## Nutrient and e acceptor consumption – Ex 3.4

## 1) N and P

The N and P consumption rates,

$$\begin{split} r_N &= (0.124 \ g \ N\!/g \ V\!S\!S) \cdot \left(0.42 \ g \ V\!S\!S\!/g \ BOD_L\right) \cdot \left(-249 \ mg \ BOD_L/L - d\right) \cdot \frac{1 + (1 - 0.8) \cdot 0.15 \cdot 2}{1 + 0.15 \cdot 2} \\ &= -10.6 \ mg \ N\!/L - d \\ r_P &= r_N \cdot 0.2 \ g P/g \ N = -10.6 \cdot 0.2 = -2.1 \ mg \ P/L - d \end{split}$$

The effluent N and P concentrations

$$C_N = C_N^0 + r_N \theta = 50 \text{ mg N/L} - (10.6 \text{ mg N/L} - d) \cdot 2 d = 28.8 \text{ mg NH}_4^+ - \text{N/L}$$

$$C_P = C_P^0 + r_P \theta = 10 \text{ mg P/L} - (2.1 \text{ mg P/L} - d) \cdot 2 d = 5.8 \text{ mg PO}_4^{3-} - \text{P/L}$$

(the amount of nutrients did not limit the biological activity in the reactor)

## 2) O<sub>2</sub>

The acceptor consumption in the reactor,

$$\begin{split} \frac{\Delta S_a}{\Delta t} &= \left(1 \ g \ O_2/g \ COD\right) \cdot \left(1000 \ m^3/d\right) \\ &\cdot \left[500 - 1.7 - 31.8 + 1.42(50 - 221)\right] mg \ COD/L \cdot 10^3 \ L/m^3 \cdot 10^{-3} g/mg \\ &= 2.24 \times 10^5 \ g \ O_2/d \end{split}$$

To support the acceptor consumption, O2 should be supplied to the reactor with a rate of:

$$\begin{split} R_{O_2} &= 2.24 \times 10^5 \ g \ O_2/d - \left(1000 \ m^3/d\right) \cdot (6-2) \ mg/L \cdot 10^3 \ L/m^3 \cdot 10^{-3} \ g/mg \\ &= 2.20 \times 10^5 \ g \ O_2/d \end{split}$$

 $(O_2$  supplied by the influent DO is very small compared to the  $O_2$  requirement – aeration is essential)

## Effect of hydrolysis - Ex 3.6

i) effluent particulate BOD,  $S_p$ 

$$S_p = \frac{S_p^0}{1 + k_{bud}\theta} = \frac{100 \text{ mg COD/L}}{1 + (0.2/d)(2 \text{ d})} = 71 \text{ mg COD/L}$$

- ii) effluent soluble BOD, S: no change, 1.7 mg BOD<sub>L</sub>/L
- iii) effective  $S^0$  considering  $S_p$ ,  $S^{0'}$ :

$$S^{0\prime} = S^0 + k_{hyd}S_p\theta = 500~mg~COD/L + (0.2/d)(71~mg~COD/L)(2~d) = 528~mg~BOD_L/L + (0.2/d)(71~mg~COD/L)$$

(error in the textbook!)

iv) Effluent VSS

$$X_a = Y(S^0 - S)\frac{1}{1 + b\theta_x} = 0.42 \cdot (528 - 1.7)\frac{1}{1 + 0.15 \cdot 2} = 170 \text{ mg VSS/L}$$

(slight increase from 161 mg VSS/L without particulate BOD)

$$\begin{split} X_i &= X_i^0 + X_a \big( 1 - f_d \big) b \theta_x = 50 \ mg \ VSS/L + \big( 170 \ mg \ VSS/L \big) \cdot \big( 1 - 0.8 \big) \cdot \big( 0.15/d \big) \cdot \big( 2 \ d \big) \\ &= 60 \ mg \ VSS/L \end{split}$$

(didn't change much – slight increase happened, but not enough to have increase in significant numbers)

$$X_v = X_a + X_i + S_p = (170 + 60) \ mg \ VSS/L + \frac{71 \ mg \ COD/L}{1.42 \ mg \ COD/mg \ VSS} = 280 \ mg \ VSS/L$$

(Assumed that the particulate COD has the same formula, C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub>N, as the biomass)

v) SMP: let's skip the calculation and obtain value from the text:

SMP = 
$$32.6 \text{ mg } BOD_L/L$$

(slight increase from 31.8 mg  $BOD_L/L$  because of increased biomass – BAP increases)

vi) Effluent COD & BOD<sub>L</sub>

$$\begin{split} &Effluent\ COD = S + SMP + 1.42 \, \cdot \, X_v = 1.7 + 32.6 + 1.42 \, \cdot \, 280 = 432\ mg\ COD/L \\ &Effluent\ BOD_L = S + SMP + 1.42 \, \cdot \, f_d \, \cdot \, X_a + S_p = 1.7 + 32.7 + 1.42 \, \cdot \, 0.8 \, \cdot \, 170 + 71 = \\ &= 299\ mg\ BOD_L/L \end{split}$$