

Application of Filtration in Seawater and Stormwater Treatment

by

MD. ABU HASAN JOHIR



University of Technology, Sydney

A thesis submitted to fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Engineering

**University of Technology, Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology**

July, 2009



University of Technology, Sydney

Application of Filtration in Seawater and Stormwater Treatment

by

MD. ABU HASAN JOHIR

A thesis submitted to fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Engineering

**University of Technology, Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology**

July, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certificate	xv
Acknowledgement	xvi
Abstract	xvii

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION 1-1

1.1 INTRODUCTION	1-2
1.2 ALTERNATIVE SOURCE OF WATER.....	1-3
1.3 NECESSITY OF PRE-TREATMENT	1-6
1.4 DEEP BED FILTER AND FIBRE FILTER AS PRE-TREATMENT	1-7
1.5 OBJECTIVES OF STUDY	1-8

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW 2-1

2.1 SEAWATER AS WATER SOURCE.....	2-2
2.1.1 Seawater organic matter.....	2-3
2.1.2 Inorganic matter in seawater.....	2-3
2.2 STORMWATER	2-4
2.2.1 Stormwater pollutants and their sources.....	2-5
2.3 SEAWATER REVERSE OSMOSIS (SWRO)	2-11
2.4 RO MEMBRANE FOULING	2-12
2.4.1 Inorganic fouling (including scaling)	2-13
2.4.2 Particles/colloids fouling	2-14
2.4.3 Biological fouling	2-14
2.4.4 Organic fouling	2-15
2.5 FOULING INDICES	2-16
2.5.1 Silt Density Index (SDI)	2-17

2.5.2	Modified Fouling Index (MFI)	2-18
2.5.3	Other Fouling Indexes	2-19
2.6	TYPICAL PRE-TREATMENT PROCESSES.....	2-19
2.6.1	Coagulation and flocculation	2-19
2.6.2	Deep bed filtration	2-21
2.6.3	Fibre filter	2-23
2.6.4	Membrane filtration.....	2-24
2.7	STORMWATER TREATMENT MEASURES	2-28
2.8	MEDIA FILTRATION AS A PRETREATMENT OF SWRO	2-35

CHAPTER 3

EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS AND METHODS 3-1

3.1	INTRODUCTION	3-2
3.2	EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS.....	3-2
3.2.1	Seawater.....	3-2
3.2.2	Stormwater.....	3-3
3.2.3	Physical properties of sand and anthracite.....	3-5
3.3	EXPERIMENTAL METHODS	3-5
3.3.1	Flocculation	3-5
3.3.2	In-line- flocculation- deep bed filtration.....	3-6
3.3.3	Fiber filter	3-6
3.3.4	Hybrid pre-treatment systems.....	3-8
	3.3.4.1 Operational conditions.....	3-9
3.3.5	CROSS-FLOW SEAWATER REVERSE OSMOSIS (SWRO) AS POST TREATMENT	3-9
3.3.6	SUBMERGED HOLLOW FIBER MEMBRANE FILTRATION AS POST TREATMENT	3-10
3.4	FIELD MEASUREMENT.....	3-11
3.4.1	Flow rate measurement.....	3-11
3.4.2	Headloss.....	3-12

3.5	ANALYTICAL METHODS	3-12
3.5.1	Turbidity	3-12
3.5.2	pH.....	3-12
3.5.3	Dissolved Organic Carbon (DOC).....	3-12
3.5.4	Molecular Weight Distribution (MWD).....	3-12
3.5.6	Silt density index (SDI) and Modified fouling index (MFI)	3-13
3.6	WATER SAMPLE ANALYSIS.....	3-15

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 4-1

4.1	PRE-TREATMENT FOR SEAWATER.....	4-2
4.1.1	DEEP BED FILTRATION AS PRE-TREATMENT TO SEAWATER REVERSE OSMOSIS (SWRO).....	4-4
4.1.1.1	Effect of filtration velocity and filter media	4-4
4.1.1.2	Effect of in-line flocculation, filtration velocity and filter media.....	4-6
4.1.1.3	Reverse Osmosis (RO) as post treatment	4-8
4.1.1.4	Summary of the performance deep bed filtration as pre-treatment	4-9
4.1.2	FIBRE MEDIA FILTER AS PRE-TREATMENT TO SWRO.....	4-10
4.1.2.1	Effect of in-line flocculation.....	4-10
4.1.2.2	Effect of different packing densities and filtration velocities.....	4-13
4.1.2.3	Summary on fibre filter as pre-treatment to SWRO	4-16
4.1.3	HYBRID FILTER SYSTEM FOR PRE-TREATMENT TO SWRO	4-18
4.1.3.1	Effect of in-line flocculation.....	4-18
4.1.3.2	Effect of different media.....	4-20
4.1.3.3	Summary on the performance of hybrid filtration system.....	4-24
4.2	PRE-TREATMENT FOR STORMWATER.....	4-25
4.2.1	Flocculation	4-26
4.2.2	DEEP BED FILTER AS PRE-TREATMENT TO STORMWATER	4-28
4.2.2.1	Effect of operating parameters of in-line flocculation.....	4-28
4.2.2.2	Submerged hollow fibre membrane as post treatment.....	4-35

4.2.2.3	Summary on the performance of the deep bed filtration and submerged hollow fiber membrane.....	4-38
4.2.3	TREATMENT OF STORMWATER USING FIBRE FILTER MEDIA	4-40
4.2.3.1	Effect of flocculant dose, filtration velocity and packing density	4-41
4.2.3.2	Summary on the performance of the in-line flocculation fibre filtration	4-46
4.2.4	HYBRID FILTER AS PRE-TREATMENT TO STORMWATER	4-47
4.2.4.1	Effect of flocculant dose	4-47
4.2.4.	Comparison between pre-treatments	4-50
4.2.4.3	Summeray of performance of hybrid filter	4-51

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS 5-1

5.1	COMPARISON OF PRE-TREATMENTS TO SWRO	5-2
5.2	ASSESSMENT OF PRE-TREATMENTS TO STORMWATER	5-3

REFERENCES.....R-1

APPENDIX-A.....A-1

NOMENCLATURE

A	=	The membrane surface area (m ²)
ANZECC	=	Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council
ASTM	=	American Standard Testing and Methods
BMP	=	Best Management Practice
BOD	=	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
BTSE	=	Biologically treated sewage effluent
BOM	=	Biodegradable Organic Matter
C _b	=	The concentration of particles in a feed water
COD	=	Chemical Oxygen Demand
Da	=	Dalton
DOC	=	Dissolved Organic Carbon
DOM	=	Dissolved Organic Matter
DAF	=	Dissolved air flotation
DMF	=	Dual media filter
kDa	=	Kilo dalton
EfOM	=	Effluent Organic Matter
GAC	=	Granular Activated Carbon
EPS	=	Extracellular Polymeric Substances
HPSEC	=	High Pressure Size Exclusion Chromatography
IE	=	Ion Exchangers
kPa	=	Kilo Pascal
m.bar	=	Millibar
MFI	=	Modified Fouling Index
MWD	=	Molecular Weight Distribution
MF	=	Microfiltration
MFI-UF	=	Modified fouling index by using ultra filter membrane

MFI-NF	=	Modified fouling index by using nano filter membrane
MWCO	=	Molecular Weight Cut-off
M_w	=	Weight Average Molecular Weight
M_n	=	Number Average Molecular Weight
NF	=	Nanofiltration
NOM	=	Natural Organic Matter
NTU	=	Nephelometric Turbidity Unit
PAC	=	Powdered Activated Carbon
R_m	=	Membrane resistance
RO	=	Reverse Osmosis
SEC	=	Size Exclusion Chromatography
SS	=	Suspended Solids
SWOM	=	Seawater Organic Matter
t	=	Filtration time (s)
THM	=	Trihalomethanes
TDS	=	Total Dissolved Solid
TMP	=	Trans-membrane Pressure
UF	=	Ultrafilter
ULPRO	=	Ultra Low-pressure Reverse Osmosis Membranes
V	=	Total permeate volume (l)
ZVI	=	zero-valent iron
ΔP	=	Applied trans-membrane pressure (Pa)
η	=	Water viscosity at 20 ⁰ C (N s/m ²)
α	=	The specific resistance of the cake deposited
ρ	=	Polydispersity
⁰ C	=	Degree Celsius

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Water supply capacity and desalination status in Australian cities (Source: http://www.ceem.unsw.edu.au/content/userDocs/OzWaterpaper1MRP_000.pdf)	1-4
Table 1.2	Summary of stormwater re-use scheme in Australia (Hatt et al., 2006).....	1-5
Table 2.1	Compositions of seawater (Sheikholeslami, 2007).....	2-2
Table 2.2	Water use and environmental values	2-5
Table 2.3	Types and causes of urban stormwater pollution (CSIRO, 1999).....	2-7
Table 2.4	Comparison the typical range of urban water quality data for Australian catchments and compares this with corresponding global data (Wong et al., 2000)	2-10
Table 2.5	Parameters to be checked in the evaluation of the fouling tendency of water (Mosset et al., 2008).....	2-17
Table 2.6	Characteristics of rapid filters.....	2-23
Table 2.7	Comparing MF and UF Membrane Processes (Wagner, 2001)	2-25
Table 2.8	Comparison of conventional and MF/UF pretreatment (Vedavyasan, 2007)	2-26
Table 2.9	Stormwater treatment methods and techniques and their advantages, disadvantages (Begum et al., 2008).....	2-29
Table 2.10a	Jeddah SWRO Plant (Al-Sheikh et al., 1997).....	2-35
Table 2.10b	Doha Research Plant, Kuwait (Ebrahim et al., 1995).....	2-36
Table 2.10c	Persian Gulf (Bonnelye et al., 2004).....	2-37
Table 2.10d	French Institute of Marine Research (Bonnelye et al., 2004).....	2-37
Table 2.10e	ONDEO Services, Gibraltar (Brehant et al., 2002):	2-38
Table 2.10f	Singapore SWRO (Chua et al., 2003).....	2-38
Table 2.10g	Ashdod, Mediterranean Sea (Glueckstern et al., 2002).....	2-39
Table 3.1	Characteristics of seawater used in this study	3-3
Table 3.2	General Characteristics of Stormwater	3-4
Table 3.3	Physical properties of Anthracite and Sand.....	3-5
Table 3.4	Characteristics of RO membrane used	3-10
Table 3.5	Characteristics of the hollow fibre membrane used.....	3-11

Table 3.6	Characteristics of UF membrane used.....	3-15
Table 3.7	Analytical methods for water sample analysis used in this study.....	3-16
Table 4.1	M_w , M_n and ρ of SWOM before and after in-line flocculation and filtration	4-7
Table 4.2	MFI and SDI_{10} values after different in-line flocculation-filtration (seawater avg. MFI = 256 s/L ² , SDI_{10} = 8.75, pressure = 200 kPa, membrane pore size = 0.45 μ m, membrane dia. = 47 mm, flocculant doase = 1 mg/L).....	4-8
Table 4.3	MFI and SDI_{10} values with and without in-line flocculation (MFI of seawater influent = 136-214 s/L ² , SDI_{10} of seawater influent = 7.40-8.75) ..	4-11
Table 4.4	ΔP and turbidity with and without in-line flocculation (turbidity of initial seawater: 1.75 NTU).....	4-12
Table 4.5	MFI and SDI_{10} values with different packing densities and filtration velocities (MFI of seawater influent = 136-214 s/L ² , SDI_{10} of seawater influent = 7.40-8.75).....	4-14
Table 4.6	ΔP and turbidity with different packing densities and filtration velocities (Average turbidity of seawater: 1.75 NTU).....	4-15
Table 4.7	SDI_{10} and MFI values of hybrid filter system (fibre filtration followed by sand filtration) with and without in-line flocculation of influent seawater (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; MFI of raw seawater: 136-214 s/L ² ; SDI_{10} of raw seawater: 7.40-8.75).....	4-18
Table 4.8	Headloss across the filters and turbidity with and without in-line flocculation of the influent seawater (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; turbidity of raw seawater: 1.95 NTU)	4-20
Table 4.9	DOC values with and without in-line flocculation of the influent seawater after a period of 5 hr of operating time (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; turbidity of raw seawater: 1.95 NTU; average DOC of raw seawater: 2 mg/L).....	4-20
Table 4.10	MFI and SDI_{10} values with different pre-treatment methods coupled with in-line flocculation (1 mg/L dose) of the influent seawater (packing	

	density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; MFI of raw seawater: 136-214 s/L ² ; SDI ₁₀ of raw seawater: 7.40-8.75)	4-21
Table 4.11	Headloss and turbidity with different pre-treatment systems coupled with in-line flocculation (1 mg/L dose) of the influent seawater (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; turbidity of raw seawater: 1.95 NTU).....	4-23
Table 4.12	DOC values with different hybrid pre-treatment methods after a period of 5 h of operating time with in-line flocculation (1 mg/L dose) of influent seawater (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; turbidity of raw seawater: 1.95 NTU; average DOC of raw seawater: 2 mg/L)	4-24
Table 4.13	TOC removal efficiency with and without flocculation (raw water TOC 4.25-8.96 mg/L)	4-31
Table 4.14	MFI value with and without flocculation (raw water MFI 750-950 s/L ²).....	4-33
Table 4.15	Effect of pre-treatment on UF-MFI value (raw water UF-MFI 23400 s/L ²)	4-33
Table 4.16	Pressure drop with different packing densities and filtration velocities.....	4-41
Table 4.17	Turbidity, TOC and colour removal efficiency with and without flocculation (Raw water turbidity 2.5-40 NTU, TOC 3.48-9.52 mg/L, colour 29 to 269 unit PtCo colour)	4-42
Table 4.18	Turbidity, TOC and colour removal efficiency with different packing densities and filtration velocities (Raw water turbidity 2.5-40 NTU, TOC 3.48-9.52 mg/L, colour 29 to 269 unit PtCo colour)	4-43
Table 4.19	MFI with fibre filter of different packing densities and filtration velocities with and without in-line flocculation (MFI of stormwater influent 750-950 s/L ²).....	4-44
Table 4.20	Total and faecal coliform and nutrients removal after fibre filtration at different velocity and flocculants doses (fibre packing density 115 kg/m ³)	4-45
Table 4.21	Heavy metal removal for fibre filtration at different velocity and flocculants doses (fibre packing density = 115 kg/m ³).....	4-46

Table 4.22	Nutrient removal efficiency (velocity through fibre filter as first stage treatment = 40 m/h, fibre packing density 115 kg/m ³ , velocity through media filter as post treatment = 10 m/h).....	4-50
Table 4.23	MFI values after different pre-treatment (raw water MFI = 15500 s/L ²).....	4-51

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Distribution of the world's water (Miller, 2003).....	1-2
Figure 1.2	The existing desalination facilities worldwide by region (Danoun, 2007).....	1-4
Figure 2.1	Reverse Osmosis vs. Osmosis (Source: Younos, 2005).....	2-11
Figure 2.2	Formation of biofilm (Sheikholeslami, 2007)	2-15
Figure 2.3	Classification of fouling compounds. (Mosset et al., 2008).....	2-18
Figure 2.4	Pathogen removal ability of membrane filtration (Adapted from Allgeier et al., 2005)	2-25
Figure 3.1	Schematic diagram of media (Anthracite/Sand/Dual) filter system.....	3-6
Figure 3.2 a	Schematic diagram of fiber filter.....	3-7
Figure 3.2 b	On-site picture of fiber filter.....	3-7
Figure 3.3	Schematic of hybrid system.....	3-8
Figure 3.4	Schematic drawing of cross-flow SWRO unit used in this study	3-10
Figure 3.5	Schematic diagram of the hollow fibre submerge membrane filtration system	3-11
Figure 3.6	SDI and MFI experimental set-up	3-13
Figure 3.7	Cake filtration curve (Boerlage et al., 1997)	3-15
Figure 4.1	Molecular Weight Distribution (MWD) of SWOM (Intensity (mV) vs time)	4-2
Figure 4.2	Effect of Filter media and filtration velocity on turbidity removal (total filter depth = 80 cm, avg. seawater turbidity = 0.82 NTU, FeCl ₃ dose=1 mg/l)	4-5
Figure 4.3	Effect of filter media and filtration velocity on headloss development (total filter depth = 80 cm, FeCl ₃ dose = 1 mg/l, average turbidity of seawater = 0.82 NTU).....	4-5
Figure 4.4	MWD of SWOM with and without pretreatment	4-7
Figure 4.5	Temporal variation trend of filtration flux with and without pretreatment (SR membrane, crossflow velocity = 0.5 m/s, initial pure water flux = 2.94 m/d at 6000 kPa, total feed volume: 5 L, J is filtration flux at a given time and J ₀ is pure water filtration flux).	4-9

Figure 4.6	Pressure development with and without in-line flocculation.....	4-11
Figure 4.7	MWD of organic matter with and without in-line flocculation.....	4-13
Figure 4.8	Pressure development with different packing densities and filtration velocities	4-15
Figure 4.9	MWD of organic matter with different packing densities and filtration velocities (FeCl ₃ dose = 1 mg/L).....	4-16
Figure 4.10	Headloss across the filters with and without in-line flocculation of the influent seawater (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; turbidity of raw seawater: 1.95 NTU).	4-19
Figure 4.11	Headloss across filters for different pre-treatment systems (packing density: 115 kg/m ³ ; filtration velocity of fibre filter: 40 m/h; turbidity of raw seawater: 1.95 NTU).....	4-22
Figure 4.12	Molecular weight distribution of organic matter present in stormwater	4-25
Figure 4.13	Effect of flocculant dose on DOC, color, turbidity removal efficiency and pH, conductivity and Zeta potential.....	4-27
Figure 4.14	Effect of filter operating parameter on headloss development (v = velocity; c = flocculant dose).....	4-29
Figure 4.15	Effect of filter operating parameter on turbidity removal efficiency (raw water turbidity = 2.5-45 NTU; v = velocity; c = flocculant dose).....	4-30
Figure 4.16	Molecular weight distributions of organic matters in stormwater before and after treatment	4-32
Figure 4.17	Effect of pre-treatment of contact flocculation on submerged membrane reactor used as post treatment (dual media; deep bed filter velocity = 10 m/h; flocculant dose = 10 mg/L; hollow fibre membrane area = 0.1m ² ; flow rate = 5 L/m ² .h; aeration rate 3.8 m ³ /m ² membrane area .h; raw water turbidity 25-35 NTU; turbidity after pre-treatment = 0.43-0.69 NTU; raw water TOC = 5.25-6.25 mg/L; TOC after pre-treatment = 2.21-2.93 mg/L).....	4-36
Figure 4.18	Determination of critical flux of submerged membrane reactor using pre-treated water by flux-step method (feed turbidity = 0.43-0.69 NTU; aeration rate = 3.8 m ³ /m ² membrane area.h, membrane area = 0.1m ²).	4-37

Figure 4.19 Effect of aeration rate on critical flux (flow rate = 10 L/m ² .h; feed turbidity = 0.43-0.69 NTU; membrane area = 0.1 m ²)	4-38
Figure 4.20 Pressure drop with and without flocculation (Packing density = 115 kg/m ³ , v = 20 m/h)	4-41
Figure 4.21 Performance of the hybrid filter (fibre+dual media; velocity through fibre filter = 40 m/h; velocity through media filter = 10 m/h; c = flocculant dose; IT = influent turbidity; raw stormwater turbidity = 5-15 NTU; raw stormwater DOC = 2.84-5.96 mg/L)	4-48
Figure 4.22 Organic matter removals by hybrid filter	4-49

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for any degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. And help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Candidature



Md. Abu Hasan Johir

Sydney, July 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author expresses his sincerest gratitude to Professor Saravanamuthu Vigneswaran, Professor of Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology (FEIT), University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia, for his continuous guidance, valuable suggestions, spontaneous encouragement and his various co-operation and efforts throughout the project work. The author should remain ever grateful for his super co-operation by inspecting every phase of the work and for providing his valuable time throughout the project work. The author is grateful to Dr. H.K. Shon, Lecturer, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, (FEIT), UTS for his valuable suggestion, timely advice and encouragement boosted the motive power of the author during many circumstances while carrying out this study. The author would like to express his humble respect to Dr. Jaya Kandasamy, Senior Lecturer, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering (FEIT), UTS, for his kind help and encouragement to complete this study. I would like to thank Associate Professor Dr Hao and David Hooper for their support while working in the Environmental and Hydraulic labs.

I also appreciate the great help of Chinu and would like to thank her for valuable advice, discussions and support during my work. I would like to thank Dr. Lee for his valuable advices and guidance's. Sincere thanks are given to all the people in SIMS (Sydney marine institute, Chowder Bay, Sydney) for their support to do experiments on-site and to Dr. Rupak, Thamer, Ben, Laszlo, Javeed, Wen Xing for their generous help in the experimental phase of this research, and staff in the Research Office for their friendship and companionship.

I wish to acknowledge my co-supervisor, Professor Tally Palmer from the Institute Water for Environment and Resource Management (IWERM) and the graduate school of Faculty of Engineering, UTS for their financial support during my study. I wish to express my deepest appreciation to my beloved family and uncle for their endless love, encouragement and spiritual support.

Sydney, 2009

Md. Abu Hasan Johir

ABSTRACT

Water scarcity is becoming a significant problem throughout the world and the creation of new sources of potable water has been a significant issue worldwide and as a consequence harvesting of stormwater and desalination have become two of the most vital and valuable alternative resources in many countries around the world. Membrane based separation systems (such as reverse osmosis) have been widely used to produce potable water. In membrane separation system membrane fouling is major problem which results in deterioration in membrane performance, lessens membrane life time and increases total cost to treatment plants. As a result, suitable pre-treatment is required which can significantly minimize fouling problems to membrane filtration technique.

The main aim of this study was to assess relative performance of filtration systems as pre-treatment to seawater and stormwater. The pre-treatment systems that were used in this study were deep bed filter (single medium and dual media), fibre filter and hybrid filter (fibre filter followed by media filter). They were assessed in terms of turbidity and organic matter removal, and head loss build-up. The efficiency of the filter as pre-treatment was evaluated in terms of Silt Density Index (SDI) and Modified Fouling Index (MFI).

In this study, two different water sources were used (namely seawater and stormwater). Seawater was chosen mainly for its organic matter together with dissolved solids and stormwater was chosen for highly colloidal substances. Four representative pre-treatments were examined to find out their effectiveness as pre-treatment to different water sources (seawater and wastewater). Another attractive and environmentally friendly pre-treatment of biofilter was not studied in this research as there was concurrent research performed in our laboratory (Chinu et al. 2008)

From the filter experimental results on seawater, it was found that the turbidity removal was high and all the deep bed filters produced more or less the same quality water. There was a slower buildup of head loss for coarser filter medium. The result showed that finer filter media (sand) and dual media filter with filtration velocity of 5 m/h exhibits 70% of turbidity

removal efficiency. The high rate fibre filter used with in-line flocculation removed the 70-80% of turbidity. The turbidity was decreased to 0.16 - 0.49 NTU by fiber filter. The pressure drop (ΔP) on fibre filter with and without in-line flocculation was 33 and 4 mbar respectively. The use of in-line flocculation improved the performance of these filters as measured by the MFI and SDI. After pre-treatment with contact flocculation-filtration and fibre filter the MFI and SDI₁₀ value reduced from 138-256 s/L² to 0.77-2.95 s/L² and from 7.40-8.75 to 2.4-4.8 respectively. On the other hand, the headloss development on dual media filter in hybrid filter system with in-line flocculation of influent seawater to the fibre filter was 11.0 cm. In addition, when different pre-treatment hybrid systems were operated at different filtration velocities (5 and 10 m/h), the MFI and SDI₁₀ was reduced to 1.4-3.6 s/L² and 2.6-3 respectively. A post treatment of reverse osmosis (RO) after an inline-flocculation-dual media filtration showed lower normalized flux decline (J/J_0) (0.35 to 0.22 during the first 20 hours operation) while, seawater without any pre-treatment showed steeper flux decline (0.18 to 0.11 within 20 hours operation) of RO.

The application of deep bed filters, fibre filter and hybrid filter as pre-treatment to stormwater was also experimentally investigated in detail. It was found that the removal efficiency for turbidity, suspended solids and TOC was found to be 95-98%, 99 % and 40-60 % respectively at a flocculant dose of FeCl₃ of 15 mg/L. The phosphorous removal efficiency was relatively good (up to 70%). The removal efficiency for heavy metals such as Cd, Pb, Cr and Ni was found to be very low for all tested filtration systems because concentrations of these metals in the influent were also low. These filters can be used as a pre-treatment to micro/ultra filter. This is demonstrated through MFI measurements. The MFI was reduced from 750-950 s/L² (for stormwater) to 15-9 s/L² (for filtered effluent). Detailed submerged membrane filter experiments conducted with pre-treated water (after dual media filtration) showed that the membrane filter can successfully be used as post-treatment to in-line flocculation-filter at a sustainable flux of 10 L/m².h to remove the remaining solids and pathogens. An increase of air scouring in the membrane unit decreased the pressure development although it did not have any effect on increasing the critical flux beyond 10 L/m².h.