SOUTH AFRICA HAS experienced a shortage in base load electricity supply in recent years, prompting Eskom to demand significant increases to the bulk price of electricity in order to finance new capital expansion projects. Wastewater treatment is typically one of the most energy-intensive activities mandated to local municipalities. As the electricity price in South Africa increases, some local authorities have begun to explore ways to reduce energy costs through enhancements to treatment infrastructure.

The recent trend at wastewater treatment works (WWTWs) in industrialised nations has been to reduce energy costs by implementing technologically complex energy-efficiency or energy recovery solutions that achieve significant reduction in net energy use, but which are associated with high upfront capital investments and onerous operating and maintenance requirements.

To date, there has been much debate in the municipal engineering sector regarding the realistic potential of implementing energy-efficiency objectives in wastewater treatment. To shed some light on the matter, a study was conducted to test the technical and economic potential of different energy-efficient solutions across a range of scales of Western Cape WWTWs and determine what process enhancements are needed.

### TABLE 1 Description of WWTWs investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WWTW</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Rated capacity (2015/16)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zandvliet</td>
<td>City of Cape Town</td>
<td>MBR and BNR/SST</td>
<td>72 Mℓ/day</td>
<td>Upgrade under way (capacity limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td>Swartland LM</td>
<td>MBR</td>
<td>10 Mℓ/day</td>
<td>Upgraded 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riebeek Valley</td>
<td>Swartland LM</td>
<td>BNR/SST</td>
<td>2 Mℓ/day</td>
<td>Upgraded 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darling</td>
<td>Swartland LM</td>
<td>BNR/SST</td>
<td>1.5 Mℓ/day</td>
<td>Due for upgrade (capacity limited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorreesburg</td>
<td>Swartland LM</td>
<td>Extended aeration / SST</td>
<td>1.5 Mℓ/day</td>
<td>Due for upgrade (ageing infrastructure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints around security and the affordability of energy are increasingly driving planning decisions in municipal water and sanitation service provision. 
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Sludge handling and beneficiation model

• Activated sludge modelling of each WWTW
• Analysis of historical influent data and process
• Conceptual design of incremental improvement calculation steps: the following sequential modelling and treatment processes at each WWTW involved the life-cycle costs of the different options at each WWTW.

The determination of energy savings achieved by improvements to the treatment processes at each WWTW involved the following sequential modelling and calculation steps:

• Conceptual design of incremental improvements to treatment process configurations
• Analysis of historical influent data and projections of the future flows and organic and nutrient loads expected at each WWTW
• Activated sludge modelling of each WWTW considering capacity upgrades and different treatment configurations
• Sludge handling and beneficiation modelling at each WWTW considering: biogas generation potential and energy recovery, net electrical energy use, and fuel energy for sludge transportation

The treatment process configuration has a significant impact on the overall energy-efficiency of the WWTW, most significantly due to the aeration requirements of biological treatment processes for the removal of organics and nutrients, as well as the pumping of wastewater flows, and sludge handling and beneficiation. Eight case study treatment process configurations were considered at each treatment works, as summarised in Table 2.

Not all options were considered for each treatment works. For instance, the larger works are already equipped with fine-bubble diffused aeration systems. For these plants, Option 1 is therefore adopted as the ‘baseline’. The options to compost sludge were also not considered in the case of Zandvliet WWTW, where close proximity to residential neighbourhoods and heavy winter rainfall would make such a technology impractical.

Results: Zandvliet WWTW

The results from Zandvliet WWTW indicate that significant energy savings can be enjoyed by adopting more sophisticated treatment options. Given the size of the Zandvliet works, any marginal savings equate to significant energy savings in absolute terms.

While composting options were not considered here, Option 4 (see Table 2) demonstrates a significant reduction in overall plant energy consumption, primarily because installing PSTs will liberate capacity in the existing conventional BNR stream, which is less energy intensive than the existing and proposed MBR streams, reducing the energy required for membrane pumps as well as for aeration.

By recovering energy from the digester biogas (option 5), the plant can achieve a net saving of over 70% against the baseline scenario, and by including pre-treatment and advanced digestion (option 6) this can be augmented further to over 80%. Option 7, on the other hand, incurs a significant energy penalty associated with the transportation of dewatered sludge.

While the ‘business-as-usual’ scenario (option 1) and installing PSTs and mesophilic digestion are the most affordable in terms of capital expenses, they are expensive in terms of OPEX, mostly due to high energy and sludge disposal costs.

In contrast, the options that involve recovery of energy are expensive in terms of CAPEX, but are significantly cheaper to operate.

For the case of large WWTWs, such as Zandvliet, the more sophisticated solutions (Options 5 and 6) are economically optimal when assessed over a 25-year planning period. In addition, the overall economic performance of the works is influenced more by the cumulative effects of operating expenses over time than by the initial capital outlay.

Results: Malmesbury WWTW

The results from Malmesbury WWTW confirm that, at larger works that use MBR technology, the more sophisticated options (Options 5 and 6) are economically optimal when assessed over a 25-year planning period. In addition, the overall economic performance of the works is influenced more by the cumulative effects of operating expenses over time than by the initial capital outlay.

<p>| TABLE 2 Matrix of options considered at each WWTW |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Zandvliet</th>
<th>Malmesbury</th>
<th>Moorreesburg, Darling &amp; Riebeek Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 0</td>
<td>Surface aeration and WAS landfill</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>FBDA</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>WAS composting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Primary settling and WAS and PS composting</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>WAS and PS mesophilic anaerobic digestion and gas flaring</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>Biogas cleaning and energy recovery (CHP)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6</td>
<td>Advanced digestion (pre-treatment &amp; additional dewatering)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7</td>
<td>Centralised advanced anaerobic digestion (pre-treatment and additional dewatering)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
technology, significant energy savings can be enjoyed by adopting more sophisticated treatment options.

The net effective energy use of each of the treatment process options at Malmesbury WWTW came to a final estimated capacity of 21 Mℓ/d (in the year 2045). By installing PSTs (option 3), the plant’s energy demand can effectively be halved, while recovering energy from the digester biogas (options 5/6/7) can achieve a net saving of over 70% against the baseline scenario.

The additional CAPEX required for more complex options results in process efficiency and reduced OPEX, primarily due to the reduced costs of sludge disposal and reduced energy costs. In terms of long-term feasibility, the economically preferred solutions are options 3, 5 and 7. This confirms the major influence of energy costs on overall economic feasibility for larger plants.

The economic feasibility of centralising the sludge treatment plant at the nearby Highlands landfill site (option 7) is further confirmed for Malmesbury WWTW. However, for this option to be viable, it needs to be proven for all of the Swartland WWTWs.

Results: smaller Swartland WWTWs
The smaller WWTWs in Swartland (Moorreesburg, Darling and Riebeek Valley) exhibit similar technical results to one another, all achieving relatively large reductions in energy demand. However, given the scale of these plants, this does not translate to significant reduction in absolute terms.

The results suggest that adopting more complex treatment technologies has the potential to reduce energy demand significantly when compared with the baseline scenarios. However, there are practical limitations to implementing some of these technology options at this scale. It is, therefore, only worthwhile to consider options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 as being technically feasible.

In comparison to the larger works assessed, these treatment works spend a greater proportion on maintenance, labour and sludge disposal than on energy. The relative benefit of implementing energy-efficient treatment technologies is, therefore, less pronounced.

The figures also indicate that, at the smaller WWTWs, savings in energy costs are almost perfectly offset by increased maintenance costs. While economically equivalent, this shift represents an opportunity for social and environmental benefit, as money is directed to the service sector of the economy, rather than to the extractive/energy sectors.

For the smaller treatment works, the relative influence of CAPEX on overall life-cycle costs is greater than for the larger WWTWs. It is also apparent that, while installing fine-bubble diffused aeration, primary settling, and composting of sludge to achieve a stable biosolid suitable for application to fallow land.

For the larger works, the optimum is achieved by the incorporation of further advanced process technologies, including sludge pre-treatment and energy recovery from anaerobic digester gas.

Given the high costs associated with transporting dewatered sludge over long distances, the economic feasibility of centralising energy recovery within a single regional facility is limited, but is still shown to be preferable to the baseline scenarios, where sludge is transported for disposal at landfill.

Conclusions
The results of the study indicate that an optimum energy-efficient process configuration is achieved for the smaller regional treatment works (less than 5 Mℓ/d to 10 Mℓ/d) when they are designed to allow for fine-bubble diffused aeration, primary settling, and composting of sludge to achieve a stable biosolid suitable for application to fallow land.

For the larger works, the optimum is achieved by the incorporation of further advanced process technologies, including sludge pre-treatment and energy recovery from anaerobic digester gas.

Given the high costs associated with transporting dewatered sludge over long distances, the economic feasibility of centralising energy recovery within a single regional facility is limited, but is still shown to be preferable to the baseline scenarios, where sludge is transported for disposal at landfill.
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