91	1.66	2.744	30.06	1.2	0.3	OK
		40	41.37	1711	33,300	4.52	2.04	4.172	38.32	3.1	1.0	OK
		60	62.14	3861	5,130	3.71	2.85	8.150	57.22	4.9	1.6	OK
		80	82.80	6856	590	2.77	3.79	14.395	81.67	1.1	0.3	OK
	2	0	0.00	0	3,600,000	6.56	0.01	0.000	0.13	-0.1	0.1	OK
		20	20.88	436	106,000	5.03	1.54	2.370	27.66	-6.8	2.3	**OUTLIER**
		30	31.18	972	66,300	4.82	1.74	3.039	31.88	-0.7	0.3	OK
		40	41.46	1719	22,800	4.36	2.21	4.871	41.98	-0.5	0.2	OK
		60	62.18	3866	3,010	3.48	3.09	9.525	62.99	-0.8	0.3	OK
		80	83.12	6909	413	2.62	3.95	15.594	85.97	-2.9	1.0	OK

Avg:	0.13
SD:	2.99
	12
p:	0.05
t (95%):	2.228

DRC	
A:	15.534
B:	1.5796

Log N_o
6.56

Grubbs' Test for Outliers	
p:	0.10
t (90%):	3.691
Grubbs' Statistic (G_{CRIT}):	2.412

DRC - dose response coefficients

Table 4-2. (continued)

Uncertainty of Dose-Response (U_{DR})

Log I	Dose (mJ/cm^2)	t	SD	U_{DR} (%)	D_L ($mJ/cm^2/Log\ I$)
0.001	0.0				15.54
0.25	4.0	2.23	2.99	167.39	15.93
0.50	8.2	2.23	2.99	81.67	16.32
1.00	17.1	2.23	2.99	38.95	17.11
1.50	26.9	2.23	2.99	24.82	17.90
2.00	37.4	2.23	2.99	17.83	18.69
2.50	48.7	2.23	2.99	13.69	19.48
3.00	60.8	2.23	2.99	10.96	20.27
3.50	73.7	2.23	2.99	9.04	21.06
4.00	87.4	2.23	2.99	7.63	21.85
3.95	86.0	2.23	2.99	7.75	21.77

t - student t test factor SD - standard deviation

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.99822
R Square	0.996444
Adjusted R Square	0.896088
Standard Error	3.140758
Observations	12

ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	2	27638.73	13819.36	1400.939	5.95E-12
Residual	10	98.64361	9.864361		
Total	12	27737.37			

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	0							
X Variable 1	15.53382	1.420807	10.9331	6.98E-07	12.36807	18.69958	12.36807	18.69958
X Variable 2	1.579603	0.445824	3.54311	0.005329	0.586245	2.57296	0.586245	2.57296

Table 4-3. UV Dose – Response Data from Collimated Beam Tests at 97% UVT (June 2012)

UVT (%)	Rep	Target UV Dose (mJ/cm^2)	Actual UV Dose	UV Dose^2	Avg pfu/ml	Avg Log(pfu)	Log I	Log I^2	$_{RED}$ Dose	Residual (mJ/cm^2)	G	Outlier ?
97.0	1	0	0.00	0	2,030,000	6.31	0.05	0.003 P	0.82	-0.8	0.6	OK
		20	20.74	430	120,000	5.08	1.28	1.641	22.13	-1.4	1.0	OK
		30	30.96	959	53,300	4.73	1.63	2.668	29.05	1.9	1.4	OK
		40	41.12	1691	14,900	4.17	2.19	4.782	40.62	0.5	0.3	OK
		60	61.79	3818	1,800	3.26	3.10	9.639	61.74	0.0	0.0	OK
		80	82.51	6808	330	2.52	3.84	14.757	80.44	2.1	1.5	OK
	2	0	0.00	0	2,860,000	6.46	-0.10	0.009	-1.48	1.5	1.0	OK
		20	20.76	431	121,000	5.08	1.28	1.631	22.06	-1.3	1.0	OK
		30	31.14	970	48,300	4.68	1.68	2.809	29.91	1.2	0.9	OK
		40	41.53	1725	13,300	4.12	2.24	5.000	41.69	-0.2	0.2	OK
		60	62.10	3856	1,470	3.17	3.19	10.193	63.89	-1.8	1.3	OK
		80	82.62	6826	247	2.39	3.97	15.740	83.79	-1.2	0.9	OK

DRC	
A:	15.449
B:	1.4294

Log N_o
6.36

Avg:	0.05
SD:	1.37
	12
	0.05
t (95%):	2.228

Grubbs' Test for Outliers	
p:	0.10
t (90%):	3.691
Grubbs' Statistic (G_{CRIT}):	2.412

DRC - dose response coefficients

Table 4-3. (continued)

Uncertainty of Dose-Response (U_{DR})

Log I	Dose (mJ/cm^2)	t	SD	U_{DR} (%)	D_L (mJ/cm^2/Log I)
0.001	0.0				15.45
0.25	4.0	2.23	1.37	77.49	15.81
0.50	8.1	2.23	1.37	37.89	16.16
1.00	16.9	2.23	1.37	18.14	16.88
1.50	26.4	2.23	1.37	11.60	17.59
2.00	36.6	2.23	1.37	8.36	18.31
2.50	47.6	2.23	1.37	6.44	19.02
3.00	59.2	2.23	1.37	5.17	19.74
3.50	71.6	2.23	1.37	4.28	20.45
4.00	84.7	2.23	1.37	3.62	21.17
3.97	83.8	2.23	1.37	3.65	21.12

t - student t test factor   SD - standard deviation

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.999622
R Square	0.999244
Adjusted R Square	0.899168
Standard Error	1.442402
Observations	12

ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	2	27492.52	13746.26	6607.111	5.6E-15
Residual	10	20.80525	2.080525		
Total	12	27513.32			

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	0							
X Variable 1	15.44899	0.664129	23.26204	4.88E-10	13.96922	16.92877	13.96922	16.92877
X Variable 2	1.4294	0.203913	7.009835	3.67E-05	0.975052	1.883747	0.975052	1.883747

Table 4-4. UV Dose – Response Data from Collimated Beam Tests at 79% UVT with Outlier Removed (June 2012)

UVT (%)	Rep	Target UV Dose (mJ/cm²)	Actual UV Dose	UV Dose²	Avg pfu/ml	Avg Log(pfu)	Log I	Log I²	RED Dose	Residual (mJ/cm²)	G	Outlier ?
79.0	1	0	0.00	0	5,430,000	6.73	-0.12	0.014 P	-1.89	1.9	0.9	OK
		20	20.76	431	249,000	5.40	1.22	1.488	21.60	-0.8	0.4	OK
		30	31.23	975	81,000	4.91	1.71	2.916	31.33	-0.1	0.1	OK
		40	41.37	1711	33,300	4.52	2.09	4.384	39.48	1.9	0.9	OK
		60	62.14	3861	5,130	3.71	2.91	8.445	57.89	4.2	2.0	OK
		80	82.80	6856	590	2.77	3.85	14.786	81.35	1.5	0.7	OK
	2	0	0.00	0	3,600,000	6.56	0.06	0.004	0.97	-1.0	0.5	OK
		30	31.18	972	66,300	4.82	1.79	3.221	33.13	-2.0	1.0	OK
		40	41.46	1719	22,800	4.36	2.26	5.100	43.07	-1.6	0.8	OK
		60	62.18	3866	3,010	3.48	3.14	9.845	63.46	-1.3	0.6	OK
		80	83.12	6909	413	2.62	4.00	16.002	85.44	-2.3	1.1	OK

Avg:	0.04
SD:	2.06
	11
p:	0.05
t (95%):	2.262

DRC	
A	16.106
B	1.3129

Log N_o
6.62

Grubbs' Test for Outliers	
p:	0.10
t (90%):	3.751
Grubbs' Statistic (G_{CRIT}):	2.355

DRC - dose response coefficients

Table 4-4. (continued)

Uncertainty of Dose-Response (U_{DR})

Log I	Dose (mJ/cm^2)	t	SD	U_{DR} (%)	D_L (mJ/cm^2/Log I)
0.001	0.0				16.11
0.25	4.1	2.26	2.06	113.32	16.43
0.50	8.4	2.26	2.06	55.55	16.76
1.00	17.4	2.26	2.06	26.73	17.42
1.50	27.1	2.26	2.06	17.17	18.08
2.00	37.5	2.26	2.06	12.43	18.73
2.50	48.5	2.26	2.06	9.61	19.39
3.00	60.1	2.26	2.06	7.74	20.04
3.50	72.5	2.26	2.06	6.43	20.70
4.00	85.4	2.26	2.06	5.45	21.36
4.00	85.4	2.26	2.06	5.45	21.36

t - student t test factor   SD - standard deviation

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.999224
R Square	0.998448
Adjusted R Square	0.887164
Standard Error	2.169925
Observations	11

ANOVA	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	2	27259.02	13629.51	2894.615	3.63E-12
Residual	9	42.37717	4.708575		
Total	11	27301.4			

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	0							
X Variable 1	16.10622	1.048756	15.35746	9.19E-08	13.73377	18.47867	13.73377	18.47867
X Variable 2	1.312854	0.32042	4.097298	0.002688	0.588015	2.037694	0.588015	2.037694



Figure 4-1 Collimated beam dose versus log N UVT 79% with outlier removed (June 2012)



Figure 4-2 Collimated beam dose versus log N UVT 97% (June 2012)



Figure 4-3 Dose response - log I versus dose - UVT 79% with outlier removed (June 2012)



Figure 4-4 Dose response - log I versus dose - UVT 97% (June 2012)

4.5 MS and Operational Flow Test Data

The operational data (flow rate, UVT, lamp power and UV sensor intensity measurements) are presented in Table 4-5. UVT was monitored continuously by an in-line analyzer. Flow rate, UVT, and intensity were recorded when each sample was collected, thus providing five data points for each test run. These values were then used to obtain an average flow rate, UVT, and intensity for each test run.

The first influent and effluent samples for MS2 determination were taken simultaneously beginning after approximately 2-3 minutes of steady state operation. Subsequent influent and effluent samples were collected simultaneously after an additional two to three minutes of operation, yielding five sets of samples over a ten to twelve minute period. The MS2 concentration data for each test run are shown in Table 4-6.

For each test condition replicate (i.e., each of the five influent and effluent samples), the log inactivation (log I) was calculated using the following equation:

$$\log I = \log (N_o / N)$$

Where:

N_o = Challenge microorganism concentration in influent sample (pfu/mL);

N = Challenge microorganism concentration in corresponding effluent sample (pfu/mL).

The log of the influent and effluent concentration is shown in Table 4-7. Table 4-8 shows the Log Inactivation results. For each test condition replicate, the RED_{meas} was determined using the measured log inactivation (log I) and the collimated beam test dose-response curves for each day of testing (See Figures 4-3 and 4-4). The five replicate RED_{meas} values were then averaged to produce one RED_{meas} for each test run and its duplicate. The calculated RED_{meas} results in mJ/cm^2 are shown in Table 4-9.

All of the flow rate tests at 15, 20, and 25 gpm with feed water at 79%, 90%, and 93% UVT or the equivalent reduced power tests achieved a minimum RED_{meas} of 40 mJ/cm^2.

The RED_{meas} for four of the test runs exceeded the maximum collimated beam dose of 80 mJ/cm^2. These runs showed calculated RED_{meas} between 82 and 87 mJ/cm^2. The RED_{meas} cannot be quantitatively determined if the measured RED exceeds the top range of the collimated data and can only be quantified as being >80 mJ/cm^2. For informational purposes, these data are presented as calculated even though they exceeded the maximum collimated beam dose of 80 mJ/cm^2 and would normally be reported at >80 mJ/cm^2. The four RED values above 80 mJ/cm^2 should be considered as estimates only.

Table 4-5. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* Operational Data

Test Condition	Run	% of Full Power[(1)]	UVT (%)	Flow (gpm)	Intensity (W/m^2)
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	100	78.5	14.9	7.0
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 1)	3	100	78.5	14.8	7.0
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	100	89.7	19.9	11.0
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 2)	5	100	89.7	19.9	11.0
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	100	93.5	24.9	12.8
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 3)	7	100	93.5	24.9	12.8
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	10	70	97.0	14.9	6.9
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 1)	11	70	97.1	14.9	6.9
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	12	80	97.1	19.9	11.0
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 2)	13	80	97.0	19.9	11.0
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	14	85	97.1	24.9	12.7
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 3)	15	85	97.1	25.0	12.7

(1) % of full power estimated based on measured amperage for the system, where amperage at reduced power is divided by amperage at full power in 97% UVT water.
SPt = Set Point Condition

Table 4-6. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Concentration Results

Test Condition	Run	Influent (pfu/mL)					Effluent (pfu/mL)				
		Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5	Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	4.70E+06	3.93E+06	3.81E+06	4.40E+06	4.57E+06	1.25E+03	9.30E+02	9.57E+02	9.50E+02	9.00E+02
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 1)	3	1.01E+06	1.44E+06	1.53E+06	1.44E+06	1.31E+06	2.05E+02	1.77E+02	6.17E+02	6.87E+02	4.40E+02
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	1.45E+06	2.14E+06	2.63E+06	1.17E+06	3.12E+06	2.97E+02	3.57E+02	4.80E+02	5.63E+02	6.13E+02
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 2)	5	6.67E+06	6.53E+06	5.03E+06	5.77E+06	6.03E+06	8.53E+02	6.97E+02	8.83E+02	8.50E+02	9.13E+02
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	8.41E+05	9.03E+05	7.65E+05	9.50E+05	7.89E+05	7.77E+02	7.87E+02	8.03E+02	7.00E+02	9.63E+02
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 3)	7	5.20E+06	5.50E+06	3.99E+06	4.80E+06	4.97E+06	1.22E+03	8.13E+02	1.11E+03	1.07E+03	1.11E+03
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	10	4.20E+06	2.16E+06	4.13E+06	4.20E+06	5.03E+06	2.24E+03	2.06E+03	1.92E+03	2.12E+03	2.14E+03
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 1)	11	7.27E+05	7.87E+05	7.33E+05	9.47E+05	8.97E+05	2.57E+02	4.55E+02	7.43E+02	8.77E+02	8.23E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	12	2.12E+06	1.33E+06	1.13E+06	1.18E+06	2.13E+06	1.50E+02	1.27E+02	1.39E+02	6.63E+01	1.53E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 2)	13	1.28E+06	9.03E+05	1.00E+06	5.43E+05	1.66E+06	3.03E+02	3.13E+02	1.79E+02	1.58E+02	2.28E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	14	4.73E+06	6.67E+06	5.47E+06	4.73E+06	7.10E+06	7.60E+02	5.23E+02	8.00E+02	5.37E+02	4.87E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 3)	15	4.17E+06	4.30E+06	4.77E+06	4.13E+06	4.37E+06	4.97E+02	7.20E+02	4.63E+02	7.67E+02	4.53E+02

SPt - Set Point Condition

Table 4-7. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Log Concentration for Influent and Effluent Samples

Test Condition	Run	Log Influent Concentration					Log Effluent Concentration				
		Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5	Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	6.67	6.59	6.58	6.64	6.66	3.10	2.97	2.98	2.98	2.95
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 1)	3	6.00	6.16	6.18	6.16	6.12	2.31	2.25	2.79	2.84	2.64
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	6.16	6.33	6.42	6.07	6.49	2.47	2.55	2.68	2.75	2.79
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 2)	5	6.82	6.81	6.70	6.76	6.78	2.93	2.84	2.95	2.93	2.96
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	5.92	5.96	5.88	5.98	5.90	2.89	2.90	2.90	2.85	2.98
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 3)	7	6.72	6.74	6.60	6.68	6.70	3.09	2.91	3.05	3.03	3.05
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	10	6.62	6.33	6.62	6.62	6.70	3.35	3.31	3.28	3.33	3.33
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 1)	11	5.86	5.90	5.87	5.98	5.95	2.41	2.66	2.87	2.94	2.92
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	12	6.33	6.12	6.05	6.07	6.33	2.18	2.10	2.14	1.82	2.18
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 2)	13	6.11	5.96	6.00	5.73	6.22	2.48	2.50	2.25	2.20	2.36
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	14	6.67	6.82	6.74	6.67	6.85	2.88	2.72	2.90	2.73	2.69
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 3)	15	6.62	6.63	6.68	6.62	6.64	2.70	2.86	2.67	2.88	2.66

SPt - Set Point Condition

Table 4-8. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Log Inactivation Results

Test Condition	Run	Log Inactivation				
		Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	3.58	3.63	3.60	3.67	3.71
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 1)	3	3.69	3.91	3.39	3.32	3.47
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	3.69	3.78	3.74	3.32	3.71
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 2)	5	3.89	3.97	3.76	3.83	3.82
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	3.03	3.06	2.98	3.13	2.91
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 3)	7	3.63	3.83	3.56	3.65	3.65
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	10	3.27	3.02	3.33	3.30	3.37
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 1)	11	3.45	3.24	2.99	3.03	3.04
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	12	4.15	4.02	3.91	4.25	4.14
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 2)	13	3.63	3.46	3.75	3.54	3.86
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	14	3.79	4.11	3.83	3.94	4.16
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 3)	15	3.92	3.78	4.01	3.73	3.98

SPt - Set Point Condition

Table 4-9. ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4* MS2 Observed RED Results

Test Condition	Run	RED (mJ/cm2)							
		Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5	Average	SD(RED)	U_{SP}
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	74.36	75.66	75.00	76.68	77.71	75.88	1.34	4.88
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 1)	3	77.37	83.06	69.80	67.98	71.79	74.00	6.17	23.14
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	77.27	79.58	78.57	67.89	77.74	76.21	4.74	17.25
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 2)	5	82.60	84.68	79.01	80.99	80.68	81.59 (1)	2.15	7.30
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	60.96	61.57	59.63	63.34	58.07	60.71	1.99	9.10
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate (SPt 3)	7	75.76	80.95	73.87	76.33	76.30	76.64	2.61	9.46
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	10	65.88	59.71	67.36	66.47	68.33	65.55	3.39	14.37
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 1)	11	70.35	65.01	59.07	60.01	60.11	62.91	4.76	21.02
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	12	88.74	85.21	82.26	91.49	88.56	87.25 (1)	3.57	11.36
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 2)	13	74.81	70.57	77.96	72.50	80.99	75.37	4.18	15.39
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	14	79.19	87.52	80.27	83.19	89.11	83.85 (1)	4.36	14.44
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate (SPt 3)	15	82.63	78.72	85.01	77.54	84.25	81.63 (1)	3.33	11.34

SD - Standard Deviation

U $_{SP}$ - Uncertainty of the Set Point {[(Student t * SD)/RED_{ave}]*100}

SPt - Set Point Condition

(1) These RED values exceeded the highest dose in the collimated beam tests and therefore should be considered estimates. Since they are above the maximum dose in the collimated beam test, the results can only truly be quantified as being >80 mJ/cm^2.

4.6 Set Line for a Minimum RED of 40 mJ/cm^2

The three set point conditions selected for this validation all achieved a minimum RED of 40 mJ/cm^2, which was the target minimum RED for developing the set line. Figure 4-5 shows the set line. The unit is validated for a minimum RED of 40 mJ/cm^2 for any flow rate - intensity combination above and to the left of the set line. The maximum flow rate demonstrated was 24.9 gpm. A UV system cannot operate above the highest validated flow rate and claim a 40 mJ/cm^2 RED. The lowest intensity demonstrating a RED of 40 mJ/cm^2 was 7.0 W/m^2. A UV system cannot operate below the lowest validated irradiance and claim a 40 mJ/cm^2 RED.

Set Point 1 – 14.8 gpm; 7.0 W/m^2
Set Point 2 – 19.9 gpm; 11.0 W/m^2
Set Point 3 – 24.9 gpm; 12.8 W/m^2



Figure 4-5 Set Line for Model UVL-200-4 For Validated Dose of ≥40 mJ/cm^2 based on MS2

4.7 Deriving the Validation Factor and Log Credit for *Cryptosporidium*

4.7.1 Validation Factor Definition

Several uncertainties and biases are involved in using experimental testing to define a validated dose and validated operating conditions such as challenge microorganism UV sensitivity, and sensor placement or variability. The validation factor (VF) for *Cryptosporidium* was determined quantitatively to account for key areas of uncertainty and variability. The equation for the VF is shown below.

$$VF = B_{RED} \times [1 + (U_{Val} / 100)]$$

Where:

VF = Validation Factor;
B_{RED} = RED bias factor;
U_{Val} = Uncertainty of validation expressed as a percentage.

The data used for the VF calculations and final results are presented in the following section.

4.7.2 RED Bias (B_{RED})

The RED bias factor (B_{RED}) is a correction factor that accounts for the difference between the UV sensitivity of a selected target pathogen and the UV sensitivity of the challenge microorganism (MS2). If the challenge microorganism is more resistant (less sensitive) to UV light than the target pathogen, the RED measured during the validation will be greater than the RED that would be measured for the target pathogen. In this case, the RED bias would be greater than 1.0. If the challenge microorganism is less resistant (more sensitive) to UV light than the target pathogen, then RED measured by the validation will be less than the RED that would be measured for the target pathogen.

A target pathogen must be selected to calculate the RED bias factor. For this test, the target pathogen *Cryptosporidium* was selected for use in presenting an example calculation of RED bias as it is a common pathogen that is evaluated for drinking water applications. *Cryptosporidium* was also selected because the EPA's LT2ESWTR requires UV reactors be validated to demonstrate a log inactivation for *Cryptosporidium*. A target of 3-log inactivation of *Cryptosporidium* was selected as water utilities in the highest risk category or "bin" may need this maximum level of inactivation. The RED bias tables in Appendix G of the UVDGM-2006 were used for determining the RED bias. The RED bias is determined from the Tables based on the sensitivity calculated for each test run replicate at a given set point (test condition) and the UVT of the water. Sensitivity is calculated as:

$$\text{Sensitivity (mJ/cm}^2\text{ per log I)} = \text{RED/ Log I}$$

Per the GP-2011 and UVDGM-2006, the sensitivity is calculated for each test replicate (five per test run, 20 samples total per set point). The highest B_{RED} value found among the replicates at a given set point is then selected for the B_{RED} value for use in the VF calculation per the UVDGM-2006 requirement. Table 4-10 shows the data for the replicates at each set point. The highest

RED bias at each set point is used in the validation factor calculations shown later in Section 4.7.3.

Table 4-10. RED Bias Factor for Each Set Point for *Cryptosporidium*

Sample Number	Test Run	UVT	Sensitivity (mJ/cm2 per Log I)			B_{RED} 4 log crypto	B_{RED} 3.5 log crypto	B_{RED} 3.0 log crypto
		%	RED	Log I	Sensitivity			
2-1	2	78.5	74.36	3.58	20.8	1.97	2.35	2.54
2-2	2	78.5	75.66	3.63	20.9	1.97	2.35	2.54
2-3	2	78.5	75.00	3.60	20.8	1.97	2.35	2.54
2-4	2	78.5	76.68	3.67	20.9	1.97	2.35	2.54
2-5	2	78.5	77.71	3.71	21.0	1.97	2.35	2.54
3-1	3	78.5	77.37	3.69	21.0	1.97	2.35	2.54
3-2	3	78.5	83.06	3.91	21.2	1.97	2.35	2.54
3-3	3	78.5	69.80	3.39	20.6	1.97	2.35	2.54
3-4	3	78.5	67.98	3.32	20.5	1.97	2.35	2.54
3-5	3	78.5	71.79	3.47	20.7	1.97	2.35	2.54
4-1	4	89.7	77.27	3.69	20.9	1.77	2.01	2.10
4-2	4	89.7	79.58	3.78	21.1	1.77	2.01	2.10
4-3	4	89.7	78.57	3.74	21.0	1.77	2.01	2.10
4-4	4	89.7	67.89	3.32	20.5	1.77	2.01	2.10
4-5	4	89.7	77.74	3.71	21.0	1.77	2.01	2.10
5-1	5	89.7	82.60	3.89	21.2	1.77	2.01	2.10
5-2	5	89.7	84.68	3.97	21.3	1.77	2.01	2.10
5-3	5	89.7	79.01	3.76	21.0	1.77	2.01	2.10
5-4	5	89.7	80.99	3.83	21.1	1.77	2.01	2.10
5-5	5	89.7	80.68	3.82	21.1	1.77	2.01	2.10
6-1	6	93.5	60.96	3.03	20.1	1.61	1.75	1.78
6-2	6	93.5	61.57	3.06	20.1	1.61	1.75	1.78
6-3	6	93.5	59.63	2.98	20.0	1.61	1.75	1.78
6-4	6	93.5	63.34	3.13	20.2	1.61	1.75	1.78
6-5	6	93.5	58.07	2.91	19.9	1.55	1.70	1.73
7-1	7	93.5	75.76	3.63	20.9	1.61	1.75	1.78
7-2	7	93.5	80.95	3.83	21.1	1.61	1.75	1.78
7-3	7	93.5	73.87	3.56	20.8	1.61	1.75	1.78
7-4	7	93.5	76.33	3.65	20.9	1.61	1.75	1.78
7-5	7	93.5	76.30	3.65	20.9	1.61	1.75	1.78
10-1	10	97.0	65.88	3.27	20.1	1.36	1.40	1.39
10-1	10	97.0	59.71	3.02	19.8	1.34	1.38	1.38
10-1	10	97.0	67.36	3.33	20.2	1.36	1.40	1.39
10-1	10	97.0	66.47	3.30	20.2	1.36	1.40	1.39
10-1	10	97.0	68.33	3.37	20.3	1.36	1.40	1.39
11-1	11	97.1	70.35	3.45	20.4	1.36	1.40	1.39
11-2	11	97.1	65.01	3.24	20.1	1.36	1.40	1.39
11-3	11	97.1	59.07	2.99	19.7	1.34	1.38	1.38
11-4	11	97.1	60.01	3.03	19.8	1.34	1.38	1.38
11-5	11	97.1	60.11	3.04	19.8	1.34	1.38	1.38
12-1	12	97.1	88.74	4.15	21.4	1.36	1.40	1.39
12-2	12	97.1	85.21	4.02	21.2	1.36	1.40	1.39

Sample Number	Test Run	UVT	Sensitivity (mJ/cm2 per Log I)			B_{RED} 4 log crypto	B_{RED} 3.5 log crypto	B_{RED} 3.0 log crypto
		%	RED	Log I	Sensitivity			
12-3	12	97.1	82.26	3.91	21.0	1.36	1.40	1.39
12-4	12	97.1	91.49	4.25	21.5	1.36	1.40	1.39
12-5	12	97.1	88.56	4.14	21.4	1.36	1.40	1.39
13-1	13	97.0	74.81	3.63	20.6	1.36	1.40	1.39
13-2	13	97.0	70.57	3.46	20.4	1.36	1.40	1.39
13-3	13	97.0	77.96	3.75	20.8	1.36	1.40	1.39
13-4	13	97.0	72.50	3.54	20.5	1.36	1.40	1.39
13-5	13	97.0	80.99	3.86	21.0	1.36	1.40	1.39
14-1	14	97.1	79.19	3.79	20.9	1.36	1.40	1.39
14-2	14	97.1	87.52	4.11	21.3	1.36	1.40	1.39
14-3	14	97.1	80.27	3.83	20.9	1.36	1.40	1.39
14-4	14	97.1	83.19	3.94	21.1	1.36	1.40	1.39
14-5	14	97.1	89.11	4.16	21.4	1.36	1.40	1.39
15-1	15	97.1	82.63	3.92	21.1	1.36	1.40	1.39
15-2	15	97.1	78.72	3.78	20.8	1.36	1.40	1.39
15-3	15	97.1	85.01	4.01	21.2	1.36	1.40	1.39
15-4	15	97.1	77.54	3.73	20.8	1.36	1.40	1.39
15-5	15	97.1	84.25	3.98	21.1	1.36	1.40	1.39
Maximum B_{RED}		Set Point 14.8 gpm - 7.0 W/m^2				1.97	2.35	2.54
		Set Point 19.9 gpm - 11.0 W/m^2				1.77	2.01	2.10
		Set Point 24.9 gpm - 12.8 W/m^2				1.61	1.75	1.78

4.7.3 Uncertainty of Validation

The uncertainty of validation (U_{Val}) addresses many sources of experimental uncertainty. As the critical source of uncertainty, such as the sensor readings, or the fit of the dose-response curve, is unknown in advance of the validation testing, the USEPA developed a decision tree to assist in establishing U_{Val}. The GP-2011 equations and in accordance with Figure 5.4 of the UVDGM-2006, which are specific to a UV intensity set point approach, were used to determine U_{Val} in calculating the validated dose. Per the GP-2011 and the EPA's UVDGM-2006, any of the following equations may be used to establish the U_{Val}:

$$U_{Val} = (U_{SP}^2 + U_S^2)^{1/2}$$
$$U_{Val} = U_{SP}$$
$$U_{Val} = (U_{SP}^2 + U_{DR}^2)^{1/2}$$
$$U_{Val} = (U_{SP}^2 + U_S^2 + U_{DR}^2)^{1/2}$$

Where:

U_S = Uncertainty of sensor value, expressed as a fraction;
U_{DR} = Uncertainty of the fit of the dose-response curve;
U_{SP} = Uncertainty of set-point;
U_{Val} = Uncertainty of the validation

The QC objective for the duty sensor is that the measurements with the duty sensor should be ≤10% of the average of two or more reference sensors. It this objective is met, then it eliminates the need to calculate the U_S factor per the GP-2011 and UVDGM-2006, Section 5.4.4. The sensor met the 10% requirement, as shown in Table 4-1, therefore U_S is not used in determining the uncertainty of validation.

The GP-2011 and UVDGM-2006 in Appendix C Section C4 show the formula and calculations for the uncertainty of the fit of the collimated beam dose response curve (U_{DR}).

The equation is:

$$U_{DR} = t * [SD / UV\ Dose_{CB}] * 100\%$$

Where:

U_{DR} = Uncertainty of the UV dose-response fit at a 95% confidence level
$UV\ Dose_{CB}$ = UV dose calculated from the UV dose-response curve for the challenge microorganism
SD = Standard deviation of the difference between the calculated UV dose response and the measured value
t = t-statistic at a 95% confidence level for a sample size equal to the number of test condition replicates used to define the dose-response.

The U_{DR} results are shown in Tables 4-3 and 4-4 for the low and high UVT waters for the test runs. The U_{DR} results for low and high UVT waters (26.73% and 18.14%, respectively) are less than 30%, and therefore U_{DR} is not used in calculating U_{Val} for the test runs.

The uncertainty in the set point value (U_{SP}) is based on a prediction interval at a 95% confidence level using the following procedure:

1. Calculate the average and standard deviation of RED_{meas} values for each test condition
2. Calculate the uncertainty of the set point RED_{meas} using:

$$U_{SP} = [(t \times SD_{RED}) / (RED_{meas})] \times 100\%$$

Where:

RED_{meas} = Average RED_{meas} value measured for each test condition;
SD_{RED} = Standard deviation of the RED_{meas} values measured for each test condition;
t = t-statistic for a 95% confidence level defined as a function of the number of replicate samples, in this case 5 replicates were used for testing yielding a t value of 2.776 (n-1 = 4).

3. Select the highest U_{SP} from the replicates at each set point for calculating the VF.

The U_{SP} results based on the RED_{meas} and standard deviation are shown in Table 4-9. In accordance with the GP-2011, the highest U_{SP} of the four test runs at each set point determines

the U_{SP} for that set point. The highest U_{SP} for each set point is 23.14% (15 gpm set point), 17.25% (20 gpm set point), and 14.44% (25 gpm set point).

The uncertainty of the validation is equal to the highest U_{SP} at a set point when the U_{DR} is <30%. Therefore U_{Val} is calculated using the equation:

$$U_{Val} = U_{SP}$$

Table 4-11 shows the U_{Val} values used for determining the uncertainty of the validation at each set point.

Table 4-11 Uncertainty of the Validation (U_{Val}) and B_{RED} Values for *Cryptosporidium*

Set Point	Max U_{DR} %	Max U_{SP} %	U_{Val} %	Max B_{RED} 4.0 log	3.5 log	3.0 log
Set Point 14.8 gpm - 7.0 W/m^2	26.73	23.14	23.14	1.97	2.35	2.54
Set Point 19.9 gpm - 11.0 W/m^2	26.73	17.25	17.25	1.77	2.01	2.10
Set Point 24.9 gpm - 12.8 W/m^2	26.73	14.44	14.44	1.61	1.75	1.78

4.7.4 Validated Dose and Set Line for *Cryptosporidium*

After establishing the U_{Val} and the RED bias as described above, the validation factor (VF) is calculated using the equation:

$$VF = B_{RED} \times [1 + (U_{Val} / 100)]$$

Where:

VF = Validation Factor;
B_{RED} = RED bias factor for *Cryptosporidium*
U_{Val} = Uncertainty of validation expressed as a percentage

The validated dose is then calculated as follows:

$$\text{Validated dose } (RED_{Val}) = RED_{meas} / VF$$

Table 4-12 shows the calculated Validation Factors (VF) for various *Cryptosporidium* log inactivation levels (3.0, 3.5, and 4.0 log inactivation).

Table 4-12 shows the RED_{Val} for *Cryptosporidium* for each test run using the validation factors for the various *Cryptosporidium* log inactivation levels and a comparison to the dose required for various levels of inactivation of *Cryptosporidium*. All of the set points achieved a validated dose that shows a minimum of a 4-log inactivation for *Cryptosporidium*. This level of inactivation exceeds the minimum 3.0 log inactivation of *Cryptosporidium,* which may be required by the EPA's LT2ESWTR in cases where a utility is in the highest "bin" or risk category for *Cryptosporidium* in their source water.

Table 4-12 Validation Factors and Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) for *Cryptosporidium*

Set Point Condition	Run	Flow Rate	Intensity	Validation Factor			RED_{meas}	RED_{Val}		
		gpm	W/m²	4.0 log	3.5 log	3.0 log	mJ/cm²	4 log mJ/cm² 22[1]	3.5 log mJ/cm² 15[1]	3.0 log mJ/cm² 12[1]
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	14.9	7.0	2.43	2.89	3.13	75.88	31.3	26.2	24.3
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 1)	3	14.8	7.0	2.43	2.89	3.13	74.00	30.5	25.6	23.7
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	10	14.9	6.9	2.43	2.89	3.13	76.21	27.0	22.7	21.0
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 1)	11	14.9	6.9	2.43	2.89	3.13	81.59	25.9	21.7	20.1
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	19.9	11.0	2.08	2.36	2.46	60.71	36.7	32.3	31.0
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 2)	5	19.9	11.0	2.08	2.36	2.46	76.64	39.3	34.6	33.1
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	12	19.9	11.0	2.08	2.36	2.46	65.55	42.0	37.0	35.4
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 2)	13	19.9	11.0	2.08	2.36	2.46	62.91	36.3	32.0	30.6
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	24.9	12.8	1.84	2.00	2.04	87.25	33.0	30.3	29.8
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 3)	7	24.9	12.8	1.84	2.00	2.04	75.37	41.6	38.3	37.6
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	14	24.9	12.7	1.84	2.00	2.04	83.85	45.5	41.9	41.2
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 3)	15	25.0	12.7	1.84	2.00	2.04	81.63	44.3	40.8	40.1

(1) Required dose for log inactivation validation per the UVDGM-2006 Appendix G; SPt - Set Point Condition

The three set point tests that achieved a minimum of 3 log inactivation for *Cryptosporidium* were plotted to form a set line. Figure 4-6 shows the set line.

The three set points are:

Set Point 1 – 14.8 gpm; 7.0 W/m^2
Set Point 2 – 19.9 gpm; 11.0 W/m^2
Set Point 3 – 24.9 gpm; 12.8 W/m^2



Figure 4-6. Set Line for Minimum 3-log *Cryptosporidium* Inactivation for ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4*.

4.8 Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) for MS2 as the Target Organism

Some regulatory agencies, such as the NYDOH, have established a standard for spray park water features and other applications based on a validated dose (RED_{Val}) of 40 mJ/cm^2 based on MS2, as the pathogen. The calculation of the validation factor for a validated dose based on MS2 is performed using B_{RED} set equal to 1.0. For MS2 validated dose calculations, B_{RED} is set equal to 1.0 because the pathogen selected, namely MS2, is the same as the test organism, so there is no bias correction. Therefore, the validation factor will not vary by the log inactivation level.

The U_{Val} is calculated in the same manner as described in Section 4.7.3.

The validation factor (VF) for evaluating validated dose (RED_{Val}) based on MS2 is calculated using the same formula as for other pathogens as follows:

$$VF = B_{RED} \times [1 + (U_{Val} / 100)]$$

Where:

VF = Validation Factor;
B_{RED} = RED bias factor (set equal 1.0)
U_{Val} = Uncertainty of validation expressed as a percentage.

The validated dose is then calculated as follows:

$$\text{Validated dose } (RED_{Val}) = RED_{observed} / VF$$

Table 4-13 shows the RED_{Val} based on MS2 for each test run.

Using the VF calculated for each set point, the RED_{Val} based on MS2 was calculated for each test run. All of the set point test runs achieved a 40 mJ/cm^2 validated dose based on MS2.

The three set point tests, which achieved a minimum 40 mJ/cm^2 validated dose (RED_{Val} based on MS2), were plotted to form a set line. Figure 4-7 shows the set line.

The three set points are:

Set Point 1 – 14.8 gpm; 7.0 W/m^2
Set Point 2 – 19.9 gpm; 11.0 W/m^2
Set Point 3 – 24.9 gpm; 12.8 W/m^2

Table 4-13 Validation Factors and Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) based on MS2

Set Point Condition	Run	Flow Rate gpm	Intensity W/m^2	Validation Factor (1)	RED_{meas} mJ/cm^2	RED_{Val} based on MS2 mJ/cm^2
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 1)	2	14.9	7.0	1.23	75.9	61.6
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 1)	3	14.8	7.0	1.23	74.0	60.1
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 1)	12	14.9	6.9	1.23	65.5	53.2
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 1)	13	14.9	6.9	1.23	62.9	51.1
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 2)	4	19.9	11.0	1.17	76.2	65.0
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 2)	5	19.9	11.0	1.17	81.6	69.6
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 2)	14	19.9	11.0	1.17	87.2	74.4
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 2)	15	19.9	11.0	1.17	75.4	64.3
Lowered UVT - Full Power (SPt 3)	6	24.9	12.8	1.14	60.7	53.1
Lowered UVT - Full Power Dup (SPt 3)	7	24.9	12.8	1.14	76.6	67.0
Lowered Power - High UVT (SPt 3)	16	24.9	12.7	1.14	83.9	73.3
Lowered Power - High UVT Dup (SPt 3)	17	25.0	12.7	1.14	81.6	71.3

(1) B_{RED} equal to 1.0 as the target organism is MS2 the same as the test organism.; SPt -Set Point Condition



Figure 4-6. Set Line for Minimum 40 mJ/cm^2 Validated Dose (RED_{Val}) based on MS2 for ETS UV *Model UVL-200-4*.

4.9 Water Quality Data

Samples were collected for general water quality characterization. Influent and effluent samples were collected during each flow test run and analyzed for temperature, pH, total chlorine, and free chlorine. An influent sample was collected from each flow test run and analyzed for turbidity, iron, and manganese.

An influent and effluent sample from each test run was also collected and analyzed for total coliform, *E. coli*, and heterotrophic plant count (HPC).

The general chemistry and microbiological results are presented in Tables 4-14 through 4-17.

Table 4-14. Temperature and pH Results

		Temperature (°F)		pH (S.U.)	
Test	**Run #**	**Influent**	**Effluent**	**Influent**	**Effluent**
Blank	1	68.0	68.2	8.80	8.82
Lowered UVT - Full Power	2	68.8	69.0	8.71	8.79
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	3	68.3	68.5	8.88	8.81
Lowered UVT - Full Power	4	67.6	67.8	8.86	8.86
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	5	67.3	67.3	8.83	8.82
Lowered UVT - Full Power	6	67.2	67.4	8.89	8.89
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	7	66.8	67.1	8.94	8.87
Reactor Blank	8	66.2	66.4	9.00	8.94
Reactor Control	9	66.6	66.6	9.03	9.00
Lowered Power - High UVT	10	67.1	67.0	9.00	9.01
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	11	66.8	67.0	8.97	9.00
Lowered Power - High UVT	12	67.2	67.3	9.00	9.01
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	13	67.0	66.8	8.97	8.96
Lowered Power - High UVT	14	68.1	67.9	8.95	9.00
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	15	67.9	67.7	8.98	8.97

Table 4-15. Total Chlorine, Free Chlorine and Turbidity Results

		Total Chlorine (mg/L)	Free Chlorine (mg/L)	Turbidity (NTU)
Test	**Run #**	**Influent**	**Influent**	**Influent**
Blank	1	<0.03	<0.03	0.54
Lowered UVT - Full Power	2	<0.03	<0.03	0.49
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	3	<0.03	<0.03	0.51
Lowered UVT - Full Power	4	<0.03	<0.03	0.40
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	5	<0.03	<0.03	0.38
Lowered UVT - Full Power	6	<0.03	<0.03	0.38
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	7	<0.03	<0.03	0.31
Reactor Blank	8	<0.03	<0.03	0.17
Reactor Control	9	<0.03	<0.03	0.18
Lowered Power - High UVT	10	<0.03	<0.03	0.22
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	11	<0.03	<0.03	0.21
Lowered Power - High UVT	12	<0.03	<0.03	0.22
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	13	<0.03	<0.03	0.20
Lowered Power - High UVT	14	<0.03	<0.03	0.21
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	15	<0.03	<0.03	0.20

Note: Runs 1-7 with the addition of LSA to lower UVT showed higher readings for turbidity; suspect an interference due to the LSA

Table 4-16. Iron and Manganese Results

Test	Run #	Iron (mg/L) Influent	Manganese (mg/L) Influent	UVT[1] (%) Influent	UVT[1] (%) Effluent
Blank	1	0.03	0.002	79	79
Lowered UVT - Full Power	2	0.02	0.002	79	79
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	3	0.02	0.002	79	79
Lowered UVT - Full Power	4	<0.02	0.001	90	90
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	5	<0.02	0.001	90	90
Lowered UVT - Full Power	6	0.02	0.001	93	93
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	7	<0.02	<0.001	93	93
Reactor Blank	8	<0.02	<0.001	97	97
Reactor Control	9	<0.02	<0.001	95	95
Lowered Power - High UVT	10	<0.02	<0.001	96	97
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	11	<0.02	<0.001	96	96
Lowered Power - High UVT	12	<0.02	<0.001	96	96
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	13	<0.02	<0.001	96	94
Lowered Power - High UVT	14	<0.02	<0.001	96	96
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	15	<0.02	<0.001	96	94

(1)UVT on grab samples, measured in laboratory after tests; Five influent samples averaged; single effluent sample reported here; In-line UVT meter used for flow test results

Table 4-17. HPC, Total Coliform and *E. coli* Results.

		Total Coliform MPN/100mL		*E. coli* MPN/100mL		HPC CFU/mL	
Test	**Run #**	**Influent**	**Effluent**	**Influent**	**Effluent**	**Influent**	**Effluent**
Blank	1	54	<1	<1	<1	1.30E+04	1.45E+02
Lowered UVT - Full Power	2	31	3	<1	<1	1.62E+04	3.75E+01
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	3	31	<1	<1	<1	1.34E+04	4.20E+01
Lowered UVT - Full Power	4	144	<1	<1	<1	1.27E+04	8.05E+01
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	5	115	4	<1	<1	1.34E+04	2.90E+01
Lowered UVT - Full Power	6	67	<1	<1	<1	1.12E+04	7.20E+01
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	7	50	<1	<1	<1	1.02E+04	2.35E+01
Reactor Blank	8	15	<1	<1	<1	1.40E+04	5.20E+02
Reactor Control	9	56	64	<1	<1	1.27E+04	1.30E+04
Lowered Power - High UVT	10	49	3	<1	<1	1.03E+04	4.25E+01
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	11	37	16	<1	<1	1.51E+04	2.85E+01
Lowered Power - High UVT	12	46	<1	<1	<1	1.36E+04	5.70E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	13	40	<1	<1	<1	1.26E+04	1.72E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT	14	28	<1	<1	<1	1.48E+04	6.30E+02
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	15	34	<1	<1	<1	1.04E+04	1.15E+02

4.10 Headloss

Headloss was measured over the flow range of 5 to 25 gpm. Pressure at the inlet and outlet of the reactor was measured at several flow rates as shown in Table 4-18.

Table 4-18. Headloss Measurement Results.

Flow Rate	Inlet (psi)	Outlet (psi)	Headloss (psi)
5.2	13.10	13.10	0.00
10.4	11.95	11.94	0.01
15.5	10.25	10.18	0.07
19.9	8.27	8.15	0.12
25.3	5.12	4.94	0.18

4.11 Power Measurement

A power monitoring platform was connected to the unit. This monitoring platform provided continuous readout of the voltage and amperage being used by the unit for each test run. Volts and amperes were recorded during each flow test. A series of power measurements were also made to show the change in intensity at various power down levels. Table 4-19 presents the power measurements taken during the flow tests.

Table 4-19. Power Measurement Results

Test	Run #	Unit Volts (volts)	Unit Amperage (amps)
Blank	1	207.8	0.90
Lowered UVT - Full Power	2	208.0	0.90
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	3	207.6	0.90
Lowered UVT - Full Power	4	206.1	0.91
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	5	206.3	0.91
Lowered UVT - Full Power	6	206.4	0.91
Lowered UVT - Full Power Duplicate	7	206.3	0.90
Reactor Blank	8	206.6	0.91
Reactor Control	9	206.1	0.04
Lowered Power - High UVT	10	207.1	0.63
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	11	207.1	0.63
Lowered Power - High UVT	12	208.0	0.72
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	13	207.3	0.72
Lowered Power - High UVT	14	207.6	0.77
Lowered Power - High UVT Duplicate	15	207.2	0.77

Chapter 5
Quality Assurance/Quality Control

5.1 Introduction

An important aspect of verification is conformance to the QA/QC procedures and requirements specified in the TQAPP and Generic Protocols. Careful adherence to the procedures ensures that the data presented in this report is of sound quality, defensible, and representative of the equipment performance. The primary areas of evaluation were representativeness, accuracy, precision, and completeness.

Because this ETV was conducted at the NSF testing lab, all laboratory activities were conducted in accordance with the provisions of the NSF International Laboratories Quality Assurance Manual.

5.2 Test Procedure QA/QC

NSF testing laboratory staff conducted the tests by following a USEPA-approved test/QA plan(1) created specifically for this verification. NSF QA Department staff performed an audit during testing to ensure the proper procedures were followed. The audit yielded no significant findings.

5.3 Sample Handling

All samples analyzed by the NSF Chemistry and Microbiology Laboratories were labeled with unique identification numbers. All samples were analyzed within allowable holding times.

5.4 Chemistry Laboratory QA/QC

The calibrations of all analytical instruments and the analyses of all parameters complied with the QA/QC provisions of the NSF International Laboratories Quality Assurance Manual.

The NSF QA/QC requirements are all compliant with those given in the USEPA method or Standard Method for the parameter. Also, every analytical method has an NSF standard operating procedure.

The bench top UV spectrophotometer was calibrated with Holmium Oxide with each batch of samples analyzed and showed peaks at 241.1nm, 250.0nm and 278.1 nm within $\pm$ 0.2nm of the actual peak. Dichromate standards were also run with each batch of samples and found to be within 1% of the true value.

5.5 Microbiology Laboratory QA/QC

5.5.1 Growth Media Positive Controls

All media were checked for sterility and positive growth response when prepared and when used for microorganism enumeration. The media was discarded if growth occurred on the sterility check media, or if there was an absence of growth in the positive response check.

5.5.2 Negative Controls

For each sample batch processed, an unused membrane filter and a blank with 100 mL of buffered, sterilized dilution water was filtered through the membrane, placed onto the appropriate media and incubated with the samples as negative controls. No growth was observed on any blanks.

5.5.3 Collimated Beam Apparatus and QA/QC

The petri dish factor was determined for the collimated beam apparatus prior to the start of the test program. Radiometers were calibrated and checked in accordance with operating procedures and UVDGM-2006 requirements. These procedures and data were reviewed as part of the NSF QA department review of the microbiological laboratory data.

NSF received reviewer comments about the collimated beam data in Draft EPA ETV NSF UV reports in November of 2011. They identified two issues related to collimated beam data for NSF to investigate. The two issues were a high degree of uncertainty with replicates in the collimated beam data and the data trending at or below the lower 95% confidence interval for MS2 UV sensitivity. The initial investigation revealed no systematic error. However, further investigation revealed a miscommunication between the company that calibrated NSF's radiometers and NSF. The radiometers were calibrated at one of two possible settings. As the company did not inform NSF of which setting it used to calibrate the radiometer, NSF used the non-calibrated radiometer setting for its CB tests. Hence the MS2 had received about 25% more UV dose than estimated by the CB data. Therefore, the calculated RED_{meas} at each set point was lower than the actual dose delivered by the unit. NSF determined that the best action was to retest all previous tested units. That testing was done in the summer of 2012 and is reported in this report. All previous data is not reported herein as it was deemed to be biased low.

The factors used in the collimated test shown below were evaluated against the protocol requirements and found to meet the QC objectives. The length (distance from the lamp centerline to the suspension) and the depth of suspension were fixed parameters. These measurements were made multiple times at the "fixed mark" on the collimated beam apparatus to estimate the precision of the measurements. The time was checked based on a stop watch with minimal uncertainty. The petri dish factor was measured several times prior to the start of the test. Absorbance uncertainty is based on spectrophotometer precision, as is the related reflectance factor. The average intensity is measured for every collimated beam test, as it is required that intensity be measured before and after each test.

To control for error in the UV dose measurement, the uncertainties of the terms in the UV dose calculation met the following criteria:

	Estimated	Required
• Depth of suspension (d)	<5%	≤ 10%
• Average incident irradiance (E_s)	2.5%	≤ 8%
• Petri Factor (P_f)	2.1%	≤ 5%
• L/(d + L)	0.7%	≤ 1%
• Time (t)	1.6%	≤ 5 %
• $(1 - 10^{-ad})/ad$	1.2%	≤ 5%

Trip blanks are normally performed to show that the stock phage solution does not change during shipment to and from the test site. The phage stock solution was delivered from the microbiology laboratory in the same building as the test rig before each test run and the samples were returned to the laboratory after each test run. Therefore trip blanks were not required for these tests, as all stock solution and test samples were received from and delivered to the microbiology laboratory before/after each test run. No shipping or long holding times was required. However, Trip Blanks were analyzed for this project to demonstrate that no change was occurring. The results are shown in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Trip Blank Results

Date	Trip Blank Lab Retained		Trip Blank Travel to Test Rig and Returned		Difference
	(PFU/mL MS2)	Log_{10}	(PFU/mL MS2)	Log_{10}	Log_{10}
June 20, 2012 Day 1	6.90E+08	8.84	6.73E+08	8.83	0.01
June 21, 2012 Day 2	5.73E+08	8.76	5.90E+08	8.77	0.01

Stability tests for MS2 are normally performed to show that the phage does not change during holding times when samples are shipped from the test site to the laboratory and/or held in the laboratory prior to analysis. However, for these tests, the test rig was located in the same building as the microbiology laboratory. Samples were delivered to the laboratory after each test run and the laboratory ran the samples within 4 to 6 hours of sample collection. Stability samples were run for informational purposes even though the holding time was very short.

Table 5-2. MS2 Stability Test Results

MS2 Stability Test Results					
High UVT 97%	**PFU/mL**	**Log 10**	**Low UVT 79%**	**PFU/mL**	**Log 10**
Influent 0 Hour	2.54E+03	3.40	Influent 0 Hour	3.50E+03	3.54
Influent 4 Hour	1.38E+03	3.14	Influent 4 Hour	2.02E+03	3.30
Influent 8 Hour	4.60E+02	2.67	Influent 8 Hour	8.13E+02	2.91
Influent 24 Hour	4.97E+02	2.70	Influent 24 Hour	8.60E+02	2.93
High UVT 97%	**Average**	**Log 10**	**Low UVT 79%**	**Average**	**Log 10**
Effluent 0 Hour	3.93E+03	3.59	Effluent 0 Hour	3.93E+03	3.59
Effluent 4 Hour	1.45E+03	3.16	Effluent 4 Hour	1.38E+04	4.14
Effluent 8 Hour	4.53E+02	2.66	Effluent 8 Hour	6.53E+03	3.81
Effluent 24 Hour	5.40E+02	2.73	Effluent 24 Hour	6.60E+03	3.82

5.6 Engineering Lab - Test Rig QA/QC

The flow meter for the test rig is part of the NSF tank, pump, and flow control system used for UV testing and other tests in the engineering laboratory. The flow meter is calibrated by the NSF QA staff at least annually. Calibration is performed by measuring the draw down volume from the calibrated feed tank over time. The tank was calibrated by filling with measured volumes of water and the corresponding depth measured. In addition to the annual calibration, the flow meter was calibrated prior to the start of these test runs. Calibration was performed at 15, 20 and 25 gpm covering the range of expected flow rates. The flow meter accuracy fell within a range of

0.5 to 1.6% of the measured tank draw down rate over the range of test flow rates. The calibration data for the flow meter is shown in Table 5-3 and achieved the requirement of +/- 5%.

Table 5-3. Flow Meter Calibration Results

Meter Flow Rate Read by meter	Volume from Tank	Run Time	Flow Rate Calculated	Percent Difference
(gpm)	(gallons)	(min:sec:millisec)	(gpm)	(%)
15.45	270.27	17:24:24	15.53	0.5
19.90	160.97	8:00:00	20.12	1.1
24.95	427.26	16:50:86	25.36	1.6

A reactor control and a reactor blank were performed as part of the validation. One reactor control, with MS2 coliphage injection, and the lamps off, was performed to demonstrate that the MS2 concentration was not changing as the seeded water passed though the reactor. A reactor blank was collected to demonstrate that the system was not accumulating or being contaminated with MS2 at levels that would interfere with the test.

Table 5-4 presents the results of the reactor control and reactor blanks. The reactor control had an average influent concentration of 5.66 log_{10} and an average effluent concentration of 5.78 log_{10} showing a difference of 0.12 log_{10} through the system with lamps off. This meets the criteria of less than a 0.2 log_{10} change through the unit with lamps turned off.

The reactor blank results showed no measureable MS2 in the system.

The results for the blank samples for HPC, total coliform, and *E. coli* were presented in Table 4-17.

5.7 Documentation

All laboratory activities were documented using specially prepared laboratory bench sheets and NSF laboratory reports. Data laboratory reports were entered into Microsoft™ Excel® spreadsheets. These spreadsheets were used to calculate the means and log_{10} reductions. One hundred percent of the data entered into the spreadsheets was checked by a reviewer to confirm all data and calculations were correct.

5.8 Data Review

NSF QA/QC staff reviewed the raw data records for compliance with QA/QC requirements. As required in the ETV Quality Management Plan, NSF ETV staff checked at least 10% of the data in the NSF laboratory reports against the lab bench sheets.

Table 5-4. Reactor Control and Reactor Blank MS2 Results

Test Condition	Test Run	UVT (%)	Flow (gpm)	Intensity (W/m^2)	Influent (pfu/mL) Rep 1	Influent (pfu/mL) Rep 2	Influent (pfu/mL) Rep 3	Effluent (pfu/mL) Rep 1	Effluent (pfu/mL) Rep 2	Effluent (pfu/mL) Rep 3
Reactor Blank	1	79	15.0	7.0	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Reactor Blank	8	97	15.2	15.0	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Reactor Control	9	97.2	15.0	0.0	2.39E+05	4.83E+05	8.50E+05	6.23E+05	6.53E+05	5.47E+05
Test Condition	**Test Run**	**UVT (%)**	**Flow (gpm)**	**Intensity (W/m^2)**	**Influent $\log_{10}$ Rep 1**	**Influent $\log_{10}$ Rep 2**	**Influent $\log_{10}$ Rep 3**	**Effluent $\log_{10}$ Rep 1**	**Effluent $\log_{10}$ Rep 2**	**Effluent $\log_{10}$ Rep 3**
Reactor Blank	1	79	15.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Reactor Blank	8	97	15.2	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Reactor Control	9	97.2	15.0	0.0	5.38	5.68	5.93	5.79	5.81	5.74

5.9 Data Quality Indicators

The quality of data generated for this ETV verification is established through four indicators of data quality: representativeness, accuracy, precision, and completeness.

5.9.1 Representativeness

Representativeness is a qualitative term that expresses "the degree to which data accurately and precisely represent a characteristic of a population, parameter variations at a sampling point, a process condition, or an environmental condition." Representativeness was ensured by consistent execution of the test protocol for each challenge, including timing of sample collection, sampling procedures, and sample preservation. Representativeness was also ensured by using each analytical method at its optimum capability to provide results that represent the most accurate and precise measurement it is capable of achieving.

5.9.2 Accuracy

Accuracy was quantified as the percent recovery of the parameter in a sample of known quantity. Accuracy was measured through use of both matrix spikes of a known quantity, where applicable, and certified standards during calibration of an instrument.

The following equation was used to calculate percent recovery:

$$\text{Percent Recovery} = 100 \times [(X_{known} - X_{measured})/X_{known}]$$

Where:

X_{known} = known concentration of the measured parameter
$X_{measured}$ = measured concentration of parameter

Accuracy of the bench top chlorine, pH, and turbidity meters was checked daily during the calibration procedures using certified check standards. The in-line UVT monitor was calibrated daily with both a purchased UVT standard and with DI water at 99.9% UVT before the flow tests.

The NSF Laboratory Quality Assurance Manual establishes the frequency of spike sample analyses at 10% of the samples analyzed for chemical analyses. Laboratory control samples are also run at a frequency of 10%. The recovery limits specified for the parameters in this verification, excluding microbiological analyses, were 70-130% for laboratory-fortified (spiked) samples and 85-115% for laboratory control samples. The NSF QA department reviewed the laboratory records and found that all recoveries were within the prescribed QC requirements. Calibration requirements were also achieved for all analyses.

5.9.3 Precision

Precision refers to the degree of mutual agreement among individual measurements and provides an estimate of random error. One sample per batch was analyzed in duplicate for the iron and manganese measurements. At least one out of every ten samples for pH, total chlorine, free chlorine, temperature, and turbidity was analyzed in duplicate as part of the daily calibration

process. Precision of duplicate analyses was measured by use of the following equation to calculate RPD:

$$RPD = \left| \frac{S_1 - S_2}{S_1 + S_2} \right| \times 200$$

Where:

S_1 = sample analysis result; and

S_2 = sample duplicate analysis result.

Acceptable analytical precision for the verification test was set at an RPD of 30%. Field duplicates were collected at a frequency of one out of every 10 samples for each parameter, to incorporate both sampling and analytical variation to measure overall precision against this objective. In addition, the NSF Laboratory also conducted laboratory duplicate measurements at 10% frequency of samples analyzed. The laboratory precision for the methods selected was tighter than the 30% overall requirement, generally set at 20% based on the standard NSF Chemistry Laboratory method performance.

All RPD were within NSF's established allowable limits for each parameter.

5.9.4 Completeness

Completeness is the proportion of valid, acceptable data generated using each method as compared to the requirements of the TQAP plan. The completeness objective for data generated during validation testing is based on the number of samples collected and analyzed for each parameter and/or method, as presented in Table 5-5.

Table 5-5. Completeness Requirements

Number of Samples per Parameter and/or Method	Percent Completeness
0-10	80%
11-50	90%
> 50	95%

Completeness is defined as follows for all measurements:

$$\%C = (V/T) \times 100$$

Where:

%C = percent completeness;

V = number of measurements judged valid; and

T = total number of measurements.

One hundred percent completeness was achieved for all aspects of this validation. All planned testing activities were conducted as scheduled, and all planned samples were collected for challenge organism and water chemistry analyses.

Chapter 6
References

1. Test/Quality Assurance Plan for The ETS UV Ultraviolet (UV) Reactor, Medium Pressure Lamps, June 2010

2. Generic Protocol for Development of Test/Quality Assurance Plans for Validation of Ultraviolet (UV) Reactors, NSF International, 7/2010.

3. Protocol for Development of Test / Quality Assurance Plans for Validation of Ultraviolet (UV) Reactors August 2011 10/01/EPADWCTR.

4. Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidance Manual For the Long Term 2 Enhanced surface Water Treatment Rule, Office of Water, US Environmental Protection Agency, November 2006, EPA 815-R-06-007

5. German Association for Gas and Water (DVGW) Technical Standard Work Sheet W 294-1,2,3 (June 2006)

6. Austrian Standards, ÖNORM M5873-1, Plants for the disinfection of water using ultraviolet radiation, Requirements and testing, Low pressure mercury lamp plants (March, 2001)

7. APHA, AWWA, and WEF (1999). *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, 20th Edition.

8. NSF International (2007). *NSF/ANSI Standard 55 – Ultraviolet Microbiological Water Treatment Systems*.

9. NSF International (2011). *NSF/ANSI Standard 50 – Equipment for Swimming Pools, Spas, Hot Tubs and Other Recreational Water Facilities*

10. Water Report 113, Safe, Sufficient and Good Potable Water Offshore: A guideline to design and operation of offshore potable water systems. 2nd edition. By Eyvind Andersen and Bjørn E. Løfsgaard

11. Recommended Standards For Water Works, Policies for the Review and Approval of Plans and Specifications for Public Water Supplies, 2012 Edition, A Report of the Water Supply Committee of the Great Lakes-Upper Mississippi River Board of State and Provincial Public Health and Environmental Managers.

Attachment 1

Model UVL-200-4 Operating and Technical Manual
Supporting Technical Data

Contact Mr. Bruce Bartley at 734-769-5148 or bartley@nsf.org for a copy of this document.

This attachment is a pdf file.

Attachment 2

Model UVL-200-4 Sensor and Lamp Information

Contact Mr. Bruce Bartley at 734-769-5148 or bartley@nsf.org for a copy of this document.

This attachment is a pdf file.

Attachment 3

Standard 55 Annex A - Collimated Beam Apparatus

Contact Mr. Bruce Bartley at 734-769-5148 or bartley@nsf.org for a copy of this document.

This attachment is a pdf file.

Attachment 4

UVT Scans for Feed Water
High and Low UVT
(with and without LSA)

Contact Mr. Bruce Bartley at 734-769-5148 or bartley@nsf.org for a copy of this document.

This attachment is a pdf file.