### Side Stream Treatment and Advanced Stabilization Technologies

#### HAZEN AND SAWYER Environmental Engineers & Scientists

### **Overall Program Agenda**

	Time	Program Item
	9:30 - 10:20	Biosolids Management / Regulatory Framework
	10:20 - 10:30	Break
	10:30 - 12:00	Biosolids Treatment Technologies
	12:00 - 13:00	Lunch
	13:00 – 13:30	Sidestream Treatment and Advanced Stabilization
	13:30 - 14:30	Energy Management
	14:30	Workshop Closure

### SIDESTREAM TREATMENT NITROGEN REMOVAL

## Conventional nitrogen removal pathway is energy and carbon "intensive"



# There are more energy and carbon efficient pathways for nitrogen removal.

- Shortcuts traditional nitrification and /denitrification
- Stopping at nitrite rather than nitrate.
- Uses 25% less oxygen (theoretical)
- Uses 40% less carbon (theoretical)



# Nitritation and Deammonification is an even more efficient N removal pathway.

- The most energyefficient and low cost way to remove nitrogen
- Uses 62.5% less oxygen
- Does not require any supplemental carbon
- Utilizes annamox bacteria



### SIDESTREAM TREATMENT PHOSPHORUS REMOVAL

## Uncontrolled Struvite formation after anaerobic digestion can be a problem



### OSTARA offers a "controlled" struvite recovery reactor system



## Multiform Harvest offers a competing controlled struvite recovery reactor



### OSTARA struvite recovery reactor system at the Nansemond WWTP.



### OSTARA struvite recovery reactor system at the Nansemond WWTP.



### Product quality can vary depending on the struvite recovery system installed.

#### **OSTARA CrystalGreen Product**

**Multiform Harvest Product** 



The two major constituents of concern in side stream from dewatering anaerobically digested sludge are:



What are the five chemical elements found in struvite:



### POST-DEWATERING TREATMENT TECHNOLOGIES

# Composting can be utilized to achieve 40 CFR 503 "Class A" standards.



- Space intensive
- High odor potential
- Labor and equipment intensive for material handling
- Seasonal product demand
- Unique marketing and distribution challenges

## Basic process configuration for composting unit treatment process.



### Alkaline stabilization can meet both "Class A" or "Class B" standards

- Calcium Oxide (Lime) is blended with dewatered cake
- Elevated pH can result in high ammonia odors release
- "Class A" achieved by:
  - pH + Temperature
  - Time + Temperature
- Finish Product used as Soil Conditioner



### Fluid bed thermal oxidation is the current "standard" in incineration



Image Courtesy IDI Technologies

## Thermal drying systems are "rated" by evaporation rate capacity



# Rotary drum thermal drying is the most prominent technology for "large" systems.



# South Cary WRF thermal drying facility 8,800 lb/hour evaporation rate capacity.



### Compact rotary drum drying systems are available for "smaller" size systems.



### Belt drying systems are a more recent addition to the sludge drying market.



## Belt dryer installation in Biel, Switzerland with an evaporation rate 2,900 lb/hour.



## Paddle dryers are the most common of the "indirect" dryer systems.



# Paddle drying system in Mason, OH with 6,500 lb/hour evaporation rate capacity.



### Fluid bed dryers are not common in the North American market.



## Fluid bed dryer in Houthalen, Belgium with evaporative capacity 8,000 lb/hour.



# Biosolids gasification is an emerging technology for energy recovery.



### Solar sludge drying beds can be covered to reduce seasonal impacts



## Automation can be applied to increase solids loading rates to reduce footprint.



What are three major types of processes used for producing a Class A biosolids after dewatering:



What is the primary criteria used for sizing an thermal drying system?

What are the five major types of thermal drying systems on the market:


## The big picture take away items...

- The "on-site" residuals stabilization and handling requirements are largely governed by the needs of the "off-site" residuals management program.
- Thickening, stabilization, dewatering, and postdewatering treatment must work together as a system to effectively achieve residuals processing objectives.

### **Reference Materials**



#### **National Manual of Good Practice for Biosolids**

Last Updated January 2005 View the Document Control Log for a Summary of Revisions

United States Environmental Protection EPA/625/9-62/013 Revised October 1999 Office of Research and Development Washington, DC 20460 http://www.eps.gox/ORD/NRMFL Agancy SEPA Environmental **Regulations and** Technology Control of Pathogens and Vector Attraction in Sewage Sludge

## **Reference Materials**





Operation of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants

Volume I: Management and Support Systems **SIXTH EDITION** 

Water Environment Federation (WEF)

MANUAL OF PRACTICE No. 11

Design of Municipal Wastewater

Water Environment

weforess

Treatment Plants

Volume 1: Planning and Configuration of Wastewater Treatment Plants

> Water Environment Federation\* (WEF\*) American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Environmental & Water Resources Institute (EWRI)

WEF MANUAL OF PRACTICE No. 8 ASCE MANUALS AND REPORTS ON ENGINEERING PRACTICE No. 76

### **Reference Materials**

#### RECOMMENDED STANDARDS for WASTEWATER FACILITIES

POLICIES FOR THE DESIGN, REVIEW, AND APPROVAL OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.

FOR WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT FACILITIES

#### 1997 EDITION

A REPORT OF THE WASTEWATER COMMITTEE

OF THE

GREAT LAKES -- UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

BOARD OF STATE AND PROVINCIAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGERS

#### MEMBER STATES AND PROVINCE

ILLINOIS INDIANA IOWA MICHIGAN MINNESOTA MISSOURI NEW YORK OHIO ONTARIO PENNSYLVANIA WISCONSIN

PUBLISHED BY: Health Research. Inc., Health Education Services Division

P.O. Box 7126 Albany, N.Y. 12224

Phone: (518) 439-7286



## Questions?

C. Michael Bullard, P.E. Vice President National Residuals & Biosolids Leader Hazen and Sawyer – Raleigh Office (919) 755-8582 mbullard@hazenandsawyer.com Biosolids and Residuals Processing & Energy Management Workshop

### December 12, 2013

### **Energy Management**

#### HAZEN AND SAWYER Environmental Engineers & Scientists

## Agenda

- Electric Utilities Overview
- Electric Billing
- Demand Management
- Resource Recovery
- Power Monitoring
- Typical Energy Efficiency Opportunities

## Energy management is more than energy efficiency



## Energy Management has potential savings of 10-40%



## Energy Management is a Continuous Process



## Managing energy begins with an energy management program



## **Electrical Utilities**

## **United States Electric Grid**



## **Utility Distribution Systems**



### **Electrical Utility Billing**

*"How" you are charged for energy is just as important as "how much" energy you use.* 

## Utility Bill Example

RATE	SERVICE PERIOD	METER	READING	METER REA	ADING	METER	USAGE
NAME	FROM TO	NUMBER	TYPE	PREVIOUS	PRESENT	CONSTANT	
LPL	07/22/1008/23/10	WF0036	Tot kWh Pk kVA Power Factor Co Pk kW			1111	1,188,875.52 1,860.9889 0.9587 1,784.16

50.00

#### EXPLANATION OF CHARGES

LPL - Light and Power Large	07/22-08/23
Contract Term Discount	
Contract Term Discount .04	
Contract Demand	
Contract Demand: 2700	
Standby Generation	
Contract Generator kW: 2700	
Parallel Gear Amt \$ -500.00	
Customer Charge	50.00
Demand 2025 KVA * 4.750000	9618.75
Energy Charge 506250 KWH * 0.036391	18422.94
Energy Charge 682626 KWH * 0.023891	16308.62
Discount	-1776.01
SG Customer Charge	620.00
Parallel Gear	-500.00
SG - Capacity Credit	-6237.00
Fuel Charge 1188876 KWH * 0.025100	29840.79
Natural Disaster Reserve	0.37
Tax Adjustment	-1916.14
Utility License Tax	1159.78
EnergyDirect.com Premium	50.00

#### BILLING INFORMATION

Tot kWh	1,188,876
Pk kVA	1,861
Ratch kVA Cont	2,025
Power Factor	0.959
Bill Demand	2,025
Generation Dem	2,700

#### **HISTORICAL DATA**

	Days KWH	KWH/DAY		
This Mth	321188876	37152		
Last Mth	30 1114437	37148		
1 Yr Ago	32 1327212	41475		

# Electrical utility bills are typically comprised of several "charges".

- Energy Usage Charge (kWh)
  - $\succ$  Energy consumed during the billing period.
  - ➤ Typically "Flat Rate" or "Time of Use".

### Demand Charge (kW)

Typically 15-30 minute peak power demand during a billing period

### Fixed Charges

- > Independent of demand or usage.
- Facility charges
- > Minimum demand/energy charges

## The demand profile establishes both "demand" and "energy usage".



## Demand ratchets can significantly impact electrical utility cost.



## Demand ratchets can significantly impact electrical utility cost.

RATE	SERVICE PERIOD	METER	READING	METER REA	DING	METER	USAGE
NAME	FROM TO	NUMBER	TYPE	PREVIOUS	PRESENT	CONSTANT	
LPL	07/22/1008/23/10	WF0036	Tot kWh Pk kVA Power Factor Co Pk kW			11111	1,188,875.52 1,860.9889 0.9587 1,784.16

#### EXPLANATION OF CHARGES

LPL - Light and Power Large	07/22-08/23
Contract Term Discount	
Contract Term Discount .04	
Contract Demand	
Contract Demand: 2700	
Standby Generation	
Contract Generator kW: 2700	
Parallel Gear Amt \$ -500.00	
Customer Charge	50.00
Demand 2025 KVA * 4.750000	9618.75
Energy Charge 506250 KWH * 0.036391	18422.94
Energy Charge 682626 KWH * 0.023891	16308.62
Discount	-1776.01
SG Customer Charge	620.00
Parallel Gear	-500.00
SG - Capacity Credit	-6237.00
Fuel Charge 1188876 KWH * 0.025100	29840.79
Natural Disaster Reserve	0.37
Tax Adjustment	-1916.14
Utility License Tax	1159.78
EnergyDirect.com Premium	50.00

#### BILLING INFORMATION

Tot kWh	1,188,876
Pk kVA	1,861
Ratch kVA Cont	2,025
Power Factor	0.959
Bill Demand	2,025
Generation Dem	2,700

#### **HISTORICAL DATA**

	Days KWH	KWH/DAY		
This Mth	321188876	37152		
Last Mth	30 1114437	37148		
1 Yr Ago	32 1327212	41475		

## "Time of Use" energy and demand billing is very common



cents/kWh

# Utility billing structures will vary significantly



- LED outdoor lighting reduces plant's outdoor lighting demand by 50kW
- Annual Energy Savings 175,000 kWh per year.



So.....

#### 175,000KWH X 8.5¢/KWH = **~\$15,000/yr.** of savings right?

Maybe not!.....

SVEC Rate LP-10 - \$17/kW any time, \$0.041/KWH any time

- LED light demand offset \$10,400/yr,
- LED light energy usage offset \$7,100/year

**LED Lighting Evaluation – Water Treatment Plant** 



SVEC Rate LP-10 - \$17/kW any time, \$0.041/KWH any time

- LED light demand offset \$0
- LED light energy usage offset \$7,100/year

**LED Lighting Evaluation – Wastewater Treatment Plant** 





## <u>"When" energy is used and</u> <u>"how much" energy is used</u> determines the overall cost.

### **Demand Management**

### "Using Energy More Efficiently"

## Common Demand Management Strategies

- Manage plant operations to reduce demand during on-peak hours
- Defer non-critical operations to off-peak hours
- Interlock intermittent loads
- Utilize on-site power generation capacity to manage plant demand
- Electric utility load response programs

## Demand Management Strategies Will Depend on Multiple Elements



## Plant demand profile impacts energy costs



## Plant demand profile impacts energy costs

 Evaluate the energy costs for two demand profiles Energy Charge – 3.0¢/KWH Monthly Demand Charge - \$10.00/kW

	Energy Usage	Energy Charge @ 3.0¢/KWH	Metered Demand	Demand Charge @ \$10.00/KW	Total Charges	Average Cost per/KWH
High Peaking Scenario	2330400 KWH	\$69,912	6500kW	\$65,000	\$134,912	5.8¢/KWH
Low Peaking Scenario	2330400 KWH	\$69,912	3700kW	\$37,000	\$106,912	4.6¢/KWH

## Case Study – Managing plant loads to reduce demand charges – HRRSA

- Electric Utility Rate
  - Demand charges \$17.33/KW (any 15 min period)
  - Energy Charges \$0.041/KWH
- Opportunity Stop non-critical mixing loads during each 20 min filter backwash cycle.
  Filter backwash loads (~100hp)
  Digester mixing loads (~85hp).
- Annual benefit ~\$10,000/year (@ 80% load factor) in demand savings

## Case Study – Reduced demand charges through filter backwash timing



The Cause: Automatic Deep-bed filter backwash process during onpeak periods - ~150kW The Response: Move timing to lower demand periods. Potential to save ~\$1500 per month

## Case Study – Managing demand during on-peak periods



Average Weekday ( kW )

## **Demand Management Key Points**

- Demand Management primary objective is to lower <u>energy costs</u>.
- Demand Management strategies can be implement at a <u>low or zero cost</u>.
- Power monitoring and an understanding of the utility billing structure are key components to developing demand management strategies
## Onsite power generation systems can be used to manage demand



**Standby Power Generator Systems** 

**Biogas Fueled CHP Systems** 

	Average Fuel and Energy Costs				
	Fuel Source	Average Fuel Cost (\$/MMBTU)	Electric Energy Conversion Efficiency (%)	Cost of Electric Energy Generated (\$/KWH)	
No Die	o.2 Non-Road esel @ \$3/Gal	\$21.43	37.5%	\$0.23*	
Na	tural Gas	\$7.70	37.5%	\$0.088*	
Ele	ectric Utility	\$17.88	100%	\$0.071**	

\* 2.0¢/KWH O&M costs included \*\* Does not include fixed charges

## On average, generating electric energy costs more than purchased electric energy

### Onsite Power Generation Systems – Peak Shaving

- Operate generators to reduce demand charges
- This strategy can be risky!
- EPA emission restrictions
- Better to defer load



Demand Profile (30 Days)

# Load management is valuable to electric utilities



#### **Demand Response Programs**

- End user's ability to shed load is valuable to electric utilities
- Many electric utilities will pay end users for "capacity".
- Plant owner is compensated by the utility to have the standby power generators available in the event of an utility emergency
- Generally less than 100 hours/year of operation

## **EPA Emission Requirements**

- EPA National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP)
  - Regulates the Carbon Monoxide emissions for existing non-emergency engines
  - Regulations not applicable to emergency use application and biogas fueled CHP systems.
- EPA New Source Performance Standards (NSPS)
  New non-emergency generators must meet stringent emission limits. Most applications require emissions after treatment for non-emergency applications
- Air Permitting

#### **Resource Recovery**

## **Energy Sources Available**

- Biogas
- Thermal Energy
- Chemical Energy
- Hydraulic Energy
- Renewable Energy







Typical WW plant will support 15-30kW of generation capacity per MGD



## Biogas to energy systems have been around a while!



How the sewage disposal plant at Birmingham, England, supplies its own power is described in the illustration. Gas from the sewage drives an ongine of 20 brake horsepower, which operates a centrifugal sludge pump

SEWAGE that costs large eliles tremendous sums each year can be turned into a source of power equivalent to thousands at tees of coal! The waste now dumped into rivers or shipped to see may be used to run factories or to light buildings!

I not conversion of severage and power is possible has been proved conclusively by the city of Birmingham, England. There a socion gas engine of 20 braice horsopower has been successfully driven by the gases given off by sevenge sludge.

On the basis of the Birmingham experiments, an American city that must now

pay for the disposal of 400,000 tons of sewage sludge a year might produce 320,000,000 cubic feet of gas suitable for beat and power, or, in terms of energy, 16,000,000 homopower hoins at 20 cubic feet per brake horsepower.

The apparatus for producing gas from sewage consists of two sludge digestion tanks in which the sewage is allowed to ferment. The gases given off are composed of from 25 to 75 per cent of methane, or marsh gas.

A gas engine of the usual type will run on sewage gas without adjustment of the

valves. Sewage gas has a higher calorific value than some illuminating gas, averaging about 650 thermal units to the cubic foot, as against 550.

The Birmingham engine runs about six hours a day and is used to operate a centrifugal aludge pump that moves the wetsludge from the gas-generating tank to the drying grounds. In this process a small proportion of the waste material produces enough power to run the pumps of the eseage disposal plant. If all the material were used, there would prohably be enough gas available to light the city.

#### Popular Science 1922

SEWAGE that costs large cities tremendous sums each year can be turned into a source of power equivalent to thousands of tons of coal! The waste now dumped into rivers or shipped to sea may be used to run factories or to light buildings!

That conversion of sewage into power is possible has been proved conclusively by the city of Birmingham, England. There a suction gas engine of 20 brake horsepower has been successfully driven by the gases given off by sewage sludge.

Boy haven't we come a long way in the last 90 years....

- "Free" fuel source
- Generate an average of 20% to 40% of the electric energy usage.
- Considered renewable energy source.
- Generally feasible where energy costs are above 7.5¢/KWH





**Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engine** 



Image Courtesy GE/Jenbacher Engines

Prime Mover Technology	Common Size Range (kW)	Typical Electrical Efficiency (%)	Typical Thermal Efficiency (%)	Installed Cost (\$/kW)	Gas Conditioning Requirements
Spark Ignited Reciprocating Engines	150- 5000kW	35%-40%	25% 45% with exhaust heat recovery	1500 - 2000 \$/kW with Heat Recovery	Moderate
Microturbines	30 – 250kW	30%	45%	2000-2500 \$/kW with Heat Recovery	High
Fuel Cells	100 – 250kW	50%		\$5000+	Very High
Stirling Engines (New Technology)	~50kW	25%	45%	\$2500+	Low

#### Waste Heat Recovery Systems

Beneficial Uses of Thermal Energy
 Digester Heating (Most Common)
 Building Heat and Cooling (Absorption Chillers)

Sludge Drying



## CHP systems can be used to drive process equipment

- Offset plants purchased power with mechanical energy
- Common applications are process pumping and aeration
- Benefit is
  dependent
  on the process
  demand.



## CHP systems can be used to generate electricity

- Offset plant's purchased power with electricity
- Benefit is not dependent on process demands.
- Possible to increase benefit by selling energy directly the utility.



## Energy generated from biogas can be sold directly to the utility



# Utility rates have a significant impact on CHP system benefit

#### Plant Demand Profile with and without 1000kW CHP System



## ~1000kW demand loss with 1 day of CHP system downtime

## CHP System Benefit Analysis SVEC – Rate LP10

	Electric Utility Cost	CHP Demand Offset @17.33/KW	CHP Energy Offset @ \$0.041/KWH	CHP System Benefit	CHP System Operation % Savings
No CHP	\$164,000	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1000kW Base Load – Continuous Operation	\$119,200	\$17,300	\$27,500	\$44,800	27%
1000kW Base Load – 1 day CHP Down Time	\$133,000	\$0	\$26,000	\$26,000	10%

- 3 day CHP peak period downtime resulted in a 40% loss of the CHP system benefit for the billing period.
- Demand ratchets can extend the loss for up to 12 months! 80% 12 month ratchet could result in a loss of ~\$170,000/year

#### Some utilities purchase renewable energy on a energy charge only rate.

![](_page_92_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Benefit may depend on renewable energy portfolio standards and goals. www.dsireusa.org

States with Renewable Portfolio Standards (mandatory) or Goals (voluntary), January 2012

![](_page_93_Figure_2.jpeg)

# **Power Monitoring**

## Power monitoring is key to energy management and optimization

![](_page_95_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_95_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_95_Picture_3.jpeg)

## Benefits from incorporating energy usage data into process operations

![](_page_96_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Monitor individual loads as well as overall distribution equipment loads

![](_page_97_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Power monitoring dashboard example

![](_page_98_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Typical Energy Management Opportunities

# The treatment process typically consumes 90% of the energy usage

![](_page_100_Figure_1.jpeg)

## National Energy Benchmark Data

Secondary Treatment Activated Sludge with Advanced Treatment and Nitrification	1,900	
Activated Sludge with Advanced Treatment, No Nitrification	1,600	
Activated Sludge with No Advanced Treatment or Nitrification	1,400	
No Activated Sludge, Trickling Filter	1,000	
	kWh/M	G

#### Source: WEF MOP-32

## Energy Optimization – Secondary Treatment Considerations

- Excessive operating units (too many tanks online)
- DO control (excessively high DO)
- Blower turndown
  limitations
- Over mixing
- Diffuser fouling
- Inefficient aeration
  equipment
- Primary clarifier efficiency

![](_page_102_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_102_Picture_9.jpeg)

#### Damaged equipment

![](_page_103_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Aeration equipment can impact energy efficiency

Aerator technologies oxygen transfer efficiencies

		AE
	SAE	at 2 mg/L DO
Aerator Type	lbO2/hp-hr	lbO2/hp-hr
Surface Aerators	1.5 – 3.2	0.7 – 2.5
Coarse Bubble	1 - 2.5	0.5 – 1.6
Fine Bubble	6 – 8	2.0 - 4.0

- Conversion to fine bubble is not always cost effective.
- Have to make an economic case to change to fine bubble from surface aerators
- Cost of energy impacts economic case

#### Questions?

Bryan R. Lisk, PE, CEM Senior Associate Hazen and Sawyer – Raleigh Office (919) 755-8655 blisk@hazenandsawyer.com