



## Project Summary

# Effect of Recycling Thermophilic Sludge on the Activated Sludge Process

T.B.S. Prakasam, S. Soszynski, D.R. Zenz, C. Lue-Hing, L. Blyth, and G. Sernel

A full-scale investigation was undertaken at the Hanover Park Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) operated by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago to study whether the net sludge production from the WRP can be reduced by implementing a scheme reported by Torpey et al. This scheme involved the recycling of sludge withdrawn from a thermophilic digester into the aeration tanks of an activated sludge system.

The Hanover Park WRP, which has a design flow capacity of 45,400 m<sup>3</sup> per day (12 mgd), was split into a control section and an experimental section. The control and experimental sections were operated as nitrifying activated sludge systems, except that thermophilic drawoff was recycled into the aeration tanks of the experimental section from a digester system, which consisted of mesophilic and thermophilic digesters operated in series.

In contrast to the results reported by Torpey et al., a significant reduction in the net sludge production was not observed as a consequence of recycling thermophilic sludge into the aeration tanks of the Hanover Park WRP.

*This Project Summary was developed by EPA's Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH, to announce key findings of the research project that is fully documented in a separate report of*

*the same title (see Project Report ordering information at back).*

### Introduction

In 1987, the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (herein called "the District") disposed of or used 251,000 tonnes (277,000 tons) of dry sludge solids produced at its seven sewage treatment facilities. Costs of treatment and disposal of sludge were a major fraction of total operating costs. Consequently, the District has a continuing interest in investigating processing approaches that reduce volume and mass of sludge produced in wastewater treatment.

A novel approach for reducing sludge production has been reported by Torpey and coworkers(1) and demonstrated at the Rockaway Sewage Treatment Plant in New York City. In this process, sludge from a mesophilic digester is processed through a thermophilic digester and then a portion of the thermophilic digester drawoff is recycled through the aeration tanks of an activated sludge system. The remainder of the thermophilic drawoff is passed through a rethickening and elutriation tank. The authors reported that the volume and quantity of the sludge, when compared with that produced by the activated sludge plant using mesophilic digestion with no recycle, was reduced by about 60%. The reduction in sludge quantity was attributed to additional destruction of solids achieved in the thermophilic digester and by the oxidation of some of the solids contained in the thermophilic sludge recycled to the

aeration tanks of an activated sludge system.

Torpey's findings have been supported by further work by New York City's Department of Environmental Protection. Carrio and coworkers (2) reported in 1985 that recirculation of digested sludge to the activated sludge aerators reduced total sludge production at the Newton Creek, Bowery Bay, 26th Ward, and Oakwood Beach wastewater treatment plants.

In view of the potential advantage of substantially reducing sludge production, the District undertook a demonstration at its Hanover Park WRP of Torpey's concepts; that is, in a plant using the activated sludge process, digest the sludge first by mesophilic and then by thermophilic digestion, and then divide the digested sludge into two portions, one for discharge and one for recycle to the activated sludge aeration. The Hanover Park WRP was selected for the study because it was easily divided into two nearly identical modules, which would provide a control section for comparison with the experimental section.

The following were the main objectives of the study conducted at the Hanover Park WRP:

1. To demonstrate on a full-scale whether retrofitting an existing activated sludge system with a mesophilic-thermophilic (M-T) digestion scheme and recycling the drawoff from the thermophilic digester into the aeration tanks of an activated sludge system would reduce the volume and quantity of volatile solids produced when compared with the volume and quantity of volatile solids produced from a conventional activated sludge system using mesophilic digestion and no recycling of digested sludge.
2. To evaluate the quality of the effluents obtained under the various phases of the M-T digestion scheme and compare these with the results obtained under the conventional mode of operating an activated sludge system.
3. To determine the dewatering characteristics of the sludges resulting from the recycling of thermophilic digester drawoff and compare them with those of the drawoff derived from a conventional mesophilic digester.
4. To evaluate the odor characteristics of the sludge derived from the M-T digester sequence and compare them with those of the mesophilic digester drawoff.

5. To compare the removal of heavy metals observed in a conventional activated sludge system with the removal observed using the recycle of the sludge from the M-T digestion scheme.

## Procedures

The Hanover Park WRP with a nominal dry weather capacity of 45,400 m<sup>3</sup> per day (12 MGD), employs primary treatment, secondary treatment by the activated sludge process, followed by sand bed filtration. The sludge is anaerobically digested, pumped to lagoon storage, and ultimately used on an adjacent farm. A schematic diagram of the plant is shown in Figure 1.

Wastewater enters the treatment plant through coarse bar screens, and flows to primary settling tanks. There are two settling tanks for each of four aeration batteries (A, B, C, and D). Two aeration tanks comprise a battery. Primary influent flows are 3,780 m<sup>3</sup> per day (1.0 MGD) for each aerator of Battery A, 7.57 m<sup>3</sup> per day (2.0 MGD) for each aerator of Battery B, and 5.68 m<sup>3</sup> per day (1.5 MGD) for each aerator of Batteries C and D. There is one clarifier for each of the eight aerators. Excess activated sludge is wasted to the primary tanks. After the secondary effluent from the clarifiers is chlorinated with sodium hypochlorite it then flows to rapid sand filters. Sludge is digested in four circular digesters equipped with floating covers. The digesters normally are maintained between 29 and 35°C and are continuously mixed. The digesters are 12.2 m (40 ft) in diameter with a variable depth of between 4.4 m (14.5 ft) and 5.9 m (19.5 ft). Digested sludge is pumped to storage basins and is applied to the sludge farm in the summer.

During the experimental program the plant was divided into two similar modules. Batteries A and B, the control section, were operated in the conventional activated sludge mode with mesophilic digestion of the mixed primary and waste activated sludge withdrawn from the primary tanks. The sludge was digested at 35°C in Digesters 1 and 2 operated in series. Both digesters were heated and continuously mixed.

The experimental section consisted of Batteries C and D and Digesters 3 and 4. Digester 3 received the mixed sludge from the primary tanks and was operated at 35°C. The sludge from Digester 3 was fed in series to Digester 4 where it was digested at 53°C.

The incoming wastewater flow was divided between control and experimental sections to give similar hydraulic retention times in the activated sludge aerators. After appropriate time periods to ensure steady state, increasing portions of the thermophilic sludge from the experimental section were recirculated to the aerators to study the effects on the activated sludge process and sludge production. There were five operating phases: phase 3--no re-circulation, phase 3a--10% recirculation, phase 3b--30% recirculation, phase 3c--40% recirculation, and phase 3d--50% recirculation.

Analyses were conducted by standard methods. An appropriate quality assurance program was carried out to ensure accuracy of all analytical measurements.


## Results

The entire experimental program including modification to the plant and cleaning of digester took almost 4 yr. The program was divided into three main phases. In Phase 1, the plant was divided into the control and experimental sections, the thermophilic digester was started up, and steady state operation was achieved. In Phase 2, background data on performance of the control and experimental sections were obtained. Phase 3, the experimental phase of the program, was subdivided into Phases 3a to 3d. In these phases, recirculation of thermophilic sludge withdrawn from Digester 4 and recycled to aeration Batteries C and D was increased in steps: zero in Phase 2 to 10%, 30%, 40%, and 50% of its output.

### Thermophilic Digester Operation

The thermophilic digester (Digester 4--the second digester in the experimental section) was operated successfully at 53°C. Figure 2 shows the period of startup and initial operation. Instability occurred at about 55°C. Although operation may have been possible at 55°C, temperature was reduced to 53°C to reduce system sensitivity. Except for occasional volatile acid excursions (see Figure 2), operation at 53°C was uneventful. During the data collection period that followed, volatile acids leaving Digester 4 ranged from 89 to 233 mg/L. Volatile acids from the second mesophilic digester in the control section (Digester 2) ranged from 18 to 86 mg/L.

The processing of approximately half of the sludge output of the plant through the thermophilic digester as a final digestion step created problems at the sludge farm. Numerous complaints about unpleasant odors were received from



Notation:  
 NWIS 20, 20A: Northwest interceptor sewers; W.W.: wet well; S. BOX: splitter box; P.S.: primary sludge; WAS: waste activated sludge; R.S.: returned sludge; ML: mixed liquor; P.E.: primary effluent; S.E.: secondary effluent; OX. POND: oxidation pond

Figure 1. Schematic of Hanover Park Water Reclamation Plant.




Figure 2. Volatile acids and temperature profile of digester 4.

persons living near the sludge farm during the experimental program as contrasted to practically no complaints when only mesophilically digested sludge was being discharged. The odor of thermophilically digested sludge evidently was either more offensive or more identifiable than the odor of mesophilically digested sludge.

#### Fate of Volatile Solids

About 2% to 5% more volatile solids were destroyed in the experimental section digesters than in the control section's mesophilic digesters when thermophilic sludge drawoff was recycled (up to 40% of the volume withdrawn) into the aeration tanks of the experimental section. When the thermophilic sludge drawoff recycle rate to the aeration tanks was increased to about 50% of the volume withdrawn, the volatile solids destruction in the experimental section digesters was found to be lower by about 12.5% than that observed in the control section digesters. At this high recirculation, the experimental section digesters were overloaded. Total residence times in control and experimental section digesters were respectively 21.5 and 8.8 days at 50% recycle. A volatile

suspended solids (VSS) balance around the aerator-clarifier revealed a net VSS production for both control and experimental systems. Scatter was too great to allow a quantitative conclusion about the influence of recirculation of digested solids on VSS production.

When masses of VSS in the waste activated sludge (WAS) streams from control Battery B were compared with those from experimental Batteries C and D, recirculation of up to 40% of the meso-thermophilically digested sludge did not increase the mass of WAS per unit volume of wastewater treated.

The difference in the total digested sludge ultimately disposed from the control and experimental sections is not statistically significant. Table 1 shows the magnitude of the differences for Phase 2 and Phases 3 a-c. Recirculation of up to 30% of the thermophilic sludge produced a negligible effect on total sludge disposed per unit volume of wastewater. At 40% recirculation, the experimental section produced 13% less sludge, which was not statistically significant. At 50% recirculation (not shown in Table 1), the experimental unit produced more sludge than the control. This result is atypical because the experimental digesters were overloaded at this high recycle.

#### Effluent Quality and Plant Performance

The overall performance of the control and experimental sections of the Hanover Park WRP was comparable during all the phases of the study. The recycling of thermophilic sludge drawoff, even at the rate of about 50% of the volume withdrawn from the digester into the aeration tanks of the experimental section, did not have an adverse effect on the secondary effluent quality.

The overall BOD removals of the control and experimental sections were comparable and were in the range of 91.7% to 97.2% and 94.2% to 97.7%, respectively, during the various phases of the study. The corresponding secondary effluent BOD values for these sections were in the range of 3 to 9 and 3 to 6 mg/L, respectively. Recycling of up to 50% thermophilic sludge had no noticeable effect on BOD removal.

The overall suspended solids removal ranged from 83.9% to 94.2% for the control section and from 89.4% to 94.7% for the experimental section. The secondary effluent suspended solids concentration in these sections were comparable and were in the ranges of 6 to 15 mg/L (control) and 5 to 10 mg/L

**Table 1.** Average Volatile Solids Production Sent to Farm During the Various Experimental Phases

Phase (Recirculation)	Sludge Production (lb/mg)*		Difference	
	Control (C)	Experimental (E)	C-E	$\frac{(C-E)(100)}{C}$
2 (0%)	372	364	8	2.2%
3a(10%)	340	334	6	1.8%
3b(30%)	274	265	9	3.3%
3c(40%)	288	250	38	13.1%

\* lb/mg x 0.12 = g/m<sup>3</sup> or mg/L

(experimental). Again, recycling of digested sludge had no noticeable effect on percent removal.

The percent removal of NH<sub>4</sub>-N was within the range of 91.0 to 98.6 percent in the control and experimental sections. That the NH<sub>4</sub>-N concentration of the secondary effluent was less than 1.2 mg/L in both of these sections indicated that the recycling of thermophilic sludge did not have an adverse effect on nitrification.

The recycling of thermophilic sludge drawoff into the aeration tanks of the experimental section did not have a discernible influence on the sludge volume index (SVI) values of the mixed liquors. However, there was too much scatter in SVI values for any firm conclusions on the effect of recycling.

A comparison of the mixed liquor dissolved oxygen concentration and oxygen uptake rate data for the control and experimental section aeration tanks revealed no significant trends. Scatter in the results prevented drawing any firm conclusions on the effect of recycling on these variables.

The recycling of thermophilic sludge into the aeration tanks of the experimental section did not seem to alter the microbiological profile of the mixed liquor when compared with that of the mixed liquor of the control section aeration tanks.

The soluble concentration of Zn, Cd, Cu, Cr, Ni, Pb, and Hg remained approximately the same in the digester feeds and draws; this indicated that no significant solubilization of these metals occurred during mesophilic or thermophilic digestion. However, the soluble concentration of iron in the digester feed of the control and experimental sections

decreased significantly as it underwent digestion in the primary digester. No further resolubilization of this metal occurred in the secondary digesters.

### Dewaterability

Capillary suction time (CST) measurements at various polymer dosages indicated that mesophilic sludge required a lower polymer dosage than did the thermophilic sludge (10 vs. 22.5 kg/dry tonne) to achieve the minimum CST that was possible. The thermophilic sludge, however, exhibited a higher floc strength than did the mesophilic sludge.

Pilot scale centrifuge studies confirmed that the thermophilic sludge required a higher polymer dosage than did the mesophilic sludge. At optimum polymer dosages, these studies also indicated that the mesophilic sludge approached 100% solids capture whereas the thermophilic sludge approached a maximum of 96% solids capture. The lower solids capture with thermophilic sludge probably resulted from the higher concentration of fine particles in it than in the mesophilic sludge.

The percent cake solids achieved in pilot-scale centrifuge studies appeared to be similar at any given polymer dosage for the mesophilic and thermophilic sludges.

### Discussion and Conclusions

The recirculation of meso-thermophilically digested sludge to the activated sludge aerator caused a minor reduction in sludge mass discharged at Chicago's Hanover Park WRP that was not statistically significant. There were no adverse effects on quality of treated wastewater.

Although the Torpey Process did not degrade the quality of the treated wastewater, it did not produce the desired reduction of mass of solids that must be discharged to the environment. This result contrasts sharply with results obtained at New York City plants. One possible reason for the disagreement is that the New York City plants use high rate activated sludge processes. The waste biological sludge from these plants could very well be substantially reduced in mass by continued recirculation through the anaerobic/aerobic processes in Torpey's scheme.


In Torpey's work, sludge was elutriated before disposal. This process is not used in Chicago. It also could be responsible for loss of suspended solid material that would not occur at the Hanover plant.

Recirculation of sludge at rates above 40% overloaded the experimental section's digesters at the Hanover WRP. Although treated wastewater quality was not degraded, further increases in recirculation rate would inevitably cause this effect. An existing facility should have excess digestion capacity before the Torpey Process can be adopted.

The objectionable odor of the thermophilically digested sludge caused so many complaints that use of this process as the terminal digestion step is ill-advised if sludge is to be utilized on farmland with close neighbors.

### Recommendations

Based on the lack of effect on sludge mass and the increase in digestion capacity required, the Torpey process is not recommended for Chicago's conventional rate activated sludge plants. Nor is thermophilic digestion as the terminal sludge digestion process





recommended if the sludge is to be used at a site with nearby neighbors.

The full report was submitted in fulfillment of Cooperative Agreement No. CR-811925 by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, Chicago, IL., under the sponsorship of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

#### Literature Cited

1. Torpey, W. N., J. Andrews, and J. V. Basilio, J. Wat. Poll. Contr. Fed., 56, 62 (1984), "Effect of Multiple Digestion on Sludge."

2. Carrio, L. A., A. R. Lopez, et al., J. Wat. Poll. Contr. Fed., 57, 116 (1985), "Sludge Reduction by In-Plant Modification: New York City's Experiences."

*T.B.S. Prakasam, S. Soszynski, D. R. Zenz, C. Lue-Hing, L. Blyth, and G. Sernel are with Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, Chicago, IL 60611.*

*J. B. Farrell is the co-author of this summary and the EPA Project Officer (see below).*

*The complete report, entitled "Effect of Recycling Thermophilic Sludge on the Activated Sludge Process," (Order No. PB 90-258 518/AS; Cost: \$31.00 subject to change) will be available only from:*

*National Technical Information Service  
5285 Port Royal Road  
Springfield, VA 22161  
Telephone: 703-487-4650*

*The EPA Project Officer can be contacted at:  
Risk Reduction Engineering Laboratory  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Cincinnati, OH 45268*

United States  
Environmental Protection  
Agency

Center for Environmental Research  
Information  
Cincinnati OH 45268

BULK RATE  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
EPA  
PERMIT No. G-35

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300

EPA/600/S2-90/037