

Membrane bio-reactor (MBR): Effect of operating parameters and nutrients removal

by

MD. ABU HASAN JOHIR



University of Technology, Sydney

A thesis submitted in fulfillment for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Faculty of Engineering & Information Technology
University of Technology Sydney (UTS)
New South Wales, Australia
September 2015.

Certificate of authorship

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

I also certify that this report has been written by me and the help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the report 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, September 2015

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my 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 would like to express his humble respect to A/Prof. Dr. Jaya Kandasamy, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering (FEIT), UTS, for his kind help and encouragement to complete this study. I would like to thank Professor H. H. Ngo and Mr. Rami Haddad for their support while working in the Environmental and Hydraulic laboratories.

I appreciate the great help of Dr. P. Loganathan, Dr. A. Sathasivan, Prof. A. Grasmick, Prof R. BenAim and Dr. H. K. Shon, Dr Robert, Dr P. Hagare and would like to thank them for their valuable advice, discussions and support during my work. I would like to thank Dr. Rupak for his advices and guidance's. Sincere thanks are given to Dr. Vinh, Nadnita, Dr Sherub, Dr Leonard, Dr Muna, Dr. Thamer, Dr. Ben, Dr. Nur, Dr. Jeong, Dr. Gayathri, Jasmin, Danious, Sukanyah, Woo, and staffs in the Research Office for their generous help, friendship and companionship.

I wish to acknowledge UTS (APA) and NCED for their financial support during my study. I wish to express my deepest appreciation, gratitude and thanks to my beloved family members for their endless love, encouragement and spiritual support.

Md. Abu Hasan Johir

Sydney, 2015

Table of Contents

Certificate of authorship	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
List of Figures	ix
List of Tables	xiii
List of Journal Publications	xvi
Nomenclature.....	xvii
Abstract.....	xix
CHAPTER 1	1-1
INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1. Background.....	1-2
1.2. Objectives of this Study	1-6
1.3. Structure and major contents of this thesis	1-6
CHAPTER 2	2-1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2-1
2.1. Background.....	2-2
2.1.1. Configuration of MBR process.....	2-2
2.2. Removal of organics and nutrients by MBR.....	2-5
2.3. Operating factors of MBR.....	2-8
2.3.1. Solid retention time (SRT) and hydraulic retention time (HRT)...	2-10
2.3.2. Organic loading rate and F/M ratio	2-11
2.3.3. Characteristics of biomass in-terms of soluble microbial product (SMP) and extracellular microbial products (EPS).....	2-12
2.4. Operation of MBR in treating saline waster.....	2-13
2.5. Membrane Fouling	2-16
2.5.1. Fundamentals of membrane fouling.....	2-16
2.5.2. Classification of membrane fouling	2-17

2.5.3. Factors affecting membrane fouling.....	2-19
2.6. Fouling control strategies.....	2-24
2.6.1. Aeration.....	2-24
2.6.2. Adsorbent addition.....	2-27
2.6.3. Periodic backwashing or cleaning.....	2-28
2.7. Physico-chemical process for removing nitrate and phosphorus.....	2-29
CHAPTER 3	3-1
EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	3-1
3.1. Background.....	3-2
3.2. Experimental materials	3-2
3.2.1. Activated sludge.....	3-2
3.2.2. Synthetic wastewater.....	3-2
3.3. Experimental methods	3-3
3.3.1. Laboratory scale high rate MBR with and without suspended media	3-3
3.3.2. Laboratory scale MBR operated at different OLRs and salinity	3-8
3.3.3. MBR-ion-exchange hybrid system.....	3-12
3.3.4. Membrane filtration adsorption hybrid (MFAH) system	3-15
3.3.5. Batch equilibrium adsorption studies	3-17
3.3.6. Batch adsorption kinetic studies.....	3-17
3.4. Analytical methods.....	3-19
3.4.1. Mixed liquor suspended solids (MLSS) and mixed liquor volatile suspended solids (MLVSS)	3-19
3.4.2. Sludge volume index (SVI)	3-20
3.4.3. Specific oxygen uptake rate (SOUR)	3-20
3.4.4. Extraction of soluble microbial product (SMP) and extracellular polymeric substances (EPS)	3-21
3.4.5. Nutrients and chemical oxygen demand (COD) analysis.....	3-22
3.4.6. Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) measurement	3-22
3.4.7. Molecular weight distribution (MWD) of organic matter	3-23
3.4.8. Fluorescent analysis.....	3-23
3.4.9. Characteristics of organic matters.....	3-23
3.4.10. X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurement	3-24
3.4.11. Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR).....	3-24
3.5. Membrane measurement.....	3-24

3.5.1. Membrane resistance measurements	3-24
3.5.2. Extraction of membrane foulant	3-25
3.5.3. Membrane cleaning.....	3-25
3.6. Cluster analysis.....	3-26
CHAPTER 4	4-1
INFLUENCE OF ORGANIC LOADING RATE, IMPOSED FLUX AND SALINITY ON THE PERFORMANCE OF MEMBRANE BIO-REACTOR (MBR).....	4-1
4.1. Background.....	4-2
4.2. Results and discussion on the effect of OLR.....	4-2
4.2.1. Performance of MBR on the removal of organic and nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) operated at different OLR.....	4-2
4.2.2. Effect of OLR on membrane fouling	4-6
4.2.3. Fractionation of organic matter of MBR effluent, SMP, EPS and foulant by LC-OCD	4-10
4.2.4. LC-OCD chromatogram of organic matter of MBR effluent, SMP, EPS and foulant	4-12
4.3. Influence of imposed flux on membrane fouling reduction in submerged membrane bioreactor (SMBR)	4-16
4.3.1. Organic matter and nutrients removal	4-16
4.3.2. Effect of imposed flux and aeration rate on membrane fouling	4-21
4.3.3. MWD of SMP and EPS at different imposed flux	4-25
4.3.4. Characterization of effluent and foulant.....	4-30
4.3.5. Practical implications	4-33
4.4. Effect of salt concentration on membrane bioreactor (MBR) performances: detailed organic characterization	4-34
4.4.1. Dissolved organic carbon (DOC) removal	4-34
4.4.2. Ammonia removal	4-39
4.4.3. Characterization of organic matter.....	4-42
4.4.4. Transmembrane pressure (TMP) development in MBR	4-48
4.4.5. Cluster analysis	4-51
4.5. Summary	4-53
CHAPTER 5	5-1

INFLUENCE OF SUPPORT MEDIA IN SUSPENSION FOR MEMBRANE FOULING REDUCTION IN SUBMERGED MEMBRANE BIOREACTOR (SMBR)5-1

5.1. Background.....5-2

5.2. Results and discussion on operating parameters.....5-2

5.2.1. Effect of operating flux and aeration rate on membrane fouling5-2

5.2.2. Effect of GAC in suspension on membrane fouling reduction5-4

5.2.3. Organic and nutrient removal5-6

5.2.4. Molecular weight distribution (MWD) of organic matters of MBR effluent, sludge and foulant.....5-9

5.2.5. Excitation Emission Matrix (EEM) of organic matter of MBR effluent, sludge and foulant5-12

5.3. Effect of the different particle sizes of GAC as suspended in membrane bio-reactor5-15

5.3.1. Biomass concentration and sludge properties.....5-15

5.3.2. Organic, ammonia and phosphate removal5-16

5.3.3. Organic characteristics of SMBR effluent with and without the addition of GAC in SMBR.....5-21

5.3.4. Effect of GAC particle size on membrane fouling reduction5-24

5.4. Summary5-27

CHAPTER 66-1

REMOVAL AND RECOVERY OF NUTRIENTS BY ION EXCHANGE FROM HIGH RATE MEMBRANE BIO-REACTOR (MBR) EFFLUENT6-1

6.1. Background.....6-2

6.2. Zirconium (IV) hydroxide on phosphorus removal6-4

6.2.1. Characterization of Zr hydroxide6-4

6.2.2. Effect of time and adsorbent dose on phosphate adsorption6-5

6.2.3. Effect of pH on phosphate adsorption6-6

6.2.4. Equilibrium adsorption modelling at different pH, temperature, and in the presence of co-existing ions6-9

6.2.5. Adsorption kinetic modelling6-12

6.2.6. Adsorption thermodynamics6-13

6.2.7. Submerged MFAH system with addition of Zr hydroxide.....6-14

6.2.8. Submerged MFAH system with repeated additions of Zr hydroxide6-16

6.3. Ion exchange as post treatment to MBR on nutrients removal.....	6-19
6.3.1. Hydrated ferric oxide (HFO) on phosphorus removal.....	6-19
6.3.2. Purolite A520E and A500P on nutrients removal	6-22
6.3.3. Effect of the two purolite ion-exchange column in series on nutrients removal.....	6-24
6.3.4. The recovery of phosphate ions and nitrogen in ion-exchange columns.....	6-25
6.4. Regeneration of ion exchange resins	6-26
6.5. Advantages and cost analysis of different ion exchange resins.....	6-27
6.6. Summary	6-28
CHAPTER 7	7-1
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	7-1
7.1. Summary of the major findings of this study.....	7-2
7.1.1. Effect of OLR, imposed flux and salt concentration on organic and nutrient removal.....	7-2
7.1.2. Effect of OLR, imposed flux and salt concentration on membrane fouling	7-4
7.1.3. Incorporation of suspended media (GAC) in MBR for fouling reduction	7-4
7.1.4. Ion exchange as post treatment to MBR to remove nutrients	7-5
7.2. Recommendations for future studies.....	7-6
References	R-1

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. MBR configurations (a) side-stream and (b) submerged.....	2-3
Figure 2.2. Nitrogen transformations in biological treatment process (Source: Sombatsompop, 2007)	2-7
Figure 2.3. Fouling mechanisms for MBR operated at constant flux is presented in (Source: Le-Clech et al., 2006).....	2-17
Figure 2.4. Schematic representation of different fouling rates during long-term operation of full-scale MBRs (Drews, 2010).....	2-18
Figure 2.5. Schematic illustration of the formation and removal of removable and irremovable fouling in MBRs (adapted from Meng et al., 2009).	2-18
Figure 2.6. Factors influencing membrane fouling in the MBR process (Adapted from Chang et al., 2002).....	2-20
Figure 2.7. Inter-relationships between different operating factors and permeability loss in lab scale MBRs (Source: Drews, 2010).....	2-22
Figure 3.1. Laboratory scale membrane bioreactor (membrane area = 0.2 m ² , pore size = 0.14 μm, volume of reactor = 10 L)	3-4
Figure 3.2. Experimental set up of membrane bioreactor (MBR)	3-8
Figure 3.3. Profile of gradual loading of salt in MBR	3-12
Figure 3.4. Experimental set up (membrane bioreactor (MBR) followed by purolite (A500P and A520E) ion-exchange column).....	3-13
Figure 3.5. Extraction procedure of SMP and EPS from mixed liquor samples.....	3-22
Figure 4.1. Effect of OLR on the conversion of NH ₄ -N into NO ₃ -N (HRT = 8 h, SRT = 40 days, volume of the reactor = 4 L).....	4-6
Figure 4.2. Effect of OLR on membrane fouling (HRT = 8 h, SRT = 40 days, volume of the reactor = 4 L)	4-8
Figure 4.3. Correlation between OLR with membrane fouling and hydrophobic and hydrophilic fraction of organic (HRT = 8 h, SRT = 40 days, volume of the reactor = 4 L).....	4-9
Figure 4.4. LC-OCD chromatogram of MBR effluent, SMP, EPS and foulant (OLR = 1.0 kgCOD/m ³ .d, HRT = 8 h, SRT = 40 days, volume of the reactor = 4 L).....	4-14

Figure 4.5. Temporal variation of membrane resistance at different imposed flux and aeration rates (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; membrane pore size = 0.14 μm; volume of reactor = 10 L; SRT = 20 days; OLR = 1.5 kg COD/m ³ .day).	4-24
Figure 4.6. Correlation between filtered volume before getting rapid TMP rise with imposed flux and aeration rates (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; membrane pore size = 0.14 μm; volume of reactor = 10 L; SRT = 20 days; OLR = 1.5 kg COD/m ³ .day)	4-25
Figure 4.7. MWD of SMP and EPS in MLSS at different fluxes (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; membrane pore size = 0.14 μm; aeration rate = 1.2 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h; volume of reactor = 10 L; SRT = 20 days; OLR = 1.5 kg COD/m ³ .day).....	4-29
Figure 4.8. MWD of organic matter of filtrate and foulant (backwash water) (Flux = 20 L/m ² .h; aeration rate = 1.2 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h; membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; membrane pore size = 0.14 μm; volume of reactor = 10 L; SRT = 20 days; OLR = 1.5 kg COD/m ³ .day)	4-32
Figure 4.9. Profile of specific removal (average) of organic (DOC) and NH ₄ -N with different salt concentrations.....	4-38
Figure 4.10. Profile of MLSS, MLVSS, and SOUR (average) with different salt concentrations.	4-38
Figure 4.11. Dissolved organic nitrogen (DON) concentration present in biopolymer at different salt concentration in MBR mixed liquor.....	4-48
Figure 4.12. TMP development with time in MBR at different salt concentration (Flux 2.5 L/m ² .h; 1 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h).....	4-50
Figure 4.13. Cluster analysis of DOC concentration at different load of salt (a) MBR effluent and (b) mixed liquor (S.C = salt concentration).....	4-52
Figure 5.1. Effect of filtration flux and aeration of membrane resistance (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; reactor size = 10 L; SRT=20 days).....	5-3
Figure 5.2. Effect of suspended media on membrane resistance (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; reactor size = 10 L; SRT = 20 days)	5-5
Figure 5.3. MWD distribution of organic matter in the MBR A) effluent; B) SMP; C) EPS and D) foulant with and without suspended medium (flow rate = 25 L/m ² .h; aeration rate = 1.0 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h; suspended medium (GAC) @ 2g/L of volume of reactor).....	5-11

Figure 5.4. EEM distribution of A) effluent; B) SMP; C) EPS and D) foulant (flow rate = 25 L/m ² .h; membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; aeration rate = 1.0 m ³ /m ² _{membrane area} .h; reactor size = 10 L; SRT = 20 days).....	5-13
Figure 5.5. EEM distribution of MBR A) effluent; B) SMP; C) EPS and D) foulant (flow rate = 25 L/m ² .h; aeration rate = aeration rate = 1.0 m ³ /m ² _{membrane area} .h; with suspended media GAC @ 2g/L of volume of reactor).	5-14
Figure 5.6. Transmembrane pressure (TMP) development profile with time with and with the addition of different particle sizes of GAC (A = without GAC; B = with GAC particle size of 300 - 600 μm; C = with GAC particle size of 150 - 300 μm; D = with GAC particle size of 600 - 1200 μm).	5-24
Figure 6.1. XRD pattern of Zr hydroxide.....	6-4
Figure 6.2. FTIR spectrum of Zr hydroxide.....	6-5
Figure 6.3. Effect of contact time and adsorbent dose (doses are shown as legends within the figure) on the removal of phosphate by Zr hydroxide (initial phosphate concentration 10 mg-P/L)	6-6
Figure 6.4. Effect of pH on phosphate adsorption by Zr hydroxide (Zr hydroxide dose 0.1 g/L).....	6-8
Figure 6.5. Equilibrium phosphate adsorption isotherms as influenced by (a) temperature, (b) pH, and (c) co-existing anions and Langmuir adsorption model fitting.....	6-9
Figure 6.6. Equilibrium phosphate adsorption isotherms as influenced by (a) temperature, (b) pH, and (c) co-existing anions and Langmuir adsorption model fitting.....	6-11
Figure 6.7. Effect of time on P concentration in the effluent in MFAH system with addition of Zr hydroxide (1 g/L) for different initial P concentrations	6-15
Figure 6.8. Effect of time on P removal efficiency in MFAH system with with addition of different doses of Zr hydroxide (Inlet concentration 10 mg-P/L).	6-16
Figure 6.9. Effect of repeated additions of Zr hydroxide (5 g/L) to MFAH system on the phosphate removal at (a) 5 L/m ² .h filtration flux and two inlet P concentrations and (b) 10 mg/L inlet P concentration and two filtration fluxes.....	6-18

- Figure 6.10.** PO_4^{3-} removal by HFO from SMBR effluent (0, 1, 5 and 10% of HFO by mass with anthracite coal as inert material was used as filter medium; influent PO_4^{3-} concentration to the post treatment HFO adsorption column was 2.2 mg/L).....**6-21**
- Figure 6.11.** Comparison between purolite A520E and A500P (bed height = 6 cm; velocity = 2.5 m/h, the concentration of $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ and $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ of the MBR effluent was 3.1 and 11 mg/L respectively)**6-23**
- Figure 6.12.** Effect on nutrient removal of two types of purolite ion-exchange resin columns in series (velocity = 2.5 h, the concentration of $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ and $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ of MBR effluent was 4.18 and 9 mg/L respectively).....**6-24**

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Comparison between MBR configurations (Source: Sombatsompop, 2007)	2-4
Table 2.2. Characteristics of different types of membranes (Adapted from Fane, 2002)	2-5
Table 2.3. Summary of operation conditions of aerobic membrane bioreactor for different wastewaters (Adapted from Sombatsompop, 2007)	2-9
Table 2.4. Typical ranges of the different fouling rates occurring at full-scale MBR (Source: Drews, 2010)	2-19
Table 2.5. Relationship between various fouling factors and membrane fouling (Adapted from Meng et al., 2009)	2-21
Table 2.6. Comparison of relevant conditions and fouling results (HF, hollow fibre; FS, flat sheet) (Source: Drews, 2006).	2-23
Table 2.7. Aeration conditions for different full-scale MBRs (Source: EUROMBRA, 2006).....	2-26
Table 3.1. Membrane characteristics used in this study.....	3-5
Table 3.2. Operating conditions of laboratory scale SMBR with and without suspended media.....	3-6
Table 3.3. Composition of synthetic wastewater.....	3-7
Table 3.4. Membrane characteristics used in this work	3-9
Table 3.5. Laboratory scale hollow fibre MBR operated at different OLRs and salinity	3-9
Table 3.6. Composition of synthetic wastewater.....	3-10
Table 3.7. Typical chemical and physical characteristic of A-500P and A520E	3-14
Table 3.8. Concentrations of the constituents of synthetic wastewater.....	3-16
Table 4. 1. Effect of OLR on the removal of DOC and nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous) (HRT = 8 h; SRT = 40 days).....	4-5
Table 4.2. Fractionation of OM by LC-OCD of bio-reactor effluent, SMP and EPS operated without membrane (OLR = 1.0 kgCOD/m ³ .d).....	4-15
Table 4.3. Removal of organic matter and nutrients by MBR operated at different imposed fluxes (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; membrane pore size= 0.14 µm; volume	

of reactor = 10 L; SRT = 20 days; OLR = 1.5 kg COD/m ³ .day; aeration rate = 1.2 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h).....	4-20
Table 4.4. Removal of DOC and NH ₄ -N by MBR with and without salt (gradual addition) concentration (HRT = 8 h)	4-37
Table 4.5. Characterization of organic matter in MBR effluent operated at different gradual loading of salt.....	4-46
Table 4.6. Characterization of organic matter in MBR mixed liquor operated at different gradual loading of salt.....	4-47
Table 5.1. R _{sc} ; R _{pb} , R _m and R _t at different operating flux and aeration rate (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; reactor size = 10 L; SRT = 20 days).....	5-4
Table 5.2. R _{sc} ; R _{pb} , R _m and R _t at operating flux of 25 L/m ² .h with and without GAC in suspension at different dose and aeration rates:.....	5-6
Table 5.3. Effect of operating flux on organic matter removal and on nitrification at an aeration rate of 1.5 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; reactor size = 10 L; SRT = 20 days):	5-8
Table 5.4. Effect of suspended media on nutrients removal operated at a aeration rate of 1.5 m ³ /m ² .membrane area.h (membrane area = 0.2 m ² ; reactor size = 10 L; HRT = 2 h; SRT = 20 days):	5-9
Table 5.5. Biomass concentration and sludge properties with and without the addition of GAC in SMBR	5-16
Table 5.6. Removal of organic, ammonia and phosphate with and without the addition of GAC in SMBR (all the concentrations are in mg/L).....	5-20
Table 5.7. Organic characteristics of SMBR effluent with and without the addition of GAC in SMBR (all the units are in mg/L).....	5-23
Table 5.8. R _t , R _c and R _p with and without the addition of different particle of GAC (membrane resistance, R _m = 0.59 x 10 ¹² m ⁻¹)	5-26
Table 6.1. Langmuir model parameters for phosphate adsorption at different temperatures, pHs, and in the presence of nitrate and sulphate.....	6-12
Table 6.2. Pseudo first- and second-order adsorption rate constants and calculated and experimental q _e values for different Zr hydroxide doses (initial phosphate concentration 10 mg P/ L)	6-13

Table 6.3. The thermodynamic parameters for the adsorption of phosphate on Zr
hydroxide6-14

Table 6. 4. Estimation of retention of nutrients in the purolite ion-exchange column.....
.....6-26

List of Journal Publications

- ❖ Johir, M. A. H., Aryal, R., Vigneswaran, S., Kandasamy, J., & Grasmick, A. (2011). Influence of supporting media in suspension on membrane fouling reduction in submerged membrane bioreactor (SMBR). *Journal of Membrane Science*, 374(1), 121-128.
- ❖ Johir, M. A. H., George, J., Vigneswaran, S., Kandasamy, J., & Grasmick, A. (2011). Removal and recovery of nutrients by ion exchange from high rate membrane bio-reactor (MBR) effluent. *Desalination*, 275(1), 197-202.
- ❖ Johir, M. A. H., Vigneswaran, S., Sathasivan, A., Kandasamy, J., & Chang, C. Y. (2012). Effect of organic loading rate on organic matter and foulant characteristics in membrane bio-reactor. *Bioresource technology*, 113, 154-160.
- ❖ Johir, M. A., George, J., Vigneswaran, S., Kandasamy, J., Sathasivan, A., & Grasmick, A. (2012). Effect of imposed flux on fouling behavior in high rate membrane bioreactor. *Bioresource technology*, 122, 42-49.
- ❖ Johir, M. A., Shanmuganathan, S., Vigneswaran, S., & Kandasamy, J. (2013). Performance of submerged membrane bioreactor (SMBR) with and without the addition of the different particle sizes of GAC as suspended medium. *Bioresource technology*, 141, 13-18.
- ❖ Johir, M. A. H., Vigneswaran, S., Kandasamy, J., BenAim, R., & Grasmick, A. (2013). Effect of salt concentration on membrane bioreactor (MBR) performances: detailed organic characterization. *Desalination*, 322, 13-20.

Nomenclature

A	=	The membrane surface area (m ²)
ASTM	=	American Standard Testing and Methods
BOD	=	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
BTSE	=	Biologically treated sewage effluent
BOM	=	Biodegradable Organic Matter
COD	=	Chemical Oxygen Demand
Da	=	Dalton
DOC	=	Dissolved Organic Carbon
DOM	=	Dissolved Organic Matter
kDa	=	Kilo Dalton
EfOM	=	Effluent Organic Matter
GAC	=	Granular Activated Carbon
EPS	=	Extracellular Polymeric Substances
HPSEC	=	High Pressure Size Exclusion Chromatography
kPa	=	Kilo Pascal
m.bar	=	Millibar
MWD	=	Molecular Weight Distribution
MF	=	Microfiltration
UF	=	Ultra filtration
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
t	=	Time
TDS	=	Total Dissolved Solid

TMP	=	Trans-membrane Pressure
V	=	Total permeate volume (l)
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

Abstract

Membrane bio-reactor is an efficient, cost effective and reliable treatment process to produce high quality water from wastewater. In this study, a number of submerged membrane bio-reactors (SMBRs) experiments were conducted at different organic loading rates (OLRs) and fluxes (ranging from 2.5 - 40 L/m².h and corresponding hydraulic retention time of 10 - 1.5 h) to investigate their influence on organic and nutrient removal and on membrane fouling. A second set of experiment was also carried out with gradual increase of salt concentration in continuous MBR to assess its performances in this particular scenario (which may occur in coastal areas and in certain industries). The operation of MBRs at low HRT resulted in sudden rise of trans membrane pressure (TMP). The sudden development of TMP was minimized by introducing granular activated carbon (GAC) in MBR as suspended medium. The incorporation of GAC reduced TMP or total membrane resistance by 58% and also helped to remove an additional amount of dissolved organic matter. Further, a set of ion exchange adsorption study was conducted for the removal and recovery of the nutrients from the effluent of high rate MBR. The major findings are summarized below.

The increase of OLR, flux and salt concentration resulted in lower removal of organic and nutrients and also caused higher membrane fouling (i.e. increased transmembrane pressure (TMP) development). The removal efficiency of DOC decreased from 93 – 98 % to 45 - 60 % when the OLR increased from between 0.5 – 1.0 to 2.75 – 3.0 kg COD/m³d. Similarly the removal of ammonia decreased from 83–88% to less than 67% when the OLR was increased to 2.0 – 3.0 kg COD/m³d. The increase of flux (i.e. reducing of HRT) also resulted in 30 - 40 % lower removal of organics and nutrients. The removal of organic and nutrient decreased when the salt concentration was

increased from 0 to 35 g/L. Based on the operating conditions of this study, the suspended media had less effect on nitrification but had an influence on organic removal. However, changing the operating parameters (such as increase of SRT) may improve nitrification rate.

The increase of OLR and salt concentration resulted in higher membrane fouling. Similarly flux and aeration rate also played a major role in membrane fouling reduction. However, the effect of flux on the reduction of membrane fouling was much higher than that caused by aeration rate. A lower flux of 20 L/m² h produced 75 times more water than a higher flux of 40 L/m²h with an aeration rate of 0.6 m³/m² membrane area-h. The reduction of aeration rate from 1.5 to 1.0 m³/m² membrane area-h caused a sudden rise of TMP. The sudden rise of TMP can be minimized by incorporating the medium in suspension in the reactor (to induce surface scouring of the membrane). The incorporation of suspended medium prevented a sudden rise of TMP (total membrane resistance reduced by ~ 58%) by creating an extra shearing effect onto the membrane surface produced by suspended media. It reduced the deposition of particles on the membrane surface by scouring. The addition of GAC also adsorbed some organic matter prior to its entry to the membrane. Nevertheless it is also important to apply a sufficient aeration rate (in our case 1 m³/m² membrane area h) to maintain a good functioning of suspended media in MBR. The aeration helped in scouring and provision of oxygen to microorganisms and maintained the media in suspension. Additionally, the amount and sizes of the suspended medium played major role in fouling reduction. In this study, we found the concentration of suspended media of 2 g/L and GAC size of 300-600 µm was effective in reducing membrane fouling. Therefore a suitable amount and size of suspended medium needed depends on the flux and aeration (or air scour) rate used.

The characteristics of organic matter of SMBRs effluent showed that a range of organic matter (such as amino acids, biopolymers, humics and fulvic acids type substances) was removed by the GAC both by scouring and adsorption mechanisms. A detailed organic matter characterization of membrane foulant, soluble microbial product and extracellular polymeric substances showed that bio-polymer together with humic acid and lower molecular neutral and acids were responsible for membrane fouling along with the deposition of floc particle onto the membrane surface.

MBR usually removes both organic matter and nitrogen from water. However, the removal of nitrogen and phosphorus using a high rate MBR system is not sufficient. It is equally practical to remove nitrogen and phosphorus by physico-chemical processes as post-treatment such as ion exchange/ adsorption. In this study, different ion exchange materials such as purolite (A520E and A500P), hydrated ferric oxide (HFO) and zirconium (IV) hydroxides were used to remove nitrogen and phosphorus from MBR effluent. They all showed ~ 90% removal of nutrients. The nutrients captured on the ion exchanger were later recovered when the ion-exchange was regenerated.