

# **Investigation of Potato Starch and Sonicated Return Activated Sludge as Alternative Carbon Sources for Biological Nitrogen Removal**

by

**Gideon Bani Kuncoro**

School of Chemical Engineering  
The University of Adelaide



A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Masters of Engineering Science

June 2008

## Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degrees or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Mr. Gideon Bani Kuncoro: .....

Date.....

## **Abstract**

High nitrogen discharge from the municipal wastewater is a major concern for the South Australian Government, primarily due to negative impacts on the marine environment. Therefore, under the South Australian Environmental Improvement Program, (SA EIP), all metropolitan wastewater treatment plants have been reconfigured to achieve enhanced nitrogen removal. Secondary treatment (denitrification process) at the metropolitan wastewater treatment plants must be optimised to meet the discharge guideline of 10 mg/L total nitrogen. However, secondary treatment at some plants is carbon limited (low C/N ratio), and external carbon supplementation is required to meet this discharge guideline.

Molasses provides the current external carbon source at two plants. It is relatively inexpensive, but other carbon sources, particularly industrial waste streams, may be more attractive, due to the potentially lower material cost, as it is practically free, and environmentally friendly. Potato starch and sonicated return activated sludge (RAS) were considered.

In this study, the bioavailability of the soluble carbon in potato starch and ultrasound treated RAS were assessed. The associated objective was to investigate the potential of both carbon sources as an external carbon donor for the denitrification zone of wastewater treatment plants to economically improve biological nitrogen removal. The economic analysis was performed using mainly United States dollars and the fixed capital investments and total capital costs were converted to Australian dollars. This was due to the United States dollars currency quotes obtained for the materials and unit operations required.

SCOD from the three sources was quantified and preliminary results were presented. Molasses provided the highest SCOD release of  $1.1285 \times 10^6$  mg-SCOD/L, sonicated RAS produced 5.6 to 68.4 times the SCOD release of the untreated RAS (35.6 mg-SCOD/L) depending on the ultrasound intensity and treatment time, while the highest soluble carbon release obtained using potato starch was 809 mg-SCOD/L (using 20.9 g/100 mL potato starch concentration).

Based on the experimental SCOD results, batch denitrification tests using the proposed carbon sources were carried out. The nitrogen removal efficiency at low dose (12.48 mg-SCOD/L) using molasses, potato starch and sonicated RAS were 77.54%, 57.24%, and 72.76% respectively, whilst at high dose (124.80 mg-SCOD/L) were 94.04%, 66.32%, and 92.10% correspondingly. In similar order of the proposed carbon sources, the nitrate removal rates for the first phase denitrification with low dose were 1.44, 1.16, and 1.18 mg-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>/h respectively, whilst the nitrate removal rate of the first phase denitrification with high dose improved to 2.01, 1.26, and 1.96 mg-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>/h correspondingly.

From the denitrification test results, molasses proved to be the optimal carbon source in terms of nitrate removal. However sonicated RAS possesses similar denitrification performance and may be a suitable alternative.

An economic analysis for sonicated RAS Option 2 confirmed it as the most viable substitute. The time to recover the initial investment (payback period) is approximately 6.5 years and the breakeven point is approximately 8 years.

Both denitrification tests and economic analyses demonstrate that sonicated RAS may be a viable and attractive substitute for the molasses.

## Acknowledgment

I would like to express my appreciation to numerous people and their organisations who have greatly contributed and assisted me to complete this research study. In particular I would like to acknowledge:

- Dr Yung Ngothai, School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, my principal supervisor, for supervisions, encouragement, discussions, ideas and the opportunity to carry out research in this field.
- A/Prof. Brian O'Neill, School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, my co-supervisor, for support, guidance, ideas and assistance in power output calculations.
- Mr. Uwe Kaeding, United Water International, my external supervisor, for support, materials and data, and the ideas, for the completion of this thesis.
- Dr. David Sweeney, United Water International, my external supervisor, for support, materials and data, and the ideas, for the completion of this thesis.
- United Water International, for the financial support and the opportunity to participate in CHEMECA Conference 2006, which led to the paper publication in The International Journal of Environment and Waste Management (IJEWM).
- Mr Ian Mackenzie, United Water International, Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant supervisors, for data and assistance in wastewater sampling.
- Dr. Chris Colby, School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, for permission to use the Microbiology Laboratory, provided initial laboratory equipments, guidance in insulation design for power output determination, advice and encouragement
- A/Prof. Dzuy Nguyen, School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Adelaide, for permission to use the Rheology Laboratory and ultrasound device.
- Smiths Snackfoods, and Ms. Yvette Lee, for assistance and providing potato starch; Andrew Wright, Peter Kay, Jason Peak and the workshop for assistance in laboratory, construction and modification of apparatus; Aning Ayucitra, M. Eng. Sc, for the assistance in overnight experiments, support and encouragements; Daniel Ford, United Water International, (responsible

for initial studies on the problem) for guidance and preliminary data; Manfred Glombowski, National Product Specialist - Laboratory Applications Environmental and Process Technologies, Biolab, for his help in selecting the suitable test kits and quote for the experiments involved; Fergus Rooksby, Enpure Limited, for providing V5 Sonix specification data and quote which has supported the economic analyses; Andrew Garland and Mellisa Murphy, Metaval/Eaton, for providing AFR Filters specification data and quote that has supported the economic analyses.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Dr. Tjahjono Koentjoro, MPH, PhD and Dr. Lina Koerniawati, MPH.

I hope that the results of my thesis would satisfy the expectations of the people associated and provide a significant contribution to the society.

# Table of Contents

<b>Declaration</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgment</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Refereed Publications from this Thesis</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>Nomenclature</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Wastewater Treatment Overview	3
2.2 Biological Treatment	4
2.3 Carbon Sources	5
2.4 Ultrasound Treatment	9
2.5 Research Gaps and Objectives	12
2.5.1 Research Gap	12
2.5.2 Research Objectives	12
<b>3 Materials and Methods</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Materials	14
3.2 Power Output Determination of Ultrasound Device	14
3.3 Potato Starch Solubility	16
3.4 Ultrasound Treatment of Return Activated Sludge	17
3.5 Ultrasound Treatment of Potato Starch	18
3.6 Soluble Chemical Oxygen Demand (SCOD) Test	18
3.6.1 Potato Starch SCOD Test	19
3.6.2 Molasses SCOD Test	19
3.6.3 Return Activated Sludge SCOD Test	19
3.7 Carbon Dosing Test and Denitrification Analysis	20
<b>4 System Mass Balance</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>5 Experimental Results and Discussion</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1 Power Output Determination of Ultrasound Device	25

5.2	Molasses SCOD Test	27
5.3	Potato Starch and Potato Starch Sonication	27
5.3.1	Potato Starch Solubility	27
5.3.2	Potato Starch SCOD Test	29
5.4	Ultrasound Treatment of Return Activated Sludge	30
5.5	Carbon Dosing Test and Denitrification Analysis	35
<b>6</b>	<b>FEASIBILITY STUDY AND COSTINGS</b>	<b>40</b>
6.1	Molasses	43
6.1.1	Molasses Total Capital Investment	43
6.1.2	Molasses Operating Cost	44
6.2	Ultrasound Treatment	47
6.2.1	RAS Sonication Option 1	48
6.2.2	RAS Sonication Option 2	54
6.3	Potato Starch	59
6.3.1	Potato Starch Mass Balance	59
6.3.2	The Reconfigured Flow Sheet Using Potato Starch as External Carbon Source	60
6.3.3	Potato Starch Operating Cost	63
6.3.4	Potato Starch Total Capital Investment	65
<b>7</b>	<b>COMPARISON OF THE ALTERNATIVE CARBON SOURCES EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>67</b>
7.1	RAS Sonication Option 1 versus Molasses	67
7.2	RAS Sonication Option 2 versus Molasses	68
7.3	Potato Starch versus Molasses	70
<b>8</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RELEVANT FUTURE RESEARCH</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Calculation of Insulation Thickness</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Calculation of Sonicator Power Output</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>V5 Sonix SCOD Release Prediction Model</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>Laboratory Scale Denitrification Analyses</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b>Economic Analysis - Molasses</b>	<b>84</b>
	<b>E.1 Fixed Capital Cost Estimation</b>	<b>84</b>
	<b>E.2 Molasses Operating Cost Estimation</b>	<b>86</b>
	E.2.1 Bulk molasses cost	86



	E.2.2 Electricity cost estimation	86
<b>Appendix F</b>	<b>RAS Sonication</b>	<b>91</b>
	<b>F.1 RAS Sonication Equipment Purchase Cost Estimation – Option 1</b>	<b>91</b>
	F.1.1 V5 Sonix	91
	F.1.2 Centrifugal Pump	92
	<b>F.2 RAS Sonication Operating Cost Estimation – Option 1</b>	<b>97</b>
	F.2.1 Power Requirement and Electricity Cost for V5 Sonix	97
	F.2.2 Power Requirement and Electricity Cost for Centrifugal Pump	98
	F.2.3 Maintenance and repair	99
	<b>F.3 Total Expenditure for Option 1</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>F.4 RAS Sonication Equipment Purchase Cost Estimation – Option 2</b>	<b>101</b>
	F.4.1 V5 Sonix	101
	F.4.2 Centrifugal Pump	101
	<b>F.5 RAS Sonication Operating Cost Estimation – Option 2</b>	<b>102</b>
	F.5.1 Power Requirement and Electricity Cost for V5 Sonix	103
	F.5.2 Power Requirement and Electricity Cost for Centrifugal Pump	103
	F.5.3 Maintenance and repair	104
	<b>F.6 Total Expenditure for Option 2</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Appendix G</b>	<b>Potato Starch</b>	<b>106</b>
	<b>G.1 Potato Starch Equipment Purchase Cost Estimation</b>	<b>106</b>
	G.1.1 Potato Starch Powder Storage Tanks	106
	G.1.2 Mixing Tank	107
	G.1.3 Jet Mixers	111
	G.1.4 Screw Conveyor	113
	G.1.5 Centrifugal Pumps	115
	G.1.6 AFR Filters	117
	<b>G.2 Potato Starch Operating Cost Estimation</b>	<b>117</b>
	G.2.1 Jet Mixers	118
	G.2.2 Screw Conveyor	118
	G.2.3 AFR Filters	119

G.2.4	Centrifugal Pumps	120
G.2.5	Maintenance and Repair	120
<b>G.3</b>	<b>Total Expenditure for Potato Starch</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Appendix H</b>	<b>Attachments</b>	<b>122</b>
H.1	V5 Sonix Attachments	122
H.2	Pipe Heaters	125
H.3	AFR Filter Specification, Operating Conditions, and Quotation	126
<b>REFERENCE</b>		<b>130</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 2-1	Wastewater treatment process flow diagram	3
Figure 2-2	Types of nitrification/denitrification process	4
Figure 2-3	Scheme of ethanol and acetic acid evolution in the bacteria metabolism during denitrification process	7
Figure 2-4	Chemical structure of: (a) linear amylose; (b) amylopectin	9
Figure 2-5	Microscopic views of secondary sludge	10
Figure 3-1	Experimental set up for sonicator output power	15
Figure 3-2	Vacuum filter apparatus	16
Figure 3-3	Sonication experimental set up	17
Figure 3-4	COD reactor and portable spectrophotometer	19
Figure 3-5	Denitrification experimental set up	20
Figure 4-1	Process flow diagram of denitrification process at Glenelg WWTP	22
Figure 5-1	Relationship between power output (W/mL) and Amplitude (%)	26
Figure 5-2	Percent dissolved potato starch for different starch concentration	28
Figure 5-3	SCOD concentration for different potato starch concentration	29
Figure 5-4	SCOD released by ultrasound treatment at various power output (W/mL) and treatment time 1/4” tip, with ice bath	32
Figure 5-5	SCOD released by ultrasound treatment 1/8” tip, without ice bath	32
Figure 5-6	Predicted SCOD release using 3kW power output	35
Figure 5-7	Change in nitrate concentration over time in denitrification analyses	36
Figure 5-8	Change in SCOD concentration over time in denitrification analyses	37
Figure 6-1	Modifications of RAS stream for B and C Plants	49
Figure 6-2	Modifications of RAS stream for D Plant	50
Figure 6-3	Flow diagram of combined RAS2 streams	54
Figure 6-4	Plant reconfiguration for starch as external carbon dose	59
Figure 6-5	Proposed jet mixer arrangement	62
Figure 7-1	Comparison of capital cost and total expenditure for molasses and RAS sonication Option 1	67
Figure 7-2	Comparison of capital cost and total expenditure for molasses and sonicated RAS Option 2	69
Figure 7-3	Comparison of total expenditure for molasses and potato starch	70
Figure A-1	Top view of calorimeter	74

Figure E-1	Efficiencies of three phase motors	89
Figure F-1	Normal operating ranges for commercially available pumps	93
Figure F-2	Efficiencies of centrifugal pumps	94
Figure F-3	Purchased cost of diaphragm, centrifugal, and rotary pumps	95
Figure F-4	Purchased cost of electric motor	95
Figure G-1	Economical depth of concrete storage tanks	107
Figure G-2	Purchase cost of concrete tanks	109
Figure G-3	Cost trend of mounded tank	110
Figure G-4	Purchased cost of screw and belt conveyors	115
Figure H-1	Power Supply Specification	122
Figure H-2	V5 Sonix Stack Specification	123
Figure H-3	V5 Sonix Reactor Vessel Specification	124
Figure H-4	Pipe heater details at Glenelg WWTP	125

## List of Tables

Table 2-1	Minimum C/N ratio for nearly complete denitrification	6
Table 2-2	Denitrification Rate	8
Table 2-3	Comparison of factor increase in SCOD Release from various studies	11
Table 4-1	B and C Plant material balance	23
Table 4-2	D Plant material balance	23
Table 5-1	Summary of sonicator power output	26
Table 5-2	Molasses SCOD data	27
Table 5-3	SCOD of untreated RAS	31
Table 5-4	Specifications of V5 Sonix power supply	33
Table 5-5	Specifications of V5 Sonix reactor vessel	33
Table 5-6	Model obtained from ultrasound treatment on RAS sonication experiments	34
Table 5-7	Experimental results of nitrate removal rate using molasses, potato starch and sonicated RAS	38
Table 5-8	Comparison of nitrate removal efficiency using molasses, potato starch and sonicated RAS	39
Table 6-1	Ratio factors for capital cost estimation based on delivered equipment cost	41
Table 6-2	Foreign currency exchange	42
Table 6-3	Marshall and Swift Equipment Cost Index	42
Table 6-4	Electricity cost for industry in Australia	42
Table 6-5	Summary of molasses capital cost	44
Table 6-6	Data of molasses pricing	44
Table 6-7	Properties of molasses	45
Table 6-8	Summary of B and C Plant material balance Option 1	49
Table 6-9	Summary of D Plant material balance Option 1	50
Table 6-10	Values of assumption used for centrifugal pump cost	52
Table 6-11	Summary of purchased equipments for RAS sonication Option 1	52
Table 6-12	Summary of capital cost estimation for RAS sonication Option 1	53
Table 6-13	Summary of B and C Plant material balance Option 2	55
Table 6-14	Summary of D Plant material balance Option 2	55
Table 6-15	Summary of purchased equipments for RAS sonication Option 2	57

Table 6-16	Summary of capital cost estimation for RAS sonication Option 2	58
Table 6-17	Summary of potato starch capital cost	65
Table 6-18	Summary of capital cost estimation for potato starch	66
Table A-1	Thermal conductivity of polypropylene and polystyrene	74
Table A-2	Dimension of polypropylene used	75
Table A-3	Approximate time to achieve 5K of water temperature rise	75
Table A-4	Summary of results for insulation thickness	78
Table B-1	Raw data (set 1)	79
Table B-2	Raw data (set 2)	79
Table B-3	Raw data (set 3)	80
Table B-4	Raw data (set 4)	80
Table B-5	Converted calculated data to W/mL	80
Table C-1	Summary of calculated Y actual values	81
Table C-2	Summary of values obtained using linear model equation for sonication at 3 kW	82
Table E-1	Details of molasses fixed capital investment	84
Table E-2	Molasses pipe heater details	87
Table E-3	Total expenditure of molasses projected for a 20 year period	90
Table F-1	Summary of operating cost estimation Option 1	99
Table F-2	Total expenditure sonication RAS Option 1 projected for a 20 year period	100
Table F-3	Summary of operating cost estimation Option 2	104
Table F-4	Total expenditure sonication RAS Option 2 projected for a 20 year period	105
Table G-1	Screw conveyor - Maximum capacity for economical service	114
Table G-2	Electrical specification for AFR filters	119
Table G-3	Total expenditure potato starch projected for a 20 year period	121

## **Refereed Publications from this Thesis**

### **Refereed International Journals**

G. Kuncoro, Y. Ngothai, D. Sweeney, B. O'Neill, U. Kaeding, Investigation of potato starch and sonicated RAS as alternative carbon sources for biological nitrogen removal, International Journal of Environment and Waste Management (IJEWM), accepted for publication in Volume xxx, 2009.

### **Refereed Australasian Conference**

G. Kuncoro, Y. Ngothai, D. Sweeney, B. O'Neill, U. Kaeding, Investigation of potato starch and sonicated RAS as alternative carbon sources for biological nitrogen removal, Proceedings: Chemeca 2006 34th Australasian Chemical Engineering Conference, D. Patterson & B. Young, Eds., The Institution of Engineers, Auckland, New Zealand, 17 – 20 September 2006, Environmental: Biological Treatment Processes II, Paper 248. (ISBN: 0-86869-110-0).

## Nomenclature

A	area (m <sup>2</sup> )
Alm	log mean area (m <sup>2</sup> )
A <sub>st</sub>	Area of steel (cu.in)
b	width of member in tank (in)
d	wall thickness (in)
cp	specific heat capacity (J/g.K)
<i>d</i>	tank diameter (m)
D	tank diameter (in, ft; see referred equation information)
E	Denitrification Efficiency
f <sub>r</sub>	ring tension (lb/in <sup>3</sup> )
G	gravitational acceleration (m/s <sup>2</sup> )
h	tank depth (ft)
H	head of pump (m)
I	current (A)
I <sub>E</sub>	actual vessel volume (m <sup>3</sup> )
K	thermal conductivity (W/m.K)
L	length of conveyor (m)
m	mass flow rate (kg/s)
m	modular ratio
[NO <sub>x</sub> <sup>-</sup> - N]	nitrate concentration
p <sub>st</sub>	tension of steel in the wall of the tank (lb/in <sup>2</sup> )
P	power requirement (kW)
P	maximum pressure at bottom wall (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )
pH	acidity of medium
q	heat; heat loss (W)
r <sub>i</sub>	radius (m)
R <sup>2</sup>	Correlation coefficient
R <sub>1</sub>	resistance (K/W)
t	time (minutes; for carbon dosing test and denitrification analysis)
t	time (seconds; for power output and insulator thickness)



$t$	mixing time (h, for jet mixers)
$t$	wall thickness (in)
$T_j$ , maximum assumed	inside temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T_0$	ambient temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T$	temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$T$	tension (kg)
$V$	voltage (V)
$V$	volume ( $\text{m}^3$ )
$W$	Branson Sonicator power output (W/ml)
$W_s$	mechanical energy (J/kg)
$X$	retention time (s)
$X$	V5 Sonix power output (W/ml)
$Y$	concentration of SCOD released (mg-SCOD/L)

### Subscripts

$f$	final
$i$	initial, inside
1	propylene layer
2	polystyrene layer

### Greek

$\Delta Q$	energy (J)
$\Delta T$	temperature difference ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ or K)
$\Sigma V$	total delivered flow to jet mixers ( $\text{m}^3/\text{h}$ )
$\eta$	fractional efficiency
$\eta_e$	motor efficiency
$\rho$	density ( $\text{kg}/\text{m}^3$ )

### Abbreviations

AU\$	Australian dollars
C/N	carbon to nitrate ratio
COD	chemical oxygen demand
GBP	Great Britain Pounds

GF/C	glass fibre filter
HDPE	high density polyethylene
kWh	kilowatt hour
MLR	mix liquor return
PE	primary effluent
RAS	return activated sludge
SCOD	soluble chemical oxygen demand
SG	Specific Gravity
TEFC	totally enclosed fan cooled
US\$	United States dollars
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant