

Faecal Sludge characterization and modeling co-treatment with Municipal Wastewater

B. Dangol^{*,**}, C.M. Hooijmans^{**}, C.M. Lopez-Vazquez^{**},
M. Ronteltap^{**}, D. Brdjanovic^{**}


*Environment and Public Health Organization (ENPHO), Nepal

**UNESCO-IHE, The Netherlands

Disclaimer

This research is funded by **The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation** under the framework of **Sanitation for the Urban Poor project** (Stimulating Local Innovation on Sanitation for the Urban Poor in Sub-Saharan Africa and South-East Asia).

This research has been published in chapter 9 of “**FSM: Systems Approach for Implementation and Operation**” book, IWA publishing 2014.



FSM practice

- Proper planning of FSM often lacks;
- FS disposed of mostly untreated and uncontrolled;
- The major challenges on FSM are:
 - Emptying;
 - Transporting;
 - Storage or treatment;**
 - Safe disposal or re-use.**
- Sometimes discharging of FS in municipal wastewater treatment plant.




Research Questions & objective

- Is it possible to co-treat FS in an activated sludge plant?
- How much FS can be added before deterioration occurs?
- What are the effects on aeration capacity, effluent concentration, settler?

To evaluate and propose key considerations for FS co-treatment with municipal wastewater in an activated sludge wastewater treatment plant.

Methodology

- Mathematical modelling of the effects of discharge of FS under steady state and dynamic conditions;
- Fractionation of the organics and nitrogenous compounds in terms of their biodegradability;
- The biodegradability of FS depends to a large extent on the storage duration in containment (Fresh vs. Digested FS) .



Inventory of literature data on public toilet (fresh) and septic tank (digested) sludge

Parameter	Public Toilet	Septic Tank
Total solids (mg/L)	30,000-52,500	12,000-35,000
TVS (%TS)	65-68%	50-73%
COD (mg/L)	10,000-250,000	3,000-90,000
BOD ₅ (mg/L)	7,600	840-30,000
TN (mg N/L)	-	190-1,500
TKN (mg/L)	3,400	1,000
NH ₄ -N (mg/L)	2,000-5,000	150-1,200
Total P (mg P/L)	450	40-300

Category	High strength		Medium strength		Low strength	
	Total COD (mg COD/L)	TN (mg N/L)	Total COD (mg COD/L)	TN (mg N/L)	Total COD (mg COD/L)	TN (mg N/L)
Digested faecal sludge	90,000	1,500	45,000	400	3,000	200
Fresh faecal sludge	250,000	5,000	65,000	3,400	10,000	2,000


Faecal sludge fractionation

Fraction	COD		N	
	Digested FS	Fresh FS	Digested FS	Fresh FS
Soluble biodegradable / ammonia	0.12	0.15	0.20	0.47
Soluble unbiodegradable	0.09	0.03	0.75	0.52
Particulate biodegradable	0.31	0.69	-	-
Particulate unbiodegradable	0.47	0.13	0.05	0.01

Biodegradable COD fraction Digested FS:
 $0.12 + 0.31 = 0.43$


Biodegradable COD fraction Fresh FS:
 $0.15 + 0.69 = 0.84$

Design and operational conditions of the activated sludge plant



Parameters	Value	Influent	Value
Flowrate (m ³ /d)	20,000	Total COD (mg COD/L)	750
Temp.	20 °C	TN (mg N/L)	60
SRT (days)	10	TP (mg P/L)	15
Reactor TSS (mg TSS/L)	4500	TSS (mg TSS/L)	400

Amount of faecal sludge added to the plant




Assessment criteria (Key Performance Indicators)

- Effluent Standards (*Urban Waste-Water Treatment Directive (91/271/EEC)*):
 - TCOD = 125 mg/L
 - TN = 15 mg/L
 - TSS = 35 mg/L
- Reactor TSS concentration $\leq 6,000$ mg/L;
- Aeration capacity and costs.


Steady state simulations results (Effluent TCOD)

limit = 125 mg/l




Steady state simulation results (Effluent TN)

limit = 15 mg/L




Steady state simulation results: (Effluent TSS)

limit = 35 mg /L



Steady state simulation results: (TSS in aeration tank)


limit ≤ 6 kg TSS/m³



Maximum volume of FS that can be discharged

Scenarios	% FS for effluent standard is met		% FS selected	% FS when TSS in aerobic tank is < 6kg TSS/L	Volume of sludge (m ³)	# Tanker loads/d	
	Total COD	Total N				5 m ³	8 m ³
Digested Sludge							
Low Strength	10%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	750	150	94
Medium Strength	1%	1.5%	1%	0.375%	75	15	9
High Strength	0.5%	0.625%	0.5%	0.25%	50	10	6
Fresh Sludge							
Low Strength	10%	0.375%	0.375%	0.375%	75	15	9
Medium Strength	1.5%	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	50	10	6
High Strength	0.375%	0.125%	0.125%	0.125%	25	5	3

Increase in aeration requirements




Increase in aeration cost


Scenarios	FS (%)	Total aeration cost (€/year) @ € 0.10/kWH		Additional aeration cost (€/year)	
		High Aer. Efficiency (2.3)	Low Aer. Efficiency (0.6)	High Aer. Efficiency	Low Aer. Efficiency
Without FS	0%	118,968	456,046	-	-
Digested Sludge					
Low Strength	3.75%	123,721	474,266	4,753 (4%)	18,220 (4%)
Medium Strength	0.375%	130,094	498,697	11,126 (9.5%)	42,651 (9.5%)
High Strength	0.25%	134,550	515,812	15,591 (13%)	59,766 (13%)
Fresh Sludge					
Low Strength	0.375%	126,062	483,237	7,093 (6%)	27,192 (6%)
Medium Strength	0.25%	137,332	526,440	18,364 (15.5%)	70,394 (15.5%)
High Strength	0.125%	149,178	571,852	30,210 (25.5%)	115,806 (25.5%)

Dynamic simulation results

- Average discharge of faecal sludge = 127.5 m³/d (0.68%)




Effluent COD and TN High-strength Digested FS




Effluent COD and TN

Low-strength Digested FS



Effluent COD and N

Low-strength Fresh FS



Attempts to improve effluent quality

- Discharge of FS during the night;
- Combined discharge of FS and influent wastewater in flow equalization tank;
- Discharge of even lower volumes of FS in the plant;

- **No significant changes.**

Conclusion:

Max. volume of FS that can be discharged

Type of faecal sludge	Max. volume		No. of tanker loads per day	
	%	m ³ /d	5 m ³	8 m ³
Digested faecal sludge				
Low-strength	0.638	128	26	16
Medium-strength	0.500	100	20	13
High-strength	0.250	51	10	6
Fresh faecal sludge				
Low-strength	0.125	25	5	3
Medium-strength	0.025	5	1	1
High-strength	0.025	5	1	1

General Conclusion

- High increase in effluent COD, N and TSS conc. (low-strength FS has lower impacts);
- Increase in aeration requirement;
- Increase in TSS in aeration tank;
- No significant improvement in effluent quality when discharged FS during the night and by adding flow-equalization tank;
- No feasible approach.

Acknowledgements

- UNESCO-IHE;
- The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation;
- ENPHO;
- And many more.....

Thank you very much!!!

Considerations

- Real case study;
- Pathogens removal;
- Resource recovery;
- Energy consumption.

