

APPLICATION OF EPANET TO UNDERSTAND LEAD RELEASE IN PREMISE PLUMBING

Regan Murray, USEPA

AWWA ACE

June 14, 2017

SEPA

Presentation outline

- Motivation & background
- Approach
- Factors affecting lead concentration at tap
- Application of model to understand exposure
- Validation of model with experimental data



Acknowledgements:

Jon Burkhardt Kelly Cahalan Darren Lytle Michael Schock Simoni Triantafyllidou

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency through its Office of Research and Development funded and collaborated in the research described here. The research has been subjected to the Agency's review and has been approved for publication. Note that approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views of the Agency. Mention of trade names, products, or services does not convey official EPA approval, endorsement, or recommendation.



Motivation

- Millions of U.S. homes have lead service lines & other sources of lead in the home
- What factors affect *how much* lead is in the water at the tap?
- If a water sample is taken at the tap, what does the resulting lead concentration mean?



Approach - EPANET Modeling









EPA

EPANET Software

- Models and simulates hydraulics within water distribution network
- Models and simulates simple decay/growth of a single substance
- Available for free on EPA's website
- Developed in 1990

EPA

 Provides basis for multiple commercial software packages



WDS Modeling Can Address

- Replacing Aging Infrastructure
 - Main breaks, damaged hydrants and valves, water loss
- Optimizing Operations
 - Pump schedules, tank cycling, pressure management, chlorine dosing, energy reduction

Planning

- Future demands, sizing new pipes & facilities, evaluating supplies, growth and decline
- Solving Water Quality Problems
 - Violations, customer complaints, low disinfectant residuals, disinfection byproducts



EPANET to Model Premise Plumbing







€PA

Factors Affecting Lead Concentration

- Hydraulic
 - Pipe lengths & diameter
 - Fixtures & appliances (where)
 - Customer usage patterns (when)
 - Flow rates (how much)
- Water quality
 - Lead sources (pipe & plumbing materials)
 - Lead dissolution (corrosivity of water)
 - Lead particulate release



Sources of Lead

- Lead service line (50-75%)
- Other materials such as galvanized pipes, lead solder, fittings, etc. (20-35%)
- Faucets (1-3%)

EPA



From AWWARF 2008 Contribution of Service Line and Plumbing Fixtures to LCR Compliance





- Why does soluble lead release into water from lead sources?
- Chemical reaction between water and plumbing causes dissolving or wearing away of lead in pipe
- Affected by use of water treatment chemicals, presence of protective scales or coatings inside pipes, condition of pipes, amount of disinfectant, and background water chemistry (e.g., alkalinity, pH, temperature)

Lead Equilibrium Model

 $\frac{dC}{dt} = \frac{AM}{V} \frac{E-C}{E}$

EPA

- C is the lead concentration in the LSL (mg/L)
- A is pipe surface area (m²)
- V is pipe volume (L)
- E is the maximum lead capacity of a water (mg/L)
- M is the dissolution rate (mg/m²/s)

Hayes et al. (2009)





- As water sits in pipe, the concentration of lead increases in the water within the LSL until it reaches its solubility limit
- When water is used within the home, the slug of lead in the LSL moves into the other pipes and enters the home through the faucets/fixtures
- Lead increases in the LSL water again



Vater Usage – Large Volumes

Large water usage flushes out soluble lead

- If someone takes a drink of water from the kitchen faucet after large water usage, the concentration at tap varies
- Concentration depends on flow rate

	% LSL removed	Conc. in next glass
Shower (17.2 gal @ 2 gpm)	100%	4 ppb
Toilet (3.6 gal @ 2 gpm)	100%	4 ppb
Toilet (1.3 gal @ 2 gpm)	50%	100 ppb



- Small water usages move lead from LSL into home plumbing pipes
- Concentration at tap stays at 0 until more water is used

	% LSL removed	
3 oz glass of water	0% - slug moved 2.7 ft.	0 ppb
Coffee pot (32 oz)	0% - slug moved 11 ft.	0 ppb
Brushing teeth (1 gal)	20% - slug moved 43.5 ft.	100 ppb



- Assume 1.5 gpm flow at faucet until lead slug removed, then glass of water is filled
- As diameter increases,
 - Lead arrives later at the tap
 - Slug duration at tap increases
 - After slug conc. in glass increases

	Arrival time at tap	Duration	Conc. in next glass
D=0.5 in	12 sec	22 sec	3 ppb
D=0.75 in	28 sec	50 sec	5 ppb
D=1 in	49 sec	90 sec	7 ppb



- Assume 1.5 gpm flow at faucet until lead slug removed, then glass of water is filled
- As home plumbing pipe length increases,
 - Lead arrives later at the tap
 - Slug duration stays the same
 - After-slug conc remains constant

	Arrival time at tap	Duration	Conc. in next glass
L = 10 ft.	9 sec	50 sec	5 ppb
L = 30 ft.	28 sec	50 sec	5 ppb
L = 50 ft.	46 sec	50 sec	5 ppb



- Assume 1.5 gpm flow at faucet until lead slug removed, then glass of water filled
- As LSL pipe length increases,
 - Arrival time is the same
 - Slug duration increases
 - After-slug conc in glass increases

	Arrival time at tap	Duration	Conc. in next glass
L = 35 ft.	28 sec	32 sec	3 ppb
L = 55 ft.	28 sec	50 sec	5 ppb
L = 75 ft.	28 sec	69 sec	7 ppb

Summary of Factors Affecting Lead



EPA

- Pipe lengths & diameter
- Fixtures & appliances
- Flow rates
- Customer usage patterns
- Lead sources
- Water quality & treatment
- Particulate release



Modeling Exposure in Homes

 Data on variability in hydraulic and water quality factors across communities with remaining lead service lines

Models

- EPANET model of premise plumbing including multiple lead sources
 - potentially modified for low flow and stagnant conditions
- Lead fate & transport model (Hayes model)
- Models of water usage (family size, appliance type)
- Monte Carlo probabilistic simulations



SEPA

Model Validation with EPA HPS

- LSL
- Pipes
- Appliances
- Usage patterns for family of 4
- Sampling strategies
- Goal: use experimental data to validate model



Model Validation with EPA HPS

- Validation of Hayes Model in HPS
 - Experiments to determine plumbosolvency (E) and reaction rate (M)
 - Fixed Length Stagnation 1, 2, 4 and 16 hours
 - Sampling under constant flow conditions 8 flowrates ranging from 0.1 to 12 L/min
- Validation of EPANET system model
 - System size/volume
 - Sequential sampling w/ 125mL vials from 4 cold faucets
 - Various actual usage patterns for multi-week period





EPA HPS Lead Concentration

Lead Concentration - Cold Water Tap Lead Concentration - Hot Water Tap PB2 for Node F1H PB2 for Node F1C 17.0 120.0 115.0 16.0 110.0 15.0 105.0 100.0 14.0 95.0 13.0 90.0 12.0 85.0 80.0 11.0 75.0 10.0 70. (TON) (nor) 65. 9.0 60.0 8 Ē 55. 50.0 7. 45.0 6. 40.0 51 35.0 30.0 4 (25.0 3.0 20.0 15.0 2.0 10.0 1.0 5.0 0.0-0.0 0 1 2 3 4 10 11 12 13 14 15 17 18 19 20 21 22 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2 3 4 8 9 23 Time (hours Time (hours

Lower concentrations due to dilution in hot water heater



Conclusions

- Concentration of lead at the tap is affected by
 - Water quality factors (lead sources, water treatment, water chemistry, pipe condition)
 - Hydraulic factors (usage patterns, pipe diameter & length, flow rates, configuration of fixtures & appliances)
- A single sample of tap water cannot represent individual exposure profiles
- A probabilistic modeling study is underway to better estimate exposure in the home and understand the relative importance of each of these factors

Regan Murray <u>Murray.regan@epa.gov</u> (513) 569-7031