Hydroturbines

Its all downhill from here...
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Historical use of water as energy

- 31 BC to 14 AD Water wheels used in Roman engineering (vertical)
- 31 AD Ancient China used water wheels (horizontal)
- 1500s Water wheels used for mining
- 1909 USBR built its first hydroelectric plant to help build Roosevelt Dam
- 1920 only 2% of energy was used to make electricity
- 1937 formation of SRP Agricultural Improvement & Power District
SRP Hydro Generation

Renewable energy during fiscal year 2007

- Hydro: 72.3%
- Geothermal: 16.7%
- Wind: 9.4%
- Landfill Gas: 1.3%
- Solar: 0.2%
- Fuel Cell: 0.1%

Values shown total 5 percent of SRP's retail sales.
Watts in a name?
A new frontier for old technology

- Water wheel usually used for mechanical work
- Hydropower
- Hydrogeneration
- Hydroturbine
- Microturbine
- Hydroelectric Power
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Open channel vs closed pipe

Vertical

- Elevation change (available head)
- Volume
- Velocity
- Load on generator
Elevation change or feet of Head

- 510’ Head  Glen Canyon Dam (Lake Powell)
  27,000,000 AF
- 249’ Head  Theodore Roosevelt Dam
  2,910,200 AF
- 72’ Head  Parker Dam (Lake Havasu)
  648,000 AK
- 29’ Head/1400 kw  South Canal (SRP Canal)
- 14’ Head/ 750 kw  Arizona Falls (SRP Canal)

Note: Some offshore installations work off tide water
SRP Arizona Falls

- 14 ft elevation change/16” pipe
- 750 kilowatts
- 150 homes powered
City of Phoenix Water System

- Service area varies 940’ to 2020’
- Pressure Zones generally 100’ elevation intervals
- Water mains 2” to 108”
- Storage tanks and reservoirs provide 2’ to 43’ of operating head
COP Hydro-generation Studies

- 1987 Energy audit at four WT plants and considered hydro-generation on gravity mains
- 1991 In-line Hydro-generation Feasibility Study multiple pressure zones at 24 St WTP
- 2003 COP participated with SRP to re-construct Arizona Falls
- 2004 Hydro-generation potential for a new PRV station and a modified PRV at 24 St. WTP
- 2009 Lake Pleasant WTP Optimization-Investigate power production potential at PRV sites on the 54” transmission main
Use of Energy Dissipaters

- Pressure Reducing Valves
- Pressure Regulating Valves
- Pressure Control Valves
- Hydro-pneumatic Tanks
Hydro Generation Potential

- Potential PRV sites near I-17
  1. 5ED-R1 (54” main) and 100’ head
  2. 4A-R (54” main) and 100’ head
  3. 3D-R11 (20” main) and 100’ head

- \( \approx 30 \text{ MGD (20,000 gpm) at each site} \)
- 335 KW produced at each site
Potential site near 24 St WTP
Pros for the sites

- Continuous operation at I-17 (possible at 24ST WTP)
- Consistent flow and head
- High head/ high flow
- Proximity to power utility connection to grid
- Green energy incentives
- Payback for installation
- Generate revenue
- PRV manufactures (Cla-val) options
CONS

- Hydroturbines are not traditionally used in water distribution systems
- All parts and lubricants that contact potable water are required to meet NSF 60/61 standard
- A special permit is required to generate electricity and send it to the grid
- Most installations will involve third party agreements to maintain equipment and negotiate send to grid
- No available facilities and infrastructure
Revenue Potential

• **I-17 PRVs**
  - 54” main, 100’ head, 340 to 420 kW potential

• **24 St WTP**
  - 48” main, four pressure zones with 108’ to 371’ head
  - 400 to 1,000 kW power generation potential

• **Sellback rate** $.05 to $.095 per kWh

• **Payback in 8 to 16 years**
Considerations

• The most important variables that will determine the type of turbine and generator are:
  1. Head height
  2. Pipe diameter
  3. Flow rate
  4. Velocity
• Las Vegas Valley Water Authority
  - 48” with 930 kW power generation
  - 42” with 671 kW power generation
  - 36” with 522 kW power generation

• Greensboro, NC
  - 87’ head, 10 MGD, 81% efficiency, 87 kW

• San Diego