#### INTEGRATING BIOLOGICAL FILTRATION TREATMENT SYSTEMS

New England Water Treatment Technology Assistance Center Department of Civil Engineering University of New Hampshire



Vasiliki Partinoudi, M. Robin Collins, Michael Unger, and Peter Dwyer



UNIVERSITY of New Hampshire

# Technology Assistance Centers located throughout the U.S.



- > University of New Hampshire
- > University of Missouri, Columbia
- > Mississippi State University
- > Montana State University

- > University of Illinois, Champaign
- > Western Kentucky University
- Pennsylvania State, Harrisburg
  - > University of Alaska, Sitka

#### **TACs Mission Statement**

The small public water systems Technology Assistance Centers form a network with the common goal to protect public health, improve water system sustainability, and enhance compliance. They do this by applying university resources to address the needs of rural and small public water systems or public water systems that serve Indian Tribes in the following areas:

- Technology Verification
- Pilot and Field Testing of Innovative Technologies
- Training and Technical Assistance

#### **Biological Filtration Systems**

 Riverbank Filtration (*RBF*) sites
 Pilot Slow Sand Filters (*SSF*)
 Biological Activated Carbon (*BAC*) Filtration

#### **Treatment Focus**

> Organic Precursor Removal
 > Microbial Removal

Processes Taking Place During Biological Filtration

#### > Physical / Chemical

- Straining
- Adsorption (transport and attachment)

#### > Biodegradation Processes

- Predation
- Scavenging
- Natural death
- Inactivation
- Metabolic breakdown

#### The Schmutzdecke

German: "Schmutz" = dirt; "Decke" = covering

Definition: "a layer of material, both deposited and synthesized, on the top of the filter bed that causes headloss disproportionate to its thickness" (AWWARF 1991)

#### > 2 Regions

- Biomat (slime)
- Biologically active media

#### Key Biofilter Design Parameters

 Quality of influent water
 Hydraulic loading rate/Flow rate/Seepage velocity
 Media type/size/depth
 Contact time/ Travel time

#### **Common Design Parameters**

Parameter	RBF	SSF	BAC
EBCT	<1 day	3-10 hr	>5 to <15 min
Media Type	Native subsurface material	Sand	GAC/Anthracite
Media Depth	Travel distance 10m-600m	0.75-1.25 m	1-2 m
HLR	Seepage velocity 0.03-1m/hr	0.1-0.3m/hr	5-25 m/hr

#### What is **Riverbank Filtration**?

"Bank filtered water is surface water, seeping from the bank or the bed of a river or lake to the production wells of a water treatment plant. During its ground passage the water quality parameters change due to microbial and physical processes and by the mixing with groundwater" (Fokken, 1995)

### Advantages of RBF

- Multibarrier approach to water treatment
- May attenuate concentration & temperature peaks
- Requires fewer and less skilled operators
  Requires fewer/no chemicals

# Removal Processes Taking Place at an *RBF* Site



# Typical Layout of a RBF Well





Cedar Rapids, IA

Louisville, KY



Total Aerobic Spore Concentrations in the River and the Riverbank Filtrates

Riverbank (Aquifer) Filtration Depth (feet)

#### Source: Wang et al. (2002)



Source: Partinoudi, 2004

#### What is Slow Sand Filtration?

During SSF untreated water very slowly percolates through a bed of porous sand. Below the sand bed is a layer of gravel for support and also at the bottom an underdrain system that collects the filtered water. As water passes through the filter microorganisms colonize the sand grains. Organic and inorganic matter also accumulates at the sticky mat known as schmutzdecke.

# Typical Layout of a Slow Sand Filter



#### Advantages of SSF

May attenuate concentration & temperature peaks

- Inexpensive O&M
- Requires fewer and less skilled operators
- Requires fewer/no chemicals
- Produces almost no sludge



Source: Page (1997)



Source: Page (1997)



Source: Page (1997)







Source: Collins et al. 1989

# Screening Design Column Study

4 Parameters / 2 Levels

 Empty Bed Contact Time: 15 min, 60 min
 Hydraulic Loading Rate: 0.2 m/hr, 0.6 m/hr
 Filter Media Size: based on sieve analysis
 Extent of Biological Ripening: "ripened", virgin

#### Screening Experiment Regults



Unger, 2006

### Length: Diameter (L/d) &



Unger, 2006

#### **Protistan Abundance**



Unger, 2006

# **Temperature Effects on SSF Study** Winthrop, ME



(Sand Coring)

Surface (Influent)

**Bottom** Drain/Backfill (Effluent)

Pilot SSF in Winthrop, ME

110 Gal Tank with Microchallenge Solution • What is Biological Activated Carbon Filtration?

> Two major steps in this process:

- Ozone as pre-oxidation
- Biological Activated Carbon Filtration (Rapid Filtration)

# Typical Layout of a BAC



Source: Amy & Carlson (2005)

#### Advantages of BAC

Has a relatively small footprint
 Can be more easily adjusted/modified
 Can be easily integrated with existing conventional treatment systems

#### DOC Removal vs. EBCT and HLR



DOC ∝ EBCT; DOC ∝ 1/HLR

# Comparison of RBF and SSF based on Partinoudi (2004) and literature values

Parameter	Removal by <b>RBF</b>	Removal by <b>SSF</b>	Removal by <b>SSF</b>
	(Partinoudi, 2004)	(Partinoudi, 2004)	(based on literature)
DOC	41-85%	13-19%	8-25%
Total Coliforms	>1-1.6 logs*	>1.8-2.2 logs	>1-2 logs*
E.coli	>0.3-0.8 logs*	>1.8logs	>3-4 logs*
Aerobic spores	>1.9-3.5 logs*	>2.1-2.3logs*	>2 logs
Turbidity	77-99%	75-90%	60->90%

\* Reduced to detection limit

#### Conclusions

- SSF and RBF are better at removing microorganisms than BAC
- Protists predation typically found in SSF and RBF but not in BAC
- Removal of DOC are comparable except in RBF where groundwater dilution can play a dominant role

RBF is more robust to water quality/variations than SSF and BAC because of greater residence times/travel distances

SSF and BAC are more amenable to modifications/improvements than RBF

#### Acknowledgments

> EPA for funding this project

- Senators B. Smith and J. Gregg for sponsoring the TACs
- The operators and managers of all the treatment facilities involved in these studies.

NE-WTTAC staff and past grad students

