

# IMPROVMENT OF DRAINS WATER QUALITY DOWNSTREAM DISPOSAL POINTS USING AGRICULTURAL WASTES

# A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Engineering Ain Shams University for the Fulfillment of the Requirement of Ph. Degree in Civil Engineering

## Prepared by ENG MARWA ABDEL FATTAH ABD ALLA

Civil Engineer Bachelor, Benha Higher Institute of Technology M.Sc. of Environmental Engineering, October 2010 Institute of Environmental Studies and Researches, Ain Shams University

# Supervisors Prof. Dr. Iman Mahmoud Elazizy

Prof. of Hydraulics and Water Resources, Irrigation & Hydraulics Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams Univ.

#### Prof. Dr. Mohamed El Hosseiny El Nadi

Prof. of Sanitary & Environmental Eng. & Head of Public Works Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams Univ.

#### Dr. Ghada Mahmoud Samy

Assistant Prof. Irrigation and Hydraulics Department, Faculty of Engineering , Ain Shams Univ.



# IMPROVMENT OF DRAINS WATER QUALITY DOWNSTREAM DISPOSAL POINTS USING AGRICULTURAL WASTES

A Thesis For

The Ph. Degree in Civil Engineering (Irrigation and Hydraulics)

by

#### ENG. MARWA ABDEL FATTAH ABD ALLA

BSc. in Civil Eng., Benha Higher Institute of Technology,2001 M.Sc. in Environmental Eng., Institute of Environmental Studies and Researches, Ain Shams University, October 2010

#### THESIS APPROVAL

| <b>EXAMINERS COMMITTEE</b>  | <b>SIGNATURE</b> |
|---|------------------|
| Prof. Dr. Mohamed Elsayed Ali Bassiuny  |                  |
| Professor of Sanitary Engineering & Dean of Benha faculty of Engineering, Benha Univ.                   |                  |
| Prof. Dr. Mohamed M. Nour Eldin Owis  |                  |
| Professor of Hydraulics and Water Resources,  |                  |
| Irrigation & Hydraulics Department, Faculty of Eng., ASU. <b>Prof. Dr. Iman Mahmoud Elazizy</b>         |                  |
| Prof. of Hydraulics and Water Resources,  |                  |
| Irrigation & Hydraulics Department, Faculty of Eng., ASU.   |                  |
| Prof. Dr. Mohamed El Hosseiny El Nad  | li               |
| Prof. of Sanitary & Environmental Engineering.<br>Head of Public Work Department, Faculty of Eng., ASU. |                  |
| nead of Lable Work Department, Lucatey of Eng., 100.  | Date:/2015       |

## **DEDICATION**

It took from me a portion of my life to finish this work, and I return the credit of finishing this work to God.

I wish to dedicate this work to who suffered to educate, prepare, build capacity and help myself to be as I am,

TO

# MYMOTHER

AND

# MYFATHER

AND I LIKE TO DEDICATE THE WORK TO MY LOVELY CHILDREN

BASEL & MOHAMED

#### STATEMENT

This dissertation is submitted to Ain Shams University, Faculty of Engineering for the degree of PhD in Civil Engineering.

The work included in this thesis was carried out by the author in the department of Irrigation and Hydraulics, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, from October 2012 to May 2014.

No part of the thesis has been submitted for a degree or a qualification at any other University or Institution.

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others

Date: - --- /2015

Signature: - -----

Name: - MARWA ABDEL FATTAH ABD ALLA

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The candidate is deeply grateful to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed El Hosseiny El Nadi**, Professor of Environmental and Sanitary Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for help, encourage, cooperation sponsoring and patient advising during preparation of this research.

And deep thanks to **Prof. Dr. Iman Mahmoud El Azizy,** Professor of Hydraulics and Water Resources, Irrigation & Hydraulics Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University.

And deep thanks to **Dr. Ghada Mahmoud Samy,** Assistant Prof. Irrigation and Hydraulics Department- Irrigation and Hydraulics - Ain Shams University.

And deep thanks to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Elsayed Ali Bassiuny,** Dean of faculty of Engineering, Benha University and professor of Sanitary Engineering for his permission to do the experimental work in the sanitary laboratory in Benha Faculty of Engineering and facilitate all odds to complete the experimental work of the research.

And deep grating to the staff and workers in Faculty of Engineering, Benha University specially whom work in the sanitary laboratory for their support, encourage and co-operation during the preparation of this research.

#### ABSTRACT

NAME: MARWA ABDEL FATTAH ABD ALLA

Title :- "IMPROVMENT OF DRAINS WATER OUALITY

DOWNSTREAM DISPOSAL POINTS USING

AGRICULTURAL WASTES"

**Faculty** : Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University **Specialty** : Civil Eng., Irrigation and Hydraulic Department

Summary:

This study aims to use agricultural wastes of ficus trees pruning, rice husk and Poinciana trees pruning as a biomedia to improve self purification process in polluted stream bodies. Also it aims to produce a mathematical model for this treatment take into consideration media self purification effect.

An experimental pilot channel was conducted for studying the effect of using biomedia with length equal to 25 and 50cm through the stream flow. A wastewater tank was used as a source of wastewater. Measurements of water samples were done for different parameters for three weeks.

Experimental measurements illustrate the removal ratio was higher by using 50cm ficus tree pruning more than using 25cm of the same media. It achieved 77% for COD and 76% for BOD and decreased the required length for self purification approximately by 154m for COD and 135m for BOD. The measurements also illustrate that using 50cm of rice husk achieved high removal ratio more than using 25cm of the same media. It achieved 60% for COD and 67% for BOD and decreased the required length for self purification by approximately 91m for COD and 90m for BOD. Poinciana trees pruning achieved higher removal efficiency for 50cm more than 25cm. it was 63% for COD and 65% for BOD and decrease the required length for self purification by 17m for COD and by 20m for BOD.

An imperical model equation was produced and verified then applying on results to calculate removal ratio and it had error percents between -8.76 % and + 9.23% for COD and -8.02% and +9.93% for BOD.

Neural networks confirm the produced model equation for prediction of COD and BOD removal ratios when using this method in water stream bodies by error range between -1.44% & +2.00%.

#### **Supervisors:**

Prof. Dr. Iman Mahmoud Elazizy, Prof. Dr. Mohamed El Hosseiny El Nadi, Dr. Ghada Mahmoud Samy

#### **Keywords**

Water quality, self purification, agriculture waste, pollution control, streams.

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

ANN Artificial neural network
ASB Aerated stabilization basin
BAF Biological aerated filter
BOD Biochemical oxygen demand

BOD<sub>5</sub> Biochemical oxygen demand at the fifth day of the

experiment

COD Chemical oxygen demand DBAF Dual biological aerated filter

DO Dissolved oxygen
EB Eucalyptus bark
FBR Fluidized bed reactor
GAC Granular activated carbon
MBR Membrane biological reactor
MLP Multilayer layer perceptron

MSE Mean Square Error PRH Phosphate rice husk PVC Polyvinyl chloride

RBC Rotating biological contactor

RBF Radial basis function S.P. Self purification SS Suspended solids

SSFW Subsurface flow wetland

TB tubular

TDS Total dissolved solids

TF/SC Trickling filter / solids contact

TSS Total suspended solids UFBR Up flow fixed bed reactor

VF Vertical flow

VFW Vertical flow wetland VSS Volatile suspended solids

XF Cross flow

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|              |  | Page |
|--------------|--|------|
| COVE         | ER                                       | i    |
| <b>THES</b>  | IS APPROVAL                              | ii   |
| <b>DEDI</b>  | CATION                                   | iii  |
| STAT         | EMENT                                    | iv   |
| ACKN         | NOWLEDGEMENT                             | V    |
| ABST         | TRACT                                    | vi   |
| ABBF         | REVIATIONS                               | vii  |
| TABL         | LE OF CONTENTS                           | viii |
| LIST         | OF FIGURES                               | X    |
| LIST         | OF TABLES                                | xii  |
| <b>CHA</b> l | PTER I: INTRODUCTION                     |      |
| 1.1 B        | ACKGROUND                                | 1    |
| 1.2 ST       | TUDY OBJECTIVES                          | 1    |
| 1.3 SC       | COPE OF WORK                             | 1    |
| 1.3.1        | Theoretical Work                         | 1    |
| 1.3.2        | Practical Work                           | 3    |
| 1.4 T        | HESIS ORGANIZATION                       | 3    |
| 1.4.1        | CHAPTER I: introduction                  | 3    |
| 1.4.2        | CHAPTER II: Literature Review            | 3    |
| 1.4.3        | CHAPTER III: Material and Methods        | 4    |
| 1.4.4        | CHAPTER IV: Results of Experimental Work | 4    |
|              | CHAPTER V: Study Modeling                | 4    |
|              | CHAPTER VI: Discussion                   | 4    |
| 1.4.7        | Chapter VII: Conclusions                 | 4    |
| CHAI         | PTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW               |      |
|              | TRODUCTION                               | 5    |
| 2.2 0        | UALITY OF WATER IN STREAM BODIES         | 5    |
| _            | Self Purification of Water Stream Bodies | 6    |
|              | PPLICATIONS OF AGRICULTURAL WASTE IN     | 9    |
|              | VASTEWATER TREATMENT                     |      |
|              | Applications for Industrial wastewater   | 9    |
|              | Applications for Domestic Wastewater     | 12   |
|              | Applications for Sludge Treatment        | 13   |
|              | ACTORS AFFECTING AGRICULTURAL WASTE USE  | 14   |
|              | IN TREATMENT                             |      |
| 2.4.1        |  | 14   |
|              | Time of Contact                          | 15   |
|              | Media Characteristics                    | 15   |

| 2.5 ATTACHED GROWTH BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT                        | 16  |
|---|-----|
| <b>2.5.1</b> MEDIA of Biological Filters                        | 17  |
| <b>2.5.2</b> Types of Biological Filter                         | 24  |
| <b>2.5.3</b> Biological Filters Systems                         | 44  |
| 2.6 MODEL WORK  | 50  |
| <b>2.6.1</b> Background   | 50  |
| <b>2.6.2</b> Water Quality Modeling                             | 51  |
| 2.7 NEURAL NETWORKS   | 64  |
| CHAPTER III: MATERIALS AND METHODS                              |     |
| 3.1 STUDY LOCATION  | 69  |
| 3.2 EXPERIMENT DESCRIPTION                                      | 69  |
| <b>3.2.1</b> Pilot Description                                  | 69  |
| 3.2.2 Used Materials  | 72  |
| 3.3 OPERATION PROGRAM   | 74  |
| 3.3.1 First Stage   | 74  |
| 3.3.2 Second Stage  | 75  |
| 3.4 SAMPLING  | 75  |
| 3.5 MEASUREMENTS  | 77  |
| <b>3.5.1</b> pH Value   | 78  |
| <b>3.5.2</b> Temperature  | 78  |
| 3.5.3 Dissolved Oxygen (DO)                                     | 78  |
| <b>3.5.4</b> Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)                       | 78  |
| 3.5.5 Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)                              | 79  |
| 3.5.6 Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)                           | 80  |
| 3.5.7 Turbidity   | 81  |
| 3.6 PHYSICAL MODELING   | 81  |
| CHAPTER IV: RESULTS ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS 4.1 INTRODUCTION   | 83  |
| 4.2 PHASE I RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS                             | 83  |
| <b>4.2.1.</b> Phase I Run I Results and Discussions             | 83  |
| <b>4.2.2.</b> Phase I Run II Results and Discussions            | 105 |
| <b>4.2.3.</b> Discussion of media thickness effect in phase I   | 125 |
| 4.3. PHASE II RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS                           | 144 |
| <b>4.3.1.</b> Phase II Run I Results and Discussions            | 111 |
| <b>4.3.2.</b> Phase II Run II Results and Discussions           |     |
| <b>4.3.3.</b> Discussion of media thickness effect in phase II  |     |
| 4.4. PHASE III RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS                          |     |
| <b>4.4.1.</b> Phase III Run I Results and Discussions           |     |
| <b>4.4.2.</b> Phase III Run II Results and Discussions          |     |
| <b>4.4.3.</b> Discussion of media thickness effect in phase III |     |

#### 4.5. DISCUSSIONS OF MEDIA TYPE EFFECT

| CHAPTER V: SIMULATION MODEL PRODUCTION                |     |
|---|-----|
| 5.1 INTRODUCTION                                      | 146 |
| 5.2 MODEL ANALYSIS                                    | 146 |
| <b>5.2.1</b> Dilution Model                           | 146 |
| <b>5.2.2</b> Biomedia Model                           | 147 |
| <b>5.2.3</b> Self Purification Model                  | 157 |
| <b>5.2.4</b> Final Complete Model                     | 164 |
| 5.3 MODEL VERIFICATION                                | 165 |
| <b>5.3.1</b> MODEL VERIFICATION USING POINCIANA TREES | 165 |
| PRUNING RESULTS                                       |     |
| <b>5.3.2</b> MODEL VERIFICATION USING NEURAL NETWORKS | 167 |
| METHOD  |     |
| CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION                                |     |
| 6.1 OVER VIEW   | 173 |
| 6.2 CONCLUSIONS                                       | 173 |
| 6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS                                   | 175 |
| 6.4 FURTHER WORK                                      | 176 |
| REFERENCES  | 177 |
| APPENDIX A: SCREEN SHOOT FOR NEURAL NETWORKS          |     |

### LIST OF FIGURES

|                     |   | Page |
|---------------------|---|------|
| CHAPTER I           |   |      |
| Figure 2.1.         | Conventional Filter Media                         | 19   |
| Figure 2.2.         | Varies Types of Plastic Media                     | 21   |
| Figure 2.3.         | New Type of Plastic Media                         | 22   |
| Figure 2.4.         | Red Wood Packing Media                            | 24   |
| Figure 2.5.         | Typical Trickling Filter Unit                     | 26   |
| Figure 2.6.         | Theory of Action in Trickling Filter              | 27   |
| Figure 2.7.         | Cutaway View of a Rectangular Biological Tower    | 30   |
| Figure 2.8.         | Diagrams of Possible Applications for Bio -Towers | 31   |
| Figure 2.9.         | Up Flow Biological Filter                         | 33   |
| Figure 2/10.        | A simplified process flow diagram of the FBR      |      |
|                     | system  | 35   |
| Figure 2.11.        | Biological Aerated Filter (BAF)                   | 36   |
| Figure 2.12.        | DBAF System                                       | 41   |
| <b>Figure 2.13.</b> | Section in RBC Unit                               | 43   |
| Figure 2.14.        | Different Diagrams of Single Stage System         | 45   |
| <b>Figure 2.15.</b> | Different Shapes of Two Stage System              | 46   |
| <b>Figure 2.16.</b> | Shapes of Combined System                         | 48   |
| <b>Figure 2.17.</b> | Roughing filter System                            | 49   |
| <b>Figure 2.18.</b> | Water quality management process                  | 51   |
| <b>Figure 2.19.</b> | The transport of a dye patch in space and time    | 52   |
| Figure 2.20.        | Contrast between diffusion and dispersion         | 54   |
| Figure 2.21.        | Neural Network training                           | 65   |
| Figure 2.22.        | Single node in a MLP network                      | 66   |
| Figure 2.23.        | A multilayer perceptron network with one hidden   |      |
| O                   | layer   | 67   |
| CHAPTER I           | II  |      |
| Figure 3.1.         | Pilot channel photo                               | 70   |
| Figure 3.2.         | Schematic diagram for pilot                       | 71   |
| Figure 3.3.         | Frame photo                                       | 72   |
| Figure 3.4.         | Ficus trees pruning                               | 73   |
| Figure 3.5.         | Rice husk   | 73   |
| Figure 3.6.         | Poinciana trees pruning                           | 74   |
| Figure 3.7.         | Multi-parameter instrument for Measurement of     |      |
| 9                   | pH, temperature, DO and TDS                       | 78   |
| Figure 3.8.         | COD Apparatus                                     | 79   |
| Figure 3.9.         | Incubator CB-3DN                                  | 80   |
| Figure 3.10         | Turbidimeter                                      | 81   |

#### **CHAPTER IV** Figure 4.1. pH range through different samples locations 86 Figure 4.2. Temperature range through different samples locations 86 Figure 4.3. DO range through different samples locations 87 Figure 4.4. COD range through different samples locations 88 Figure 4.5. BOD range through different samples locations 90 TDS range through different samples locations 92 Figure 4.6. Figure 4.7. Turbidity range through different samples locations 93 Figure 4.8. pH range through different samples locations 96 Figure 4.9. Temperature range through different samples 97 locations 97 DO range through different samples locations **Figure 4.10.** COD range through different samples locations 98 **Figure 4.11. Figure 4.12.** BOD range through different samples locations 100 TDS range through different samples locations **Figure 4.13.** 102 **Figure 4.14.** Turbidity range through different samples locations 103 Removal ratios in different thicknesses of Ficus **Figure 4.15** 104 trees pruning media Figure 4.16. pH range through different samples locations 107 **Figure 4.17.** Temperature range through different samples locations 107 **Figure 4.18.** DO range through different samples locations 108 DO range through different samples locations 109 **Figure 4.19. Figure 4.20.** BOD range through different samples locations 111 **Figure 4.21.** TDS range through different samples locations 113 Turbidity range through different samples locations **Figure 4.22.** 114 pH range through different samples locations **Figure 4.23.** 117 **Figure 4.24.** Temperature range through different samples locations 117 **Figure 4.25.** DO range through different samples locations 118 COD range through different samples locations **Figure 4.26.** 119 **Figure 4.27.** BOD range through different samples locations 120 **Figure 4.28.** TDS range through different samples locations 122 Turbidity range through different samples locations **Figure 4.29.** 123 **Figure 4.30.** Removal ratios in different thicknesses of rice husk 124 **Figure 4.31.** pH range through different samples locations 127 Temperature range through different samples **Figure 4.32.** 127 locations DO range through different samples locations 128 **Figure 4.33. Figure 4.34.** COD range through different samples locations 129 **Figure 4.35.** BOD range through different samples locations 131 TDS range through different samples locations **Figure 4.36.** 133

| Figure 4.37.        | Turbidity range through different samples locations | 134 |
|---------------------|---|-----|
| <b>Figure 4.38.</b> | pH range through different samples locations        | 136 |
| <b>Figure 4.39.</b> | Temperature range through different samples         |     |
|                     | locations   | 136 |
| Figure 4.40.        | DO range through different samples locations        | 137 |
| Figure 4.41.        | COD range through different samples locations       | 138 |
| Figure 4.42.        | BOD range through different samples locations       | 140 |
| Figure 4.43.        | TDS range through different samples locations       | 142 |
| Figure 4.44.        | Turbidity range through different samples locations | 142 |
| Figure 4.45.        | Removal ratios in different thicknesses of          |     |
| O                   | Poinciana trees pruning                             | 143 |
| Figure 4.46.        | Comparison between the applied three media with     |     |
| 8                   | thickness 50cm in removal ratios                    | 144 |
|                     |   |     |
| <b>CHAPTER V</b>    | 7   |     |
| Figure 5.1.         | Removal efficiency of COD due to comparison         |     |
| G                   | equation  | 148 |
| Figure 5.2.         | Removal efficiency of COD due to concentrations     |     |
| G                   | for regression analysis - first trial               | 149 |
| Figure 5.3.         | Removal efficiency of COD due to concentrations     |     |
| G                   | for regression analysis - second trial              | 150 |
| Figure 5.4.         | Removal efficiency of COD due to concentrations     |     |
| O                   | for regression analysis - third trial               | 152 |
| Figure 5.5.         | Removal efficiency of COD due to concentrations     |     |
| G                   | for regression analysis - fourth trial              | 153 |
| Figure 5.6.         | Removal efficiency of BOD due to concentrations     |     |
| G                   | for regression analysis - first trial               | 155 |
| Figure 5.7.         | COD concentration through the pilot length for S.P. |     |
| _                   | first trial   | 157 |
| Figure 5.8.         | COD concentration through the pilot length for S.P. |     |
| _                   | fourth trial  | 161 |
| Figure 5.9.         | Regression of Neural Network for COD                | 168 |
| Figure 5.10.        | Plot fit of Neural Network for COD                  | 168 |
| Figure 5.11.        | Best validation performance due to mean square      |     |
| _                   | error for COD                                       | 169 |
| Figure 5.12.        | Regression of Neural Network for BOD                | 170 |
| Figure 5.13.        | Plot fit of Neural Network for BOD                  | 171 |
| Figure 5.14.        | Best validation performance due to mean square      |     |
| C                   | error for BOD                                       | 172 |

### **LIST OF TABLES**

|                              |   | <b>Page</b> |
|------------------------------|---|-------------|
| CHAPTER 1                    |   | 10          |
| <b>Table 2.1. Table 2.2.</b> | Physical Properties of Filter Media Performance Summary for East BAF Column at Salt | 18          |
| 1 avic 2.2.                  | Lake City, Utah.  | 37          |
| <b>CHAPTER</b>               | <u>III</u>  |             |
| <b>Table 3.1.</b>            | Plan of the experimental work   | 76          |
| <b>Table 3.2.</b>            | Process of measurements   | 77          |
| CHAPTER 1                    | <u>IV</u>   |             |
| Table 4.1.                   | Tap water and raw wastewater analysis results for                                   |             |
|                              | phase I-run I   | 84          |
| <b>Table 4.2.</b>            | Water quality parameters analysis from different                                    |             |
|                              | locations for phase I - run I   | 85          |
| <b>Table 4.3.</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for COD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (I-I)  | 89          |
| <b>Table 4.4.</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for BOD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (I-I)  | 91          |
| <b>Table 4.5.</b>            | Tap water and raw wastewater analysis for phase I-                                  |             |
|                              | run II  | 94          |
| <b>Table 4.6.</b>            | Water quality parameters analysis from different                                    |             |
|                              | locations for phase I-run II  | 95          |
| <b>Table 4.7.</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for COD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (I-II)   | 99          |
| <b>Table 4.8.</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for BOD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (I-II)   | 101         |
| <b>Table 4.9</b>             | Tap water and raw wastewater analysis for phase II-                                 |             |
|                              | run I   | 105         |
| <b>Table 4.10</b>            | Water quality parameters analysis from different                                    |             |
|                              | locations for phase II- run I   | 106         |
| <b>Table 4.11</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for COD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (II-I)   | 110         |
| <b>Table 4.12</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for BOD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (II-I)   |             |
| <b>Table 4.13</b>            | Tap water and raw wastewater analysis for phase II-                                 |             |
|                              | run II  | 115         |
| <b>Table 4.14</b>            | Water quality parameters analysis from different                                    |             |
|                              | locations for phase II- run II  | 116         |
| <b>Table 4.15</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for COD   |             |
|                              | concentrations (II-II)  | 119         |
| <b>Table 4.16</b>            | Calculated removal efficiencies for BOD   | -           |
|                              | concentrations (II-II)  | 121         |

| <b>Table 4.17</b>  | Tap water and raw wastewater analysis for phase III-                            | 105  |
|--------------------|---|------|
| T-11- 4 10         | run I   | 125  |
| <b>Table 4.18</b>  | Water quality parameters analysis from different locations for phase III- run I | 126  |
| <b>Table 4.19</b>  | Calculated removal efficiencies for COD   | 120  |
| 1 abic 4.17        | concentrations (III-I)  | 130  |
| <b>Table 4.20</b>  | Calculated removal efficiencies for BOD   | 130  |
| 14516 4.20         | concentrations (III-I)  | 131  |
| <b>Table 4.21</b>  | Tap water and raw wastewater analysis for phase III-                            | 131  |
| 10010 1121         | run II  | 134  |
| <b>Table 4.22</b>  | Channel water analysis from different locations for                             |      |
|                    | phase III- run II   | 145  |
| <b>Table 4.23</b>  | Calculated removal efficiencies for COD   |      |
|                    | concentrations (III-II)   | 139  |
| <b>Table 4.24</b>  | Calculated removal efficiencies for BOD   |      |
|                    | concentrations (III-II)   | 140  |
|                    |   |      |
| <b>CHAPTER</b>     |   |      |
| Table 5.1.         | Fraction of COD removed for comparison trial                                    | 148  |
| Table 5.2.         | COD calculations due to concentration for                                       |      |
|                    | regression analysis - first trial   | 149  |
| Table 5.3.         | COD calculations due to concentrations for                                      |      |
|                    | regression analysis - second trial  | 151  |
| Table 5.4.         | COD calculations due to concentrations for                                      | 1.50 |
| T-1-1- 5 5         | regression analysis - third trial   | 153  |
| Table 5.5.         | COD calculations due to concentrations for                                      | 154  |
| Table 5.6.         | regression analysis - fourth trial BOD calculations due to concentrations for   | 134  |
| Table 3.0.         | regression analysis- first trial  | 155  |
| Table 5.7.         | BOD calculations due to concentrations for                                      | 133  |
| Tuble 5.71         | regression analysis - second trial  | 156  |
| Table 5.8.         | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P. first                           | 100  |
|                    | trial (I-I)   | 158  |
| Table 5.9.         | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P. first                           |      |
|                    | trial (I-II)  | 158  |
| <b>Table 5.10.</b> | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P. first                           |      |
|                    | trial (II-I)  | 158  |
| <b>Table 5.11.</b> | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P. first                           |      |
|                    | trial (II-II)   | 159  |
| <b>Table 5.12.</b> | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P.                                 |      |
|                    | second trial  | 159  |
| <b>Table 5.13.</b> | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P.                                 | 160  |
| <b>Table 5.14.</b> | COD concentration through pilot length for S.P.                                 |      |
|                    | third trial (average equation)  | 161  |