

Reducing the cost of sludge treatment and disposal by implementing thermal hydrolysis for a large wastewater treatment plant.

D. Ferraro¹, A. Jimenez¹, D. Ringoot¹, C. Drossos²

1 Cambi Group AS, Asker, Norway

2 DeltaCo N.&K.DROSSOS, Greece

Keywords: Thermal Hydrolysis Process; Advanced Anaerobic Digestion; Dryers

Email: claudio.drossos@deltaco.gr

Conventional Mesophilic anaerobic digestion (MAD) is an established technology for sludge stabilisation prior to dewatering and disposal. The drawback of MAD is that it requires large digestion volumes and achieves a relatively low efficiency in terms of biogas production, pathogen removal and dewatering. As a result, many utilities are considering an additional thermal drying step for digested and dewatered sludge in order to achieve the minimum product volume with low pathogen levels. This is however, at the cost of substantial capital and operational expenditure. Pre-treatment of raw sludge with the Thermal Hydrolysis Process (THP) prior to MAD alleviates most of the challenges of conventional digestion, dewatering and drying and reduces operational expenses. THP treatment consists of exposing sludge to temperatures of 150 – 165°C at pressures of 5 to 6 bar under saturated steam conditions. At these conditions, sludge viscosity is reduced, complex organic compounds are hydrolysed, cell walls are destroyed, and dewaterability is improved as a result of the destruction of extracellular polymeric substances (EPS). As a result, MAD digesters can be fed at high dry solids concentrations of 10 to 12% DS with reduced HRT (15 days) resulting in a strong reduction of the required digester volume. In addition, biogas production is increased. As dewaterability is improved, there are lower residual sludge amounts and a strong reduction or even avoidance of drying needs. The THP process is typically applied in one of two configurations:

Full THP: This setup treats both primary and secondary/waste activated sludge with THP followed by compact digestion. This configuration achieves a high level of pathogen removal and is commonly applied when the final product (called “biosolids”) is directly land applied. This typically leads to the lowest overall cost for sludge management.

WAS-only THP: This configuration treats only waste activated sludge (WAS) with THP, with primary sludge being fed directly to MAD. This configuration also achieves higher biogas production and improved dewatering; however, it requires somewhat bigger digesters and does not achieve full pathogen removal. The THP system, as it's treating only the WAS, will be smaller and requires less energy. Dryer size and the energy balance of the overall process are also optimised.

This paper describes the business case for a typical, large- scale wastewater treatment plant (approx. 400,000 PE) producing 30 ton of dry Solids (DS)/day of raw sludge and compares three scenarios: conventional MAD followed by thermal drying, Cambi Full THP, and Cambi WAS-only THP followed by thermal drying. OPEX estimates are provided for the 3 cases. Table 1 shows the design basis of the study.

Table 1. Design basis considered in the study

| Description | Unit | Value |
|--|----------------------------------|-------|
| Primary Sludge (PS) | tDS/d | 12 |
| | %VS | 75 |
| | COD/VS (g/g) | 1.7 |
| Waste Activated Sludge (WAS) | tDS/d | 18 |
| | %VS | 70 |
| | COD/VS (g/g) | 1.45 |
| Specific thermal energy during thermal drying | MWh/tH ₂ O evaporated | 0.95 |
| Specific electrical power consumption for thermal drying | MWh/tH ₂ O evaporated | 75 |

As this study shows, THP significantly impacts the required digester volume, the digested and dewatered sludge cake volumes and quality, and the plant's energy balance (in both configurations). In the case of thermal drying, the dryer size, as defined by the water evaporation capacity (tH₂O/hour), is greatly impacted by THP. Full THP with land application avoids the need for thermal drying altogether but relies on an accepted and regulated outlet for high-quality biosolids (this framework does not exist in all countries). The main overview of key design numbers for the three scenarios is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Main results of the compared configurations

| Description | Units | MAD + drying | WAS-Only THP + drying | Δ | Full THP (no drying) | Δ |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| | | Value | Value | | Value | |
| Digester volume | m ³ | 15,000 | 6,394 | -57.4% | 4,091 | -72.7% |
| Biogas production | Nm ³ /day | 7,720 | 9,750 | +26.3% | 10,005 | +29.6% |
| Electricity generation with CHP | kW | - | 180 | - | 858 | - |
| Cake dry solids | % DS | 24% | 30% | +29.2% | 31% | +25.0% |
| Dewatered Sludge | t/year | 29,113 | 20,531 | -29.5% | 19,583 | -32.7% |
| Electrical energy for dryer | MWh/year | 1,601 | 1,027 | -35.9% | - | - |
| Total Thermal energy for dryer | MWh/year | 20,282 | 13,003 | -35.9% | - | - |
| Cake volume after drying | ton/year | 7,764 | 6,844 | -11.8% | - | - |
| Final sludge to be disposed | ton/year | 7,476 | 6,844 | -11.8% | 19,583* | +152.2% |

In addition, an OPEX evaluation is made comparing operational costs for the three scenarios. Based on unit costs as presented in Table 3, the OPEX is evaluated in Table 4.

Table 3. Operational Expense values

| Description | Units | Value |
|--|------------------------|-------|
| Cost of electricity | €/MWh | 150 |
| Sludge disposal cost – Dried cake | €/ton | 40 |
| Sludge –transport cost for hygienised cake | €/ton | 10 |
| Polymer cost | €/kg active | 4,0 |
| Potable water | €/m ³ | 2,0 |
| NH ₄ -N removal cost | €/kgNH ₄ -N | 0,4 |
| External fuel for thermal drying | €/MWh | 50 |
| Chemical cost for boiler | €/ton of water | 1 |

Table 4. OPEX Comparison

| | | MAD + drying | WAS-Only THP + drying | Full THP (no drying) |
|---|--------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Electricity from CHP | Eur/y | - | -236,578 | -1,126,981 |
| Polymer (total) | Eur/y | 441,942 | 457,710 | 488,808 |
| Cake disposal | Eur/y | 310,542 | 273,750 | 195,828 |
| Electricity for THP, digestion, pre/post dewatering | Eur/y | 143,193 | 116,768 | 132,124 |
| Potable water + chemicals for steam | Eur/y | - | 23,482 | 39,031 |
| External fuel for dryer | Eur/y | 130,057 | - | - |
| Electricity for dryer | Eur/y | 240,185 | 153,984 | - |
| NH ₄ aeration (WAS tank) | Eur/y | 51,226 | 72,988 | 70,081 |
| Total OPEX | Eur/y | 1,317,145 | 862,105 | -201,108 |
| Delta (- means savings) | EUR/y | | -455,041 | -1,518,253 |

Conclusion: By applying THP to biological sludge, the operational cost of sludge treatment with thermal drying can be substantially reduced. By using Full THP, drying can be avoided altogether, resulting in the lowest sludge treatment cost.

References

Barber, W. 2020 Sludge thermal hydrolysis. Application and Potential. IWA Publishing, UK.
 Ringoot, D., Reitsma, B., Neef, R. Thermische hydrolyse als de motor voor centrale slibverwerking
 Zikakis, D. 2017 Thermal hydrolysis of waste activated sludge only at the Psytalia WWTP in Athens: operation feedback.