

Synergistic effects using ozone, UV and advanced oxidation in multi barrier treatment processes for potable water and waste water reuse



Outline

- Introduction & Principals
- Pesticide Removal in WTP
- Seasonal Taste & Odor Treatment
- Indirect and Direct Potable Reuse
- Questions & Discussion









- UVC is light with a high energy
- Generated through mercury containing lamps (LP or MP) or LEDs
- Common wave length is 254 nm
- Photolysis is the main mechanism





- Strong oxidizing and disinfection agent
- Needs to be generated on site
- Selective reactions with organic matter









AOP

| Oxidant | Oxidation Potential (V) | Oxidation Potential Rel. to Chlorine (V) |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Hydroxyl Radical | 2.80 | 2.05 |
| Ozone | 2.07 | 1.52 |
| Hydrogen Peroxide | 1.78 | 1.31 |
| Potassium Permanganate | 1.70 | 1.25 |
| Sodium Hypochlorite | 1.49 | 1.10 |
| Chlorine | 1.36 | 1.00 |
| Chlorine Dioxide | 1.27 | 0.93 |
| Oxygen | 1.23 | 0.90 |

OH Radicals



- React very fast with organic and inorganic compounds
- Lifetime is only nano seconds
- Any organic or inorganic compound will decrease the efficiency
- Compounds are usually <u>not</u> mineralized $\bigvee_{RO_2} \bigoplus_{RO_2} \bigoplus_{RO_2} \bigoplus_{RCHO} \bigoplus_{R$



| Principals | | | АОР |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------|-------|
| UV H ₂ O ₂ | | | |
| Start | : | | |
| | $H_2O_2 + h\nu \rightarrow 2 HO$ • | Ф _{ОН} =1 | (2-1) |
| Pron | notion: | | |
| | $H_2O_2 + HO \bullet \rightarrow H_2O + HO_2 \bullet$ | | (2-2) |
| 95.0 pm 147.5 pm | $HO_2 \bullet + H_2O_2 \rightarrow H_2O + \bullet O_2 \bullet + \bullet OH$ | | (2-3) |
| | $2 \text{ H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow 2 \text{ H}_2\text{O} \textbf{+} \textbf{\bullet}\text{O}_2 \textbf{\bullet}$ | | (2-4) |
| ^{94.0} H Term | ination: | | |
| `` <u>`</u> | $HO\bullet + \bullet OH \to H_2O_2$ | | (2-5) |
| | $HO\bullet + HO_2\bullet \rightarrow H_2O + \bullet O_2\bullet$ | | (2-6) |
| | $HO_2 \bullet + \bullet O_2 H \rightarrow H_2O_2 + \bullet O_2 \bullet$ | | (2-7) |

wedeco a xylem brand



- Uses GAC, Anthrazite, Sand or expended Clay
- Removes ammonia
- Removes TSS



- Reduces trace organic contaminants including NDMA
- Reduces oxidation by-products and lowers TOC

Synergistic Effects









Pesticide Removal - Metaldehyde

- Slug and Snail poison
- Metaldehyde is very persistant
- Passes ozone and GAC without significant removal



Pesticide Removal - Metaldehyde

- WTP in the UK
- Flow rate 800 m³/h (5 MGD)
- Elevated Metaldehyde levels in the reservoir with seasonal peaks (6 month 0.5 LOG and 3 month 1.0 LOG removal)
- Elevated Bromide levels 70-90 µg/L
- 6 month pilot study to evaluate:
 - UV LP AOP
 - Ozone AOP
 - Ozone AOP+ UV LP AOP







Wedeco Pro₃mix

Wedeco LBX 10

















| Technology | LOG | Costs kUSD / 10 y |
|--------------------|-----|-------------------|
| Ozone AOP | 0.5 | 4.370 |
| UV AOP (LP) | 0.5 | 5.820 |
| UV AOP (LP) | 1.0 | 8.340 |
| Ozone AOP + UV AOP | 1.0 | 7.730 |







- WTP in the Netherlands
- Flow rate 12,000 m³/h



- Micro pollutants in the raw water source (Meuse River)
- Elevated Bromide levels 90-170 µg/L
- Very strict Bromate limits (<0.5 µg/L)





Source: Ton Knol , DUNEA - IOA Berlin 2017



- 8 year research project to evaluate:
 - > UV LP AOP
 - > UV MP AOP
 - Ozone AOP
 - > Ozone + UV LP AOP









Source: Ton Knol et al.





Source: Ton Knol et al.



Average conversion of compounds by H2O2 /O3 / UV from 17-08-2011 until 15-02-2012

Source: Ton Knol et al.



Benefits serial AOP

- 3 oxidation mechanisms
- Increase UVT by oxidation DOC
- Energy efficient
- Smaller footprint
- Target: 80% conversion of MC at energy consumption of 0.15 kWh/m³







Source: Ton Knol et al. IOA Berlin 2017







Source: Ton Knol et al. IOA Berlin 2017








Pesticide Removal Summary

- Ozone improves the UVT and lowers scavenging potential
- Ozone AOP has the lowest OPEX
- When Bromate formation is a concern AOPs can be combined
- Combined AOP's can provide lower treatment costs than single UV based AOPs
- Combined treatment steps provide a multiple barrier against a wider range of pollutants and pathogens
- If an upstream ozone treatment is reasonable must be evaluated considering CAPEX and OPEX









What is T&O?

- Two major compounds are responsible for T&O
- Methylisoborneol & Geosmin
- MIB & Geosmin are formed by cyano bacteria during the bloom
- Bloom event is typically seasonal (2-3 month per year)
- Traces (ng/L) of MIB & Geosmin are recognized by humans
- Easy break trough when using GAC
- PAC needs up to 50 ppm for 20 minutes RT

Ozone / Ozone AOP for T&O





Ozone & Ozone AOP – 2-MIB



Ozone & Ozone AOP – Geosmin



Ozone & Ozone AOP





UV AOP for T&O









UV AOP for T&O



46



















Multibarrier for trace organic removal (ng/L)

2-MIB in Oxidation outlet

2-MIB in Oxidation inlet

2-MIB in Oxelia outlet

300,0 81,0 16,2 0xelia 1: O3 + BAF 0xelia 2: AOP + BAF



Treated Water Biostability by Oxelia (µg/L)







Depth of media (cm)



Technologies - Selection

- How long is the T&O event
- Flow rate
- Water quality (UVT, TOC, Alkalinity, etc.)
- Existing infrastructure / Available footprint
- Price for oxygen, peroxide, etc.
- Other treatment challenges



. . . .

Technologies – Selection: UV LP vs. MP

| | low pressure system | medium pressure system | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Flow rate | 4419 m³/h | 4419 m³/h | |
| Number of reactors | 3 | 3 | |
| Quantity of lamps | 504 | 48 | |
| Lifetime of lamps | 14,000 h | 14,000 h 9,000 h | |
| Quantity of ballasts | 252 | 48 | |
| Average power consumption (AOP mode) | 148 kWh (33.5 W/m³) | 296 kWh (67 W/m³) | |
| H ₂ O ₂ Dose | 10 mg/L | 10 mg/L | |
| AOP mode operation | 1560 h/a | 1560 h/a | |
| Average power consumption (Disinfection mode) | 15 kWh | 65 kWh | |
| Disinfection mode operation | 7200 h/a | 7200 h/a | |
| Price 1 kWh | 0,08 \$ | 0,08 \$ | |
| Annual ballast failure rate | 2 % | 3 % | |
| Years of operation | 15 | 15 | |
| Interest rate | 3% | 3% | |

Technologies – Selection UV LP vs. MP





Technologies – Selection UV LP vs. MP

| Days of AOP operation | Savings LP vs. MP | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 30 | 38,000 USD | | |
| 60 | 44,000 USD | | |
| 90 | 50,000 USD | | |
| 120 | 56,000 USD | | |
| 360 | 105,000 USD | | |



Technologies – Selection UV LP vs. MP

- UV LP has become more popular due to higher rated lamps (> 0.5 kW / lamp) → CAPEX savings
- Year around disinfection requirements favor UV LP due to lower energy costs → OPEX savings

Siheung DWTP AOP Project

- UVT : 92.7% ~ 97.3% (Avg. 95.7%)
- Flow : 106,050 $m^3/d = 4,419 m^3/h$

Treatment Goal

0.5 LOG Removal of 2-MIB

\rightarrow 60 days/y

3.0 LOG Removal of Cryptosporidium

\rightarrow 365 days/y



Pilot tests – LP Reactor

- Type : WEDECO LBX 120
- Flow Rate : 1,000 m³/d
- Lamps : 6 Lamp á 360 W incl. Ballasts = 2,16 kW







Pilot tests – MP Reactor

Flow Rate : 2,000 m³/d

Lamps : 4 Lamp á 3000 W incl. Ballasts = 12 kW







Pilot tests – Summary

| Low pressure reactor | | Medium pressure reactor | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| EED | H_2O_2 dose | LOG | EED | H_2O_2 dose | LOG |
| [kW/m³] | [mg/L] | reduction | [kW/m³] | [mg/L] | reduction |
| 0.07 | 5 | 0.58 | 0.190 | 5 | 0.50 |
| 0.07 | 10 | 0.87 | 0.144 | 10 | 0.53 |

→ LP UV AOP needs more than 50% less energy

Siheung DWTP AOP Project







- Surface Water Treatment
- Flow rate 4419 m³/h
- 60 days T&O removal
- 365 days 3 LOG Crypto
- UVT 93%







- Classic ozone contactor for year round disinfection, color removal, NOM oxidation and seasonal T&O removal by peroxide dosing
- BAF for peroxide quenching and further NOM / AOC removal





- Ozone AOP Reactor for seasonal T&O removal
- BAF for peroxide quenching and further NOM / AOC removal
- UV system for year round disinfection





- UV AOP system for seasonal T&O removal and year round disinfection
- BAF for peroxide quenching and further NOM / AOC removal



Technology evaluation – 60 days AOP mode



T&O Summary

- LP UV AOP can be an attractive option for seasonal T&O treatment
- LP UV AOP provides significantly lower energy costs compared to UV MP
- Ozone AOP usually provides the lowest OPEX
- Combination with BAF provides a stronger barrier and cost savings for residual peroxide quenching
- Decision which technology is most economical has to be evaluated in each case
- Additional treatment challenges or benefits of certain technology need to be considered









Benefits:

- Relieves Water Stress
- Cost-Effective
- Drought-Resistant
- Urbanization means Point of Waste = Point of Use



Challenges:

- Trace Organic Contaminants (TOrCs)
- Pathogens
- Public Perception "The Acceptance Factor"
- Lack of Regulations








- The use of Ozone for reuse is primarily driven by the need to:
 - Remove emerging contaminants due to both public perception and regulatory uncertainty along with known adverse environmental impacts
 - Improve aesthetic impacts of reclaimed water such as color and odor that readily important to customers
 - Enhance multiple-barrier treatment train approaches for indirect and direct potable reuse
 - Address challenges posed by use of membranes such a brine residual management and membrane fouling



Ozone-Oxidation

- Disinfects (i.e. virus inactivation)
- Removes color and odor
- Reduces trace organic contaminants
- Increases biodegradability of recalcitrant organic carbon
- Supersaturates water with dissolved oxygen

Ozone-BAF

"Free" biology

.

•

- <u>Destroys</u> recalcitrant organic carbon
- Generates biologically stable effluent
- Eliminates toxicity
- Increases UVT
 - Provides multiple-barrier

BAF

- Removes ammonia
- Removes TSS
- Reduces trace organic contaminants including NDMA
- Reduces oxidation byproducts





1 Inactivation of Pathogens & Oxidation of Organics **2** Removal of TSS and Turbidity **3** Destruction/Removal of TOC, CECs, and DBPs



Comparison of O3-BAF to RO for Indirect Potable Reuse

| | MF-Ozone-BAF | MF-RO-AOP |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Installed capital cost | ~ 40% lower | High |
| Annual operation and maintenance cost | ~ 50% lower | High |
| Energy | Low | High |
| Consumables | Low (GAC does not need to be replaced) | No (RO membranes must be replaced) |
| Residual Management | Minimal | Yes |
| TDS/Salinity Removal | No (use partial RO treatment if needed) | Yes |
| Destroys TOrCs and TOC | Yes | No (creates a residual waste stream) |

Water Reuse – OXELIA Pilots (WWTP Zelienople)



| Flowrate | 5 – 25 GPM |
|----------------------------|---|
| Ozone Generation System | PSA O2 on-site concentrator + WEDECO GSO system |
| Ozone Dose | 0 or 2 -25 ppm |
| Ozone Contact tank | 2 × 300 gallon |
| Filter Size | 2'(L)× 2'(W)× 17'(H) (Full size filter) |
| Filter Media | 6' of Spent GAC (ES 0.95mm, UC 1.7) 6' of Anthracite (ES 0.95mm, UC 1.7) |





Water Reuse – OXELIA Pilots (WWTP Zelienople)



Water Reuse – OXELIA Pilots (WWTP Zelienople)

| | Secondary Treated Efflluent | Ozonated water/ Filter inlet | Filter Outlet |
|-----------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| COD | 21 – 33 mg/L | Not Measured | 10 - 20 mg/L |
| TOC | 4.8 – 7.0 mg/L | Not Measured | 3.0 - 5.5 mg/L |
| UVT | 58% – 72% | 65% - 82% | 70% - 89% |
| Turbidity | 7 – 10 NTU | Not Measured | 0.2 – 3.0 NTU |
| TSS | Not Measured | 5 – 10 mg/L | 0.2 – 2.4 mg/L |
| TKN | 2.8 mg/L | 2.1 mg/L | 1.4 mg/L |



Water Reuse – San Diego Pure

- $O_3 + BAF + MF + RO + UVAOP$
- 165 m³/h
- Ozone capacity of 4 kg/h
- 15 min EBCT Gravity GAC Filters
- Base of design for a 5677 m³/h Reuse plant





Water Reuse – San Diego Pure

Key Observations

- ~40% TOC removal across O3-BAC system
- Ozone excellent at removing a majority of CECs
- BAC (after ozone) provides additional barrier for most challenging CECs and oxidation byproducts
- O3-BAC significantly reduces organic fouling of UF membranes
- O3-BAC improves quality of RO concentrate
- O3-BAC satisfied California criteria for AOP



Water Reuse – WRRF 11-02



- Utilize exhausted GAC for study to eliminate adsorption impacts
- Increased UV Transmittance from ~76% to ~89%







Water Reuse – WRRF 11-02







Ref: Trussell Technologies IOA-PAG Dallas 2015



Water Reuse – DCTWRP AWPF Pilot Project



Limited side stream treatment from RO evaluated for the scenario where it is deemed necessary for meeting TDS or chloride limits:



Water Reuse – DCTWRP AWPF Pilot Project



Water Reuse – DCTWRP AWPF Pilot Project



Water Reuse - Summary

- TOC removal across O3-BAF System approached steady-state after 4-6 weeks of operation
 - Measured true acclimatization of biology by beginning pilot with "exhausted" GAC
- The UV Transmittance of the water increased from ~76% to ~89% across the O3-BAF System
 - Surrogate for TOC removal, overall performance
 - Significantly reduces size of downstream UV System
- NDMA formed by Ozone is removed by BAF
 - Ozone formation of NDMA will vary from site to site
 - Changes in EBCT appear to impact NDMA removal
 - Conceptual treatment train accounts for potential NDMA issues by using UV as final polish
- Achieving 3-4 day run times in between backwashes, but could be longer if triggered by head loss
- Ozone and O3-BAF significantly reduce organic fouling of membranes
- Ozone-Enhanced Biologically Active Filtration enables the implementation of costeffective alternatives to RO-based treatment trains

Thank You!



