Overwhelmed and Overloaded? Do More with Less by Increasing Capacity and Resiliency with IFAS

Mark Maroney, P.E.



Texas Assoc. of Clean Water Agencies January 31, 2020

# What is IFAS?

Integrated Fixed Film Activated Sludge

 Hybrid Process: Fixed Film + Suspended Growth
 Immersed media added to conventional activated sludge
 Increases biomass inventory

#### Integrated Fixed-Film Activated Sludge (IFAS) Process



Biomass Growth on Media Courtesy: Headworks, Inc.

#### To Be Clear... IT IS NOT HONEYCOMB CEREAL BITS!!!!



### Colorado IFAS Plant



#### **IFAS Media Retention Screens**



# Why We Looked At IFAS

- Allison WWTP biologically overloaded
- Existing plant not designed for TCEQ added ammonia nitrogen limit of 12 mg/l
- Plant has trouble with solids loadings and spikes due to meat packing plant discharge



### ALLISON WWTP DESIGN FLOW

- •Original Const. at 2.0 MGD: **1966**
- •Expansion to 5.0 MGD: 1984
- •Rated Capacity:

Average Daily: 5.0 MGD

2-Hr. Peak: 15.0 MGD

•Current Avg. Daily Flow: 2.8 MGD

### **Allison Design Basis**

|      | Original      |             |            |
|------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|      | <u>Design</u> | <u>2019</u> |            |
| BOD5 | 230 mg/l      | 273 mg/l    | 19% Higher |
| TSS  | 230 mg/l      | 308 mg/l    | 34% Higher |
| ΤΚΝ  |               | 58 mg/l     |            |

(MAX LOADINGS BOD5 940 mg/l – TSS 1,400 mg/l

#### **TCEQ Discharge Parameters**

|       | <u>Then</u> | Now     |
|-------|-------------|---------|
| BOD5  | 20 mg/l     | 20 mg/l |
| TSS   | 20 mg/l     | 20 mg/l |
| NH3-N | none        | 12 mg/l |

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

- 1: Add Aeration Basin Capacity (Single-Stage Nitrification)
- 2: Retrofit Existing Aeration Basins to IFAS System
- 3: Add Aeration Basins and Secondary Clarifiers (Two-Stage Nitrification)
- 4: Add Primary Clarifiers
- 5: Add Equalization Basin

#### Alternative Comparison

| Alternative                    | Advantages  | Disadvantages  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 – New Aeration Basins for    | ✓ Allows a phased approach from 12 to 3 mg/L  | x Less buffer for shock loads without changing                                 |
| Additional Capacity            | ✓ Same operation as existing process  | MLSS   |
| (Single-Stage Nitrification)   | ✓ Increases capacity of aeration basins   | x Additional land area   |
|                                | ✓ Lowest capital cost   | x Requires modification to existing aeration                                   |
|                                | <ul> <li>Allows a phased approach</li> </ul>  | basins – structural condition  |
| 2 – Retrofit Existing Aeration | ✓ Utilize existing infrastructure   | x More aeration required   |
| Basins to MBBR/IFAS            | <ul> <li>Operationally stable/robust environment for<br/>autotrophic bacteria in varying organic and<br/>ammonia loading</li> </ul> | x Maintaining operation during construction                                    |
|                                | ✓ Allows for independent control of nitrifiers  | x Highest capital cost   |
| 3 – New Aeration Basins and    | <ul> <li>Additional buffer against shock loads</li> </ul>   | x Additional equipment to maintain   |
| Secondary Clarifiers (Two-     | <ul> <li>More stability of ammonia oxidizing bacteria</li> </ul>  | x Operation/process different from existing                                    |
| Stage Nitrification)           | (AOBs) than single-stage  | x Additional land area   |
|                                | ✓ Allows a phased approach  | x Odorous sludge produced by primary   |
|                                | <ul> <li>Primary sludge favorable thickening and</li> </ul>   | clarification  |
| 4 – New Primary Clarifiers     | dewatering characteristics  | <ul> <li>x Higher sludge production – solids handling modifications</li> </ul> |
|                                |   | x Additional land area   |
|                                | ✓ Could allow for isolation of toxic loadings   | x Not a viable long-term solution without                                      |
|                                |   | additional aeration basin capacity   |
|                                |   | x Odors generated from storage of influent                                     |
| 5 – New Equalization Basin     |   | x Instrumentation to determine when to divert                                  |
|                                |   | flows to EQ basins   |
|                                |   | x Additional land area   |

# IFAS Advantages

Lowest capital cost of the alternatives ✓ Allows a phased approach ✓ Increase treatment in same reactor volume Resistance to shock loads and washouts Improve settling and clarifier performance Operationally stable/robust environment for autotrophic bacteria in varying organic and ammonia loading

# **EXISTING IFAS FACILITIES VISIT** (City Staff, Consultants and Equip. Reps)

- •Metro Denver WWTP Denver, Co.
- •Williams Monaco WWTP Colorado
- •Broomfield WWTP Broomfield, Co.
- •Crow Creek WWTP Cheyenne, Wy
- •Dry Creek WWTP Cheyenne, Wy

Feb. 2019

# **EXISTING AERATION BASINS**



### IFAS DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

- Upstream ¼" screening critical (bar screens)
- Normally operates a higher DO levels
- Coarse bubble aeration recommended to keep media in suspension
- Media retaining screens required to keep media in the aeration basins
- Basin level monitoring recommended due to potential screen blinding
- Possible issues with foaming

#### ANOTHER DAY IN PARADISE

# QUESTIONS?