

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of California-American Water
Company (U210W) for Approval of the
Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and
Authorization to Recover All Present and Future
Costs in Rates.

A.12-04-019
(Filed April 23, 2012)

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ERIC J. SABOLSICE

Lori Anne Dolqueist
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
One Embarcadero Center
30th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 291-7400
ldolqueist@manatt.com

Attorneys for Applicant
California-American Water Company

Sarah E. Leeper
Javier Naranjo
California-American Water Company
333 Hayes Street, Suite 202
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 863-2960
sarah.leeper@amwater.com

Attorneys for Applicant
California-American Water Company

March 8, 2013

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. EXPERIENCE WITH DESALINATION	2
III. ESTIMATE MODIFICATIONS	3
A. Power	3
B. Labor Expense.....	5
C. Chemicals.....	6
D. Boron.....	6
E. Repair and Replacement	7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates.

A.12-04-019
(Filed April 23, 2012)

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ERIC J. SABOLSICE

I. INTRODUCTION

Q1. Please state your name and business address.

A1. My name is Eric J. Sabolsice, my business address is 511 Forest Lodge Road, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, and my business telephone number is (831) 646-3291. I am the Director of Operations and General Manager for the Coastal Division of California-American Water Company (“California American Water”).

Q2. Did you previously provide information regarding your employment and qualifications?

A2. Yes. I included information regarding my employment and qualifications in my direct testimony submitted as part of this proceeding.

Q3. What is the purpose of your testimony and what issues will you be addressing in your rebuttal testimony?

A3. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (“DRA”) report on California American Water’s application for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project, A.12-04-019. Specifically, DRA’s recommendations regarding operation & maintenance (“O&M”) costs.

1 **II. EXPERIENCE WITH DESALINATION**

2 Q4. Does California American Water have any experience operating desalination facilities?

3 A4. Yes. California American Water has operated and maintained the Sand City Desalination
4 Plant since early 2010. The source of supply to the facility is naturally occurring brackish
5 water withdrawn through beach wells containing between 17,000 to 24,000 mg/L total
6 dissolved solids (“TDS”). Reverse osmosis (“RO”) membranes are utilized to remove
7 dissolved salts and produce permeate that contains approximately 180 mg/L as TDS. The
8 RO is followed by ultra violet (“UV”) disinfection to ensure proper disinfection. The
9 permeate is then rehardened using calcite contactors and chlorine is added for disinfection.
10 Finally, sodium hydroxide is added for pH adjustment to ensure the product water is
11 noncorrosive. The product water is blended 3/1 with water from the distribution system,
12 metered and then pumped to California American Water customers.

13
14 Q5. Did California American Water utilize the Sand City Desalination Facility as a reference
15 when developing the cost model for the water supply project cost model?

16 A5. Yes. While the water supply project’s desalination facilities will be different in some
17 respects (e.g. plant capacity and the naturally occurring levels of TDS in the raw water),
18 there are many similarities that provide reference points when estimating future O&M
19 costs. These similarities include subsurface intakes located along the beach, minimal
20 pretreatment systems due to higher quality raw water associated with subsurface intakes,
21 the use of reverse osmosis to remove salts and the use of an energy recovery system to
22 transfer energy from the waste stream to the feed water.

23
24 Q6. Are there other desalination projects currently in operation that you have used as a
25 reference when estimating power consumption?

26 A6. Yes. American Water operates and maintains the largest seawater desalination project
27 (27.5 MGD or 30,800 AFY) in the U.S. through a joint venture with Acciona Agua, S.A.
28 The facility is located in Apollo Beach, FL and is operated under contract to Tampa Bay

1 Water. I was personally involved as the Project Director for the joint venture during
2 design, construction, and start up of the facility. The desalination plant processes
3 seawater withdrawn from the outfall of the Big Bend Power Station owned by TECO
4 Energy. The seawater water drawn from the power plant outfall is warmed by the power
5 plant steam condensers to above 100 degrees Fahrenheit. The warmed seawater reduces
6 the feed pressure required. The reduced feed pressure results in a power consumption rate
7 of approximately 3.0 kWh/cubic meter. Other projects of interest around the world
8 include the Fujairah I desalination plant expansion in Abu Dhabi rated at 36 MGD. The
9 facility utilizes a hybrid desalination process combining multi-stage flash distillation and
10 reverse osmosis. The projected power consumption is reported to be 3.7 kWh/cubic
11 meter.¹ Finally, the 18 MGD Ghalilah seawater reverse osmosis facility located in Ras al-
12 Khaimah, UAE is reported to claim an energy consumption target of 3.14 kWh/cubic
13 meter.² This lower consumption target is stated to have caused “ripples of surprise in the
14 industry.”³

16 **III. ESTIMATE MODIFICATIONS**

17 **A. Power**

- 18 Q7. Do you agree with DRA regarding estimates of power consumption in Chapter 4, Section
19 C.1?
- 20 A7. No. DRA understates the expected levels of energy consumption for the facility by 50%
21 in some cases when estimating kilowatt-hours (“kWh”) per year for the intake wells,
22 desalination facility, and conveyance/high service pumps. DRA proposes the annual
23 consumption rate for the 9.6 MGD facility be adjusted down to 26,500,000 kWh from
24 51,500,000 kWh. A similar reduction is suggested for the smaller facility as well. DRA’s
25 estimate for the larger facility equates to 7,563 kWh/MG or 2.0 kWh per cubic meter of
26 water produced. When intake wells, desalination process, and conveyance are taken into

27 ¹ See GLOBAL WATER INTELLIGENCE, Feb. 2013, p. 27.

28 ² See *id.*

³ *Id.*

1 account, the Sand City Desalination Facility produces water at approximately 3.3 kWh per
2 cubic meter. DRA's forecast for the water supply project is much lower than the actual
3 rate of consumption experienced at the Sand City Desalination Facility. In addition, the
4 forecast is far below any known seawater reverse osmosis facility in the world.
5

6 Q8. Would California American Water's facility, as proposed in its water supply project
7 application, operate at a similar power consumption rate as the Sand City Desalination
8 Plant?

9 A8. No. The water supply project will operate at a higher rate of consumption than the Sand
10 City Desalination Plant. While the process will be similar to Sand City, a key difference
11 will be higher raw water TDS (i.e. salinity) expected for the larger water supply project
12 facility. The goal of using slant wells as the form of subsurface intake will be to obtain a
13 raw water supply that is closer to that of seawater. The raw water TDS concentration is
14 expected to range between 28,000 to 33,000 mg/L. The projected salinity for the water
15 supply project is 20% to 30% higher than the raw water TDS concentration experienced at
16 the Sand City Desalination Plant. As salinity increases so does the osmotic pressure. For
17 reverse osmosis to occur the osmotic pressure must be overcome. Additional factors that
18 will affect the driving pressure required to produce permeate are the type of membrane
19 system, system configuration, and feed water temperature.
20

21 Q9. Do you agree with DRA's suggested correction to the power model regarding adjusting
22 for the density of seawater?

23 A9. Yes. Due to its mineral or salt content seawater will be denser than fresh and that
24 adjustment can be incorporated. With that correction, it remains somewhat vexing as to
25 how DRA estimated the rate of power consumption for the entire facility at 2.0 kWh per
26 cubic meter, which would be more in line with a facility treating source waters with a
27 much lower total dissolved solids or utilizing a process such as forward osmosis. While
28 forward osmosis as a technology is known to reduce the rate of energy consumption, it is

1 new in the drinking water industry and far from proven. Furthermore, the use of an
2 osmotic agent to facilitate osmosis requires separation of the pure water from the agent.
3 These agents are not yet NSF/ANSI certified for contact with potable water by the
4 California Department of Health. In closing, I believe that DRA's use of such a low ratio
5 of power/production indicates an error in their calculations when considering results for
6 other projects around the world.

7
8 Q10. Do you agree with DRA's position regarding a reduction in labor expense of \$20,000
9 annually?

10 A10. No. DRA's bases the adjustment on an escalation factor of 3.1% as opposed to that
11 contained in California American Water's application of 4%. The Energy Cost of Service
12 Branch Escalation Memorandum escalation factor does not take into account cost of living
13 factors specific to the Monterey Peninsula nor does it consider the skill set required to
14 operate and maintain a large desalination facility. While the suggested reduction is small,
15 it should be recognized that this facility will be one of the largest desalination facilities
16 operating on the west coast and will have its share of operational challenges. Sufficient
17 budget for personnel is important to ensure that the right talent is available to operate and
18 protect the asset.

19
20 **B. Labor Expense**

21 Q11. Do you agree with DRA's position regarding the use of de-chlorination chemicals and
22 subsequent reduction of the chemical budget?

23 A11. No. De-chlorination may be required to avoid the formation of disinfection by-products
24 when what supplied from the desalination facility or groundwater replenishment facility is
25 injected into the aquifer. The escalation factor of 4% should be maintained as the market
26 for certain chemicals such as anti-scalents may be significantly affected by a large
27 desalination plant, such as the proposed project here in Monterey.

1 **C. Chemicals**

2 Q12. Do you agree with DRA's position on removing the cost of second pass membrane
3 replacement?

4 A12. No. DRA's has maintained that a second pass RO train is unnecessary and therefore no
5 second pass replacement is needed. California American Water requires inclusion of a
6 second pass RO train in the design to ensure that the facility is reliably able to meet the
7 California Department of Public Health's notification level of 1 mg/L for Boron.

8
9 **D. Boron**

10 Q13. What has been California American Water's experience with Boron at the Sand City
11 Desalination Plant?

12 A13. The Sand City Desalination Plant utilizes naturally occurring brackish source water that
13 contains a Boron concentration of 2 – 4 mg/L. The single stage reverse osmosis process
14 results in a permeate Boron concentration of 0.9 to 1.1 mg/L. The permeate is blended
15 with distribution system water to reduce the final Boron level below the notification limit
16 of 1 mg/L.

17
18 Q14. What is your expectation for Boron concentrations for the proposed water supply project?

19 A14. I would expect that as TDS increase the level of Boron will increase as well. Using slant
20 wells, California American Water will draw upon the naturally occurring brackish water
21 beneath the ocean floor resulting in a feed water Boron concentration greater than 4 mg/L.
22 The expected permeate concentration would be greater than the 1 mg/L, which would
23 exceed the California Department of Health's limit. Furthermore, the second pass RO
24 train will ensure that the chloride levels in the product water are maintained low enough to
25 avoid customer complaints regarding taste or damage to plants/landscaping. It is
26 important to California American Water that any new facility should be designed to
27 reliably meet current and future primary and secondary public health standards. The value
28

1 of the membrane replacement account should be maintained as proposed in California
2 American Water's application to include second pass replacement.

3
4 Q15. Is it possible for California American Water to blend the permeate with distribution water
5 to lower the Boron concentration to below 1 mg/L similar to the Sand City Desalination
6 Plant?

7 A15. The output of the Sand City Desalination Plant is approximately 220 gallons per minute as
8 permeate. This equates to 3% of the daily input to the Monterey distribution system,
9 allowing for an adequate blend. During the summer months, the proposed 6.4 MGD or
10 9.6 MGD desalination facility will provide the majority of daily input to the Monterey
11 distribution system and therefore cannot be blended to reduce the Boron concentration.

12
13 **E. Repair and Replacement**

14 Q16. Do you agree with DRA's reduction in the value of the repair and replacement ("R&R")
15 account for the facility?

16 A16. No. DRA simply adjusted the value of the R&R account based on its reduced estimate of
17 overall plant costs. The value of the R&R account is based on an expected replacement
18 schedule, which is significantly affected by the corrosive seawater environment, and
19 higher operating pressures experienced at a desalination facility. Proper maintenance of
20 equipment is critical both to protect the health and safety of employees working in the
21 area of the equipment as well as to ensure the desired production. The value of the R&R
22 account should be maintained as proposed in California American Water's application.

23
24 Q17. Does this complete your rebuttal testimony?

25 A17. Yes it does.
26
27
28