# DEWATERING OF ALUM SLUDGE USING FLOATABLE MEDIA REACTOR

## Submitted by Sherif Abdel Monem Ibrahim Shehata

B.Sc. of Engineering, Faculty of Engineering Helwan University, 2001

Diploma of Environmental Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies & Research, Ain Shams University, 2010

A thesis submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of
The Requirement for the Master Degree
In
Environmental Sciences

Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences
Institute of Environmental Studies and Research
Ain Shams University

## **APPROVAL SHEET**

# DEWATERING OF ALUM SLUDGE USING FLOATABLE MEDIA REACTOR

### Submitted by

#### **Sherif Abdel Monem Ibrahim Shehata**

B.Sc. of Engineering, Faculty of Engineering Helwan University, 2001 Diploma of Environmental Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies & Research, Ain Shams University, 2010

A thesis submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of

The Requirement for the Master Degree

In

Environmental Sciences
Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences

This thesis Towards a Master Degree in Environmental Sciences Has been Approved by:

Name Signature

#### 1. Prof. Dr. Abdel kawi Mokhtar Khalifa

Emeritus Prof. of Hydraulic and Irrigation Faculty of Engineering Ain Shams University

#### 2. Prof. Dr. Moustafa Mohamed Hassan Khalil

Professor, of Analytical and Inorganic Chemistry Faculty of Science Ain Shams University

#### 3. Prof. Dr. Taha Abdel Azim Mohamed Abdel Razek

Professor of Environmental Analytical Chemistry Vice Dean of Institute of Environmental Studies & Research for Community & Environment Affairs Ain Shams University

#### 4. Dr. Ahmed Shafik El-Gendy

Associate Prof., Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences Institute of Environmental Studies & Research Ain Shams University

# DEWATERING OF ALUM SLUDGE USING FLOATABLE MEDIA REACTOR

### Submitted by

#### **Sherif Abdel Monem Ibrahim Shehata**

B.Sc. of Engineering, Faculty of Engineering Helwan University, 2001 Diploma of Environmental Sciences, Institute of Environmental Studies & Research, Ain Shams University, 2010

A thesis submitted in Partial Fulfillment
Of
The Requirement for the Master Degree
In
Environmental Sciences
Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences

Under The Supervision of:

## 1. Dr. Ahmed Shafik El-Gendy

Associate Prof., Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences Institute of Environmental Studies & Research Ain Shams University

#### 2. Prof. Dr. Taha Abdel Azim Mohamed Abdel Razek

Professor of Environmental Analytical Chemistry
Vice Dean of Institute of Environmental Studies & Research for Community
& Environment Affairs
Ain Shams University.

**STATEMENT** 

This dissertation is submitted to the Institute of Environmental Studies

and Research, Ain Shams University for the degree of Master of

**Environmental Sciences** 

The work included in this thesis has been carried out by the author in

the Department of Environmental Engineering, Ain Shams University.

No part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or a qualification

at any other university or institution.

Date: 09/07/2017

Name: Sherif Abdel Monem Ibrahim Shehata

Signature: Sherif Abdel Monem

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, **Dr. Ahmed Shafik El-Gendy** for his continuous encouragement, advice, support, enthusiasm and patience towards my research at the Institute of Environmental Studies and Research, Ain Shams University

Grateful appreciation is also expressed to my co-supervisor, at an early part of this study Prof. **Dr. Taha Abdel Azim Mohamed Abdel Razek** for his support and advice. I also wish to thank my colleagues for providing technical assistance.

I would like to extend my thanks and appreciation to the management of Veolia Water Technologies for conducting the experimental works and site facility.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues at Abu-Dahshan drinking water treatment plant for their moral, strong support and input during the experimental works.

Finally yet importantly, many thanks for my family and my wife for their patience, support and motivation along studies duration.

#### **ABSTRACT**

Dewatering of drinking water treatment sludge aims to reduce the cost of sludge handling and transportation. In Egypt a large quantity of sludge is generated from surface water treatment for potable supplies typically involves coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, and filtration processes for removing colloidal as well as suspended solids from raw water. A pilot scale filter was tested for dewatering and thickening of alum sludge generated during the production of potable water in a conventional compact water treatment plant (WTP). The alum sludge is produced from coagulation process using aluminum sulfate (Alum) (Al<sub>2</sub> (SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub>. 18H<sub>2</sub>O). The pilot scale was fabricated from scheduled uPVC pipe. The reactor was filled with floatable media (polystyrene) working as filtration media with counter flow concept. The alum sludge was discharged into the pilot scale setup from the sludge holding tank in the WTP using submersible pump.

The pilot scale filter was tested at different rates of filtration (ROF) ranged from  $25 \text{ to } 400 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$ . In addition, different media heights (100 - 800 mm) were investigated to study the efficiency of the sludge thickening. The filter rate of washing (ROW) was tested to determine the optimum value that will clean the filter. ROW equal to one to four times the ROF were investigated. The optimum range of ROF was found to be  $200 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^2/\text{d}$  and the filtration media height 500 mm, at the optimum operating conditions, the floatable media filter had the ability to thicken the alum sludge and, the turbidity of the water produced after thickening were less than 18 NTU.

A comparison between pilot scale filter and the conventional thickener was performed to evaluate the dewaterability for both systems using drying beds as a dewatering method for the thickened sludge produced from pilot scale filter and conventional thickener. The efficiency of the Floatable Media Reactor

(FMR) in thickening of the alum sludge is better than the conventional thickener otherwise, the drying bed area shall be decreased to half of required area needed with the conventional thickener.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT                       |                             | I    |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
| ABSTRA                                | ACT                         | II   |
| LIST OF CONTENT LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS |                             | IV   |
|                                       |                             | VIII |
| LIST OF                               | F TABLES                    | IX   |
| LIST OF                               | FIGURES                     | X    |
| CHAPTI                                | ER (1) INTRODUCTION         | 1    |
| 1.1                                   | Background                  | 1    |
| 1.2                                   | Problem Definition          | 2    |
| 1.3                                   | Objective                   | 4    |
| 1.4                                   | Scope Of Work               | 4    |
| CHAPTI                                | ER (2) LITERATURE REVIEW    | 5    |
| 2.1                                   | Overview                    | 5    |
| 2.2                                   | Coagulation Process         | 6    |
| 2.3                                   | Coagulant Types             | 7    |
| 2.4                                   | Alum Sludge Characteristics | 12   |
| 2.5                                   | Sludge thickening           | 13   |
| 2.5.1                                 | Thickening Methods          | 14   |
| 2.5.1.1                               | Gravity Thickeners          | 14   |
| 2.6                                   | Sludge Dewatering           | 18   |
| 2.6.1                                 | Dewatering Methods          | 19   |

| 2.6.1.1   | Non-Mechanical Dewatering  | 20 |
|-----------|--|----|
| 2.6.1.1.1 | Drying Beds  | 22 |
| 2.6.1.1.2 | Dewatering Lagoons   | 24 |
| 2.6.1.2   | Mechanical Dewatering  | 25 |
| 2.6.1.2.1 | Belt Filter Press Dewatering                                       | 25 |
| 2.6.1.2.2 | Centrifugation   | 27 |
| 2.7       | Comparison between different mechanical dewatering systems         | 30 |
| 2.8       | Filtration   | 31 |
| 2.8.1     | Filtration Mechanism   | 31 |
| 2.8.2     | Design Options   | 32 |
| 2.8.3     | Theory of operation  | 35 |
| 2.8.4     | Cleaning and sizing of deep bed filters                            | 40 |
|           |  |    |
| CHAPTER   | R (3) MATERIALS AND METHODS  | 41 |
| 3.1       | Description of Abu-Dahshan WTP                                     | 41 |
| 3.1.1     | Description of the treatment process at Abu-Dahshan WTP            | 42 |
| 3.1.1.1   | Coagulation, flocculation and sedimentation                        | 44 |
| 3.1.1.2   | Filtration and disinfection  | 45 |
| 3.1.1.3   | Sludge collection and management                                   | 46 |
| 3.2       | Description of Pilot-Scale Setups used in the experiments          | 48 |
| 3.2.1     | Description of the pilot-scale setup Floatable Media Reactor (FMR) | 48 |
| 3.2.2     | Description of the Pilot-Scale Setup (Conventional Thickener)      | 52 |
| 3.2.3     | Description of the Pilot-Scale Setup (Drying bed)                  | 54 |
| 3.3       | Experiment Setup   | 58 |
| 3.3.1     | Phase I; Testing the performance of FMR                            | 59 |
| 3.3.2     | Phase II; Testing the performance of conventional thickener        | 60 |
| 3.3.3     | Phase III; Testing the performance of drying bed                   | 60 |

| 3.4        | Sampling and sample analysis   | 60 |
|------------|--|----|
| 3.4.1      | Sampling   | 60 |
| 3.4.2      | Sample analysis  | 61 |
|            |  |    |
| CHAPTI     | ER (4) RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS   | 63 |
| 4.1        | Phase I  | 63 |
| 4.1.1      | Effect of different rates of filtration (ROF) on filtered water quality at different heights of media of the FMR | 63 |
| 4.1.2      | Effect of different values of ROF on operating time (working hours) at different height of media of the FMR      | 64 |
| 4.1.3      | Relation between filtered water quality and operating time   | 66 |
| 4.1.4      | Effect of different rates of washing on filter cleaning  | 67 |
| 4.2        | Optimum operating parameters for FMR   | 68 |
| 4.2.1      | Optimum Rate of Filtration (ROF)   | 68 |
| 4.2.2      | Optimum height of media  | 69 |
| 4.2.3      | Operating Time (working hour)  | 69 |
| 4.2.4      | Optimum Rate of Washing (ROW)  | 70 |
| 4.3        | Phase II: Water sampling   | 71 |
| 4.3.1      | Pilot-scale setup (FMR) water sample   | 71 |
| 4.3.2      | Pilot-scale setup convectional clarified water sample  | 72 |
| 4.4        | Water analysis   | 73 |
| 4.5        | Phase III: Testing of sludge dewaterability  | 73 |
| 4.5.1      | Dewatering using drying bed  | 74 |
| 4.5.2      | Comparison between dewatering efficiency of both systems   | 76 |
| CHAPTI     | ER (5) CONCLUSION  | 78 |
| SUMMARY    |  | 79 |
| REFERENCES |  | 83 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

WTP : Water Treatment Plant

TSS : Total Suspended solids

NTU : Nephelometric Turbidity Unit

NRC : National Research Centre

PVC : Polyvinyl chloride

FMR : Floatable Media Reactor

ROF : Rate of Filtration

ROW: Rate of Washing

HLR : Hydraulic Loading Rate

SLR : Surface Loading Rate

ECP : Egyptian Code of Practice

DAF : Dissolved Air Floatation

SDB : Sand Drying Bed

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table No. |   | Page |
|-----------|---|------|
| Table 2.1 | Settling time for different particle size                 | 6    |
| Table 2.2 | Typical composition of water treatment works sludge       | 13   |
| Table 2.3 | Advantages and disadvantages of sludge dewatering system  | 30   |
| Table 3.1 | Raw water characteristics                                 | 41   |
| Table 3.2 | Alum sludge characteristics                               | 48   |
| Table 4.1 | Typical water washing rates                               | 70   |
| Table 4.2 | Comparison between pilot setup and conventional thickener | 73   |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure No. |  | Page |
|------------|--|------|
| Figure 2.1 | Coagulation – flocculation process                   | 10   |
| Figure 2.2 | Gravity thickener                                    | 16   |
| Figure 2.3 | Belt filter press                                    | 27   |
| Figure 2.4 | Centrifuge dewatering device                         | 28   |
| Figure 2.5 | Schematic of basic filtration principles             | 35   |
| Figure 2.6 | Definition of filter resistance                      | 37   |
| Figure 2.7 | Retention mechanisms in a deep bed filter            | 38   |
| Figure 3.1 | Compact treatment unit                               | 43   |
| Figure 3.2 | Compact drinking water treatment plant               | 47   |
| Figure 3.3 | Schematic diagram for pilot-scale setup              | 51   |
| Figure 3.4 | The thickener pilot-scale setup                      | 54   |
| Figure 3.5 | Schematic of pilot-scale setup for sludge drying bed | 58   |
| Figure No. |  | Page |

| Figure 4.1 | Effect of ROF on the quality of filtered water                            | 63 |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 4.2 | Effect of ROF on operating time at different media heights                | 65 |
| Figure 4.3 | Effect of operating time on the quality of the filtered water             | 66 |
| Figure 4.4 | Effect of duration of operating time on the quality of the filtered water | 67 |
| Figure 4.5 | FMR sludge and water samples  | 71 |
| Figure 4.6 | Convectional thickener sludge and water samples                           | 72 |
| Figure 4.7 | Dried thickened sludge for FMR  | 74 |
| Figure 4.8 | Dried thickened sludge for conventional thickener                         | 75 |
| Figure 4.9 | Water content % for FMR and conventional thickener                        | 77 |

### CHAPTER (1)

#### INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

Conventional drinking water treatment plants consist of several These processes include coagulationtreatment processes. flocculation, sedimentation, filtration and disinfection (Jekel, 1989), which remove solids, organic and inorganic pollutants, some metals and pathogenic microorganisms. These processes and technologies used to remove contaminants from water and to improve and protect water quality are similar all around the world. Coagulation is a critical process in drinking water treatment involving colloid charge neutralization followed by aggregation into flocs that are amenable to solid/liquid separation with subsequent processes such as filtration. The most coagulant used in water treatment is alum [(Al<sub>2</sub> (SO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, 18H<sub>2</sub>O], due to its effectiveness in treating a wide range of water types and relatively low cost so, it is commonly used in Egypt. The alum is usually added in a dose range of 25 - 40 mg/l (El-Nahhas, 2011). The coagulation process uses alum leads to the formation of sludge called "Alum sludge" which are gelatinous in character and usually require to dewatering. (Bache and Papavasilopoulos, 2003). A large quantities of alum sludge usually generated, which must be properly managed (Jangkorn et al., 2011). The added coagulant (Alum) reacts with water alkalinity and produces a gelatinous precipitate (called flocs) which grow by gentle mixing of water (called flocculation) and then