


**MAGNETITE SEEDED HIGH GRADIENT MAGNETIC FILTRATION  
TREATMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND DOMESTIC WASTES**

---

**FINAL REPORT  
FY-80**

**November 15, 1980**



**CENTER FOR ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH**  
UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO — U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MAGNETITE SEEDED HIGH GRADIENT MAGNETIC FILTRATION  
TREATMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND DOMESTIC WASTES

FINAL REPORT

FY-80

NOV. 15, 1980

PARTICIPATING PERSONNEL:

Luís de Andino  
Arthur McB. Block  
María de Lourdes Fuentes  
Iván García Muñiz  
José Hernández Betancourt  
Eddie N. Laboy  
Axel Lluch  
Alvin Mirabal  
Héctor Miranda  
Ilse Ortabasi  
Ugur Ortabasi  
María Beatriz Riesco  
Johnny Villamil

REPORT PREPARED BY

Arthur McB. Block

Ana J. Correa

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Description of HGMS Treatment .....	1
2.1 Design of the HGMS Plant .....	5
Figure 1 .....	6
3. Municipal Sewage Treatment .....	7
3.1 Operation Parameters of the HGMS Plant for Sewage Treatment .....	7
Figure II .....	8
3.2 Water Quality Parameters .....	10
3.3 Description of the Experiments .....	10
3.4 Results and Discussion for Sewage Treatment .....	11
3.4.1 Aerobic Activated Sludge Plant .....	11
3.4.2 Plant No. 2 (Guaynabo Plant) .....	12
Table I .....	13
Table II .....	14
Table III .....	15
3.4.3 Tests of Polymer Flocculant .....	17
3.5 Comparison of Performance of HGMS and Activated Sludge .	17
3.6 Economic Analysis of HGMS .....	18
Table IV .....	21
3.7 Summary and Conclusions .....	22
Table V .....	23
4. Industrial Effluent Treatment .....	24
4.1 Effluent Characterization and Testing .....	24
5. Publications and Conferences .....	25
6. Technicals Details of Investigative Projects .....	25
References .....	26

## 1. Introduction

The economic electrical generation of intense high density magnetic fields confined within a cylindrical volume of large cross-sectional area has led to a rapid development of high gradient magnetic separation (HGMS) over the past 10-15 years. Several reviews of HGMS and its applications have appeared recently.<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> In spite of its relatively short period of existence HGMS has enjoyed a good deal of enthusiasm and acceptance in applications involving removal of magnetic materials from liquid and gas streams. In fact, the theory of optimization of separations from liquid<sup>5,6</sup> and gas<sup>7</sup> streams has come under study and is likely to be expanded as combustion engineers begin to apply HGMS to the desulfurization of coal slurries.<sup>8</sup>

## 2. Description of HGMS Treatment

High gradient magnetic separators or filters have been designed to maximize magnetic forces on fine magnetic particulate material suspended in fluid media using a filamentary matrix in a cylindrical pipe cavity situated inside the coil of a large electromagnet of 2000-5000 Gauss intensity. The combination of an efficient magnet and a fine wire matrix permits the economical generation of a very dense magnetic field at the wire surfaces of the matrix and a high gradient of the field near the matrix wire, resulting in strong forces over a large surface area in the magnetic filter bed. Since magnetic field interaction accounts for the filtering holdup forces and the filamentary matrix typically only occupies 3-7% of the cross-sectional area in the cylindrical pipe conducting the flow, there is only a small pumping pressure or head loss during the processing. Indeed, filtration at rates of 7000-10000 liters of liquid per minute per square meter of fluid stream cross-section can be carried out economically.

The entire HGMS process is cyclical in nature. Magnetic particles in the material flowing through the magnetic separator accumulate on the matrix; the separator matrix packs up with separated material from the side where flowing material first meets it. This is the feed part of the cycle which ends before break-through of particles on the other side of that matrix occurs. At that point, the field is switched off and the captured particles can be removed from the matrix system by flushing the canister containing the matrix with air, with an air-water mixture, with a solvent or with water alone. The length of the feed part of the cycle can be determined roughly by assuming that the wires of the matrix can capture 3 to 4 times their own volume of material. This means that a loaded filter canister will contain about 20% by volume of captured particles. The processing rate of the magnetic separation,  $P$  is given by

$$(1) \quad P = V_0 AD$$

where  $V_0$  is the slurry velocity,  $A$  is the cross sectional area of the separator and  $D$  is the duty factor. The duty factor is given by

$$(2) \quad D = \text{Feed Time} / (\text{Feed time} + \text{Dead Time})$$

The dead time is part of the cycle when the feed is not flowing and consists of time to switch the magnet on/off and the time to flushout the magnetically trapped material. For efficient operation the feed time must be much greater than the dead time.

An extension of the process to the filtration of non-magnetic particles and even dissolved materials may be attained by precipitation, aggregation and flocculation of these species with magnetic "seed" particles. This process makes high gradient magnetic filtration applicable to a wide variety of liquid effluent filtration problems.

The magnetic seed material which has been most generally applicable is magnetite,  $Fe_3O_4$ , magnetic (black) iron oxide. While other ferro-magnetic materials may be used in certain cases, magnetite is the obvious choice for several reasons. First, it is strongly ferromagnetic; its induced magnetization is about 40% of that of pure iron. Second, the type of magnetite required is relatively inexpensive (about \$80 per ton). Third, it is quite inert in most systems of interest. Finally, the surface of magnetite appears to be a good adsorbent material. Viruses and algae, for instance, have an excellent affinity for the surface and in general the particles are easily incorporated into flocs formed by inorganic flocculants<sup>9,10</sup>. Other possible seed materials include other less oxidized forms of iron, iron ore, cobalt, and nickel as well as oxides of these and other well-known, relatively strong magnetic substances.

Another possible alternative which has received some attention recently is based upon the use of an electric superconductor magnet to generate ultra-high fields and field gradients in the canister containing the matrix<sup>11</sup>. This system has the advantage that ferromagnetic seed material would not be necessary because potentially cheaper paramagnetic material such as metal oxides would be sufficiently attracted to the matrix wires and could carry out the same or superior adsorption as that demonstrated for magnetite.

After seeding, magnetite or other magnetic particles in wastewater are bound to non-magnetic component solids and solutes normally present by means of adsorption, coagulation, flocculation and co-precipitation.

The process of adsorption includes non-magnetic and ionic components adhering to the surface of the seed particle, or the seed particles adhering to larger non-magnetic aggregations. The adsorptive forces may include one or more than one component in an interfacial double layer and, to enhance adsorption, pH adjustment may be required.

Inorganic and organic compounds can also be added to the candidate waste stream to aid coagulation (alum, ferric chloride) and flocculant (anionic, cationic or neutral surfactants such as Hercofloc, Nalcofloc, Percol, etc.). The organic polymer surfactants generally tend to bridge the gaps between large particles, creating massive floc which are more resistant to disruption by hydrodynamic shear forces upon passage through and during holdup in the magnetic matrix.

Coprecipitation of dissolved organic compounds and weakly magnetic or non-magnetic inorganic ions and compounds is a third factor in HGMS treatment. Hydroxides formed by flocculation produce large surface areas available for adsorption of ionic species and the capacity for adsorption of ions by oxide surfaces is well known. Indeed, it appears that even the thin layer of hydroxide existing on the surface of naturally occurring iron oxides in boiler water can adsorb or occlude calcium and magnesium ions sufficiently well that single pass HGMS treatment can significantly reduce the boiler water hardness. Boiler feed water can also be seeded for removal of copper ions and copper oxides, though in many applications, the quantity of naturally occurring iron oxide and metallic iron is large enough that, again, no seed material is necessary<sup>12,13</sup>. An obvious extension of these processes to remove dissolved material is precipitation followed by flocculation of the resulting suspension with magnetic seed<sup>14</sup>. For specific applications, several natural flocculant/seed combinations have been developed, such as the formulation of aluminum sulfate containing fine particles of magnetite, or a magnetite suspension in which the magnetite particles have received a fine coating of an organic polymer flocculant<sup>15</sup>.

## 2.1 Design of the HGMS Plant

The high gradient magnetic separation runs were carried out using a mobile pilot plant designed and built by Sala Magnetics, Inc. of Boston, Massachusetts. The pilot plant is a self-contained HGMS plant requiring 120/240 V electrical power. It includes pumps, mixers and ancillary equipment to screen influent, dose the influent with alum and magnetite in a slowly agitated polyethylene chamber, subsequently to dose with organic flocculant, magnetically filter, flush the magnetic matrix with a compressed air/water mixture and thicken sludge in a circular settler. The maximum filtration flow rate obtainable using the pilot plant was 38 l/min. with a maximum sludge production of 0.5 kg/hr. The actual flow rates used during the experiments varied between 9 and 18 liters per minute. All operations could be accomplished automatically by setting the appropriate on-board computer/timer. The pilot plant was designed to fit in a large truck trailer chassis which could be transported using a 2 1/2 ton pickup truck. A conceptual diagram of the pilot plant operation is shown in Figure I with major operational steps numbered:


1. Screening.
2. Alum and magnetite addition with pH adjustment.
3. Polyelectrolyte flocculant addition.
4. HGMS processing.
5. Compressed air/water flushing of the matrix.
6. Outflush to a surge tank.
7. Sludge settling/thickening.

In the experiments on municipal sewage, no attempt was made to recover magnetite, though there are several possible methods for post-treatment of the sludge for such recovery<sup>16,17</sup>.



Figure I

PILOT PLANT CONCEPTUAL DIAGRAM



### 3 Municipal Sewage Treatment

Over the past year, studies of HGMS applied to industrial and municipal wastewater in Puerto Rico by the Center for Energy and Environment Research of the University of Puerto Rico have yielded process and cost information relevant to the application of HGMS as a large scale sewage treatment. The purpose of this section is to present performance data for HGMS applied in situ to municipal sewage treatment and to provide approximate cost comparisons for equivalent performance between a secondary aerobic treatment plant and an HGMS treatment system.

The El Conquistador secondary aerobic activated sludge treatment plant is located in Trujillo Alto, Puerto Rico. Its design capacity is  $2 \times 10^6$  liters per day but the actual volume of sewage treated by the plant rarely exceeded 400,000 liters per day during this study.

The Guaynabo Treatment Plant design uses primary treatment and settling followed by trickling filtration through a rock bed. One of the Guaynabo trickling filters along with the mobile HGMS laboratory is shown in Figure II. This plant has a handling capacity of  $10^7$  liters per day of raw sewage.

#### 3.1 Operation Parameters of the HGMS Plant for Sewage Treatment

Optimum feed concentrations of magnetite, alum and polyelectrolyte flocculant were determined using jar tests on 200 ml. samples of wastewater. For alum dosing, the optimum concentration was taken as the lowest concentration providing a maximum decline in turbidity of the wastewater after 4 minutes of stirring and up to 1 minute of settling; for magnetite dosing, the optimum initial experimental concentration was taken to be that which conferred sufficient magnetism on the settled floc that a bar magnet subsequently introduced into the test jar attracted the floc sufficiently well that the clear water could be poured off leaving the bar magnet and the magnetic hydrous aluminum




FIGURE II High Gradient Magnetic Separation Pilot Plant Parked in front of a Trickling Filter Unit of the Guaynabo Sewage Treatment Plant.

oxide/polyelectrolyte precipitates; for polyelectrolyte dosing, the optimum concentration was taken to be the minimum concentration necessary for binding and settling of the gelatinous precipitate produced by the 4-minute agitation of the alum-dosed solution.

Optimum concentrations from the jar tests were then used to calculate the concentrations of the stock solutions to be added to the wastewater stream using typical pumping rates. For example, in the case of alum, the appropriate alum stock solution concentration was approximately determined by assuming a delivery rate of the pump used to dose the alum and applying the following equation:

$$(3) \text{ USC} = \frac{\text{FW} \times \text{OC}}{\text{DR}}$$

in which:

USC = Unknown alum stock solution concentration

FW = Flowrate of waste water influent (present)

OC = Optimized concentration of alum.

DR = Delivery rate of USC (Assumed).

Stock concentrations of magnetite suspension and polyelectrolyte solution are determined in an analogous fashion. In practice, precise rates of delivery were adjusted during a run to maintain a maximum removal of turbidity from the effluent processed using the minimum amount of each additive. The pH adjustment usually involved dropwise addition of 5N sodium hydroxide to the first mixing tank into which the magnetite and alum were being added. The rate of addition of sodium hydroxide was adjusted using a direct reading pH meter during processing.

### 3.2 Water Quality Parameters

The water quality parameter of greatest importance in monitoring the HGMS pilot plant performance was the turbidity, generally measured at 550 nm using a 1 cm path length with a Zeiss PM3-DL single beam spectrophotometer or a portable Hach single beam spectrophotometer having a path length of approximately 2.5 cm. Total suspended solids (TSS) were measured by methods 208 D in "Standard Methods"<sup>18</sup>; biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), and total phosphorous (TP) were determined according to procedures 507 and 425 C,D respectively in "Standard Methods"<sup>18</sup>. The measurements of total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN) were performed on 100 ml. of suitably diluted sample digested with 1.5 gms of potassium sulfate, 0.1 gms. of copper sulfate, 5 ml. of concentrated sulfuric acid nominally 36N and 4 selenized Hengar granules after which the procedure generally described in method 421 was employed with the Nesslerization modification 418 D 4c from "Standard Methods"<sup>18</sup>.

During extended runs of 1 1/2 to 3 hours, samples were taken at the start, halfway through the separation and just before the end of the run. At each sampling point, quantities of both the influent and the effluent after HGMS treatment were collected for comparison.

### 3.3 Description of the Experiments

The HGMS filtration of influent to the secondary activated sludge plant (The El Conquistador Plant, Trujillo Alto, Puerto Rico) was done batchwise with a maximum of 346 liters per run of the shredded fresh influent.

In the latter application the maximum filtering flowrate tested was 11 liters/minute with filter cycles lasting 1 minute. A magnetic field intensity of 2.5 kilogauss was maintained during all runs. Granular alum and Herco-

floc 831 were utilized in all the filtrations. Optimum concentrations of alum, magnetite and polyelectrolyte were of the order of 550 mg/l, 400 mg/l and 3 mg/l, respectively for all runs. No attempt was made to vary these concentrations during an actual extended filtration run.

The on-site filtrations were carried out at the trickling filter plant (The Guaynabo Municipal Plant) over a period of 7 weeks. During that time some 26 filtration runs of fresh sewage were made with filter flow rates ranging from 11-18 liters/minute and a magnet delay or dead time of 4-6 seconds. The longest continuous filtering operation was some 3 1/2 hours in duration and a 2.5 kilogauss magnetic field was used for all tests. Two forms of alum were utilized, granular and liquid. A number of different polyelectrolytes ranging from anionic to nonionic and cationic were jar tested to determine their effectiveness. The high molecular weight synthetic polymers tried during actual filtrations were the following: Betz 1110, 1120, 1130 and 1140; Hercofloc 818, 827 and 831; and Percol 720, 726, 728 and 776. Testing of these polymers was done after the pilot plant system was standardized in terms of the optimum concentrations of alum, magnetite and Hercofloc 831. After testing of a given polymer was completed the system was again brought back to its conventional operational configuration using Hercofloc 831. This was done in order to recheck the system and be sure that the concentration requirements for the waste had not changed during the testing period. Each testing period lasted about 30 to 45 minutes.

### 3.4 Results and Discussion for Sewage Treatment

#### 3.4.1 Aerobic Activated Sludge Plant

Results of HGMS batch-wise pilot plant treatment of shredded and screened effluent from the aerobic activated sludge plant are depicted in

Table 1. Two very typical runs and one superior run were selected as "representative". The average percent reduction in absorbance, TSS, BOD and TP of 96%, 92%, 72% and 87% respectively can probably be reproduced at any given time provided that operating parameters such as quantity of alum, Hercofloc 831, pH etc. can be changed to reflect changes in the incoming sewage. Indeed our experience with the Guaynabo trickling filter plant influent was that very small changes in operating parameters are required to continuously meet pre-specified treatment criteria.

The quantity of alum - 550 mg/l - does seem excessive and, as will be discussed below the concentration of alum necessary for optimum treatment of influent to the Guaynabo Municipal treatment plant was considerably less.

#### 3.4.2 Plant No. 2 (Guaynabo Plant)

In Table II, performance results for HGMS applied to shredded screened influent to the Guaynabo Plant are displayed. These runs represent widely varying influent composition and the HGMS treatment appears to be at least adequate in every case, particularly with respect to phosphorous removal. Average treatment for all runs show removal of absorbance, TSS, BOD and TP to be 88%, 72% and 90% respectively.

Three runs were made on effluent from the primary clarifier of the Guaynabo Plant and the results of HGMS treatment of this waste are shown in Table III. There is a substantial improvement in the wastewater quality although HGMS treatment seems to be more suitable for freshly shredded and screened influent. The average treatment for the 3 runs show removal of absorbance BOD, TP and TN to be about 85%, 56%, 52% and 97% respectively. The continued high performance of HGMS with respect to phosphorous removal may be related to the fact that most of the phosphorous in the effluent was

Table I. Performance of HGMS on Shredded and Screened Influent to the El Conquistador Treatment Plant

Filtration #	Absorbance (550 NM)	TSS (mg/l)	BOD (mg/l)	TP (mg/l)
1 Effluent	.246	195	370	0.62
HGMS Effluent	.011	20	44	0.14
% Reduction	96%	90%	88	77%
2 Effluent	-	189	187	0.65
HGMS Effluent	-	9	65	0.01
% Reduction	-	95%	60%	99%
3 Effluent	.238	118	195	0.48
HGMS Effluent	.009	12	63	0.07
% Reduction	96%	90%	68%	85%
AVERAGE				
% Reduction	96%	92%	72%	87%



Table III. Performance of HGMS on Effluent from the Primary Clarifier of the Guaynabo Treatment.

Filtration No.	Absorbance (550nm)	TSS (mg/l)	BOD (mg/l)	TP (mg/l)	TN (mg/l)
1 Influent After HGMS % Reduction	0.298	-	294	0.69	-
	0.050	-	118	0.003	-
	83%	-	60%	100%	-
2 Influent After HGMS % Reduction	0.197	-	297	0.67	5.46
	0.041	-	135	0.06	2.59
	79%	-	55%	91%	53%
3 Influent After HGMS % Reduction	0.219	-	160	-	-
	0.029	-	99.2	-	-
	88%	-	38%	-	-
4 Influent After HGMS % Reduction	0.455	400	341	0.53	7.02
	0.042	52	106	0.005	3.49
	91%	88%	69%	99%	50%

Table II. Performance of HGMS on Shredded and Screened Influent to the Guaynabo Treatment Plant.

Filtration No.	Absorbance (550 nm)	TSS (mg/l)	BOD mg/l	TP (mg/l)	TN (mg/l)
1 Influent	0.224	1500	348	0.63	-
After HGMS	0.036	150	84	0.14	-
% Reduction	84%	90%	76%	78%	-
2 Influent	0.224	1500	300	0.66	-
After HGMS	0.022	250	83	0.01	-
% Reduction	90%	83%	72%	99%	-
3 Influent	0.174	1250	130	0.26	-
After HGMS	0.007	75	63	0.01	-
% Reduction	96%	94%	52%	96%	-
4 Influent	0.510	-	590	0.64	-
After HGMS	0.027	-	65	0.01	-
% Reduction	95%	-	89%	98%	-
5 Influent	0.483	378	336	0.78	-
After HGMS	0.024	43	88	0.03	-
% Reduction	95%	89%	74%	96%	-
6 Influent	0.324	196	278	0.82	-
After HGMS	0.033	16	92	0.06	-
% Reduction	90%	92%	67%	93%	-
7 Influent	0.427	340	232	0.86	-
After HGMS	0.046	16	47	0.21	-
% Reduction	89%	95%	80%	76%	-
8 Influent	0.401	326	311	0.72	8.01
After HGMS	0.018	2	106	0.12	3.87
% Reduction	96%	99%	66%	83%	52%
9 Influent	0.161	56	-	-	-
After HGMS	0.021	20	-	-	-
% Reduction	87%	64%	-	-	-
10 Influent	0.364	220	97	0.27	-
After HGMS	0.034	18	43	0.018	-
% Reduction	91%	92%	56%	93%	-
11 Influent	0.147	96	180	-	-
After HGMS	0.024	16	50	-	-
% Reduction	84%	83%	72%	-	-
12 Influent	0.149	138	194	-	-
After HGMS	0.031	20	30	-	-
% Reduction	79%	86%	85%	-	-

in the form of orthophosphate which precipitates very well as a complex aluminum hydroxyphosphate and, as a consequence, ought to be removed very efficiently in the HGMS process.

Visual observations of the sewage entering the plant on dry and sunny days were strikingly different from those made on rainy days. This change in effluent could also be noticed in a change in the requirements of alum, which were generally higher on rainy days. Alum proved to be the most critical and variable of the additives used for magnetic filtration. The quantity required to produce a rapid precipitation of curdy flocs, varied from as low as 90 mg/l to as high as 190 mg/l. On the average, for Guaynabo, alum concentrations of 130 mg/l gave positive results. Granular versus liquid alum made no difference in the requirement of alum needed for filtration. However liquid alum was much easier to handle than the granular form.

Magnetite concentrations as low as 100 mg/l and as high as 1000 mg/l were tried; but it was observed that 250 mg/l was enough for a good filtration of raw sewage. Concentrations higher than 250 mg/l did not improve the filtration and did not lengthen the filter cycle as had been expected. Concentrations of 180 mg/l and lower resulted in a considerable quantity of flocculated material escaping from the magnetic matrix. This was probably due to the decreased incorporation of the magnetic particles in the flocs. It is interesting to note, however, that on the average a magnetite concentration equal to 1.6 times the concentration of suspended solids present was sufficient for an acceptable filtration. This is far lower than the conventional recommended dose rate which is about 3 times the concentration of TSS<sup>19</sup> in many applications.

### 3.4.3 Tests of Polymer Flocculant

Hercofloc 831, a synthetic polymer was the polyelectrolyte utilized in all filtration experiments conducted over an extended period. A number of other polymers were also tested on raw sewage from the trickling filter plant but always for periods of time shorter than 1 hour. Concentration of this moderately anionic polymer ranged from as low as 1.0 mg/l to as high as 20 mg/l. It was observed that a 1.5 mg/l concentration gave as good results as higher concentrations, while at concentrations as low as 1.0 mg/l the precipitate agglomerates formed were not large and yielded easily to disruptive hydrodynamic shear forces while passing through the magnetic matrix. Of the rest of the polymers tested only two produced good-sized flocs and the filtrate in each case showed a generally higher absorbance value than did the filtrate using Hercofloc 831. With the highly anionic Betz 1120 a reduction in absorbance of 97.3% was observed and a percent reduction in BOD of 77.8 was obtained. The moderately anionic Betz 1110 produced a reduction of absorbance of 73.2% and large flocs. It should be pointed out that all of these polymers were tested at pH's which did not require adjustment (i.e. between 6.3 - 6.5).

### 3.5 Comparison of Performance of HGMS and Activated Sludge

The HGMS treatment was superior to that observed over an 8 month period for the El Conquistador secondary aerobic activated sludge plant (operated at 20% capacity) with respect to TSS and TP. However, the El Conquistador plant was capable of removing 85-92% of the influent BOD, while the HGMS treatment rarely exceeded 80% removal. While none of the experiments was run without prior planning, fine tuning of HGMS treatment was not part of the scope of the pilot plant trials and it is believed that BOD removal in excess

of 85% can be realized on a routine basis with little additional experimentation. Indeed, HGMS treatment of wastewater and combined sewage and storm overflow indicate that 90% or higher BOD removal may be reasonably expected<sup>19</sup>.

### 3.6 Economic Analysis of HGMS

In order to place seeded HGMS in a cost/benefit perspective, cost estimates for construction, operation and maintenance were carried out for a  $4 \times 10^6$  liter (1 million gallon) per day (MGD) plant operating during the 3rd quarter of 1980. The analysis is designed for comparison with the same capacity aerobic activated sludge plant with a performance equivalent to the HGMS plant (Table IV). The cost of the land on which either plant could be installed was not included, though the land area requirements for HGMS are certainly no greater than 1/2 those for an aerobic activated sludge plant. This fact may be very important for small, densely populated islands, such as Puerto Rico where suitable available land for municipal use as a sewage treatment plant area may cost in excess of \$200 per square meter. If  $2000 \text{ m}^2$  (roughly 1/2 acre) is required for construction of an aerobic plant of the designated capacity compared with  $700 \text{ m}^2$  for the HGMS plant, the savings in land, alone, using the HGMS plant is considerable.

Construction costs are \$741,313 using estimates for a dedicated HGMS plant<sup>20</sup> and adjusted for 3rd quarter 1980 at an annual increment of 9%. The cost represents design, construction and installation of a fully automatic, self-contained  $4 \times 10^6$  liter/day plant of the following description.

It incorporates pre-treatment (screening and degritting), sludge dewatering, and magnetite seed recovery subsystems in addition to the basic seeded HGMS process. The solids operation i.e. sludge dewatering and magnetite reclamation, would function during a single shift only and chemical storage facilities would permit a 30-day uninterrupted operation period. The control systems would allow continuous operation requiring only a daily operation inspection. This plant would have a back-up system for units critical to process function. The estimated cost includes standard instrumentation and data logging equipment.

Estimated construction costs for a  $4 \times 10^6$  liter/day municipal aerobic activated sludge sewage treatment plant was obtained from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) data for the years 1973-1977<sup>21</sup>. The cost data was adjusted as described above to 3rd quarter 1980. The actual cost, \$2,578,816, includes all unit process installation: shredders, screens, pumps, digesters, sludge drying beds, chlorination chamber, etc.; site preparation, instrumentation and laboratory. Operation would require 1 shift operator and 1 inspector weekly. No backups are included in the base design. Function of the plant would be uninterrupted except for maintenance of digester sections, probably comparable to the operation schedule of the HGMS system.

According to these estimates, capital expenditures are 72% higher for a secondary aerobic activated sludge plant when compared with the HGMS system.

Operation and maintenance costs provide a substantially different perspective. The total estimated yearly operation and maintenance cost for HGMS during 3rd quarter, 1980 in the  $4 \times 10^6$  liter/day plant is \$138,335. This cost can be broken down as shown in Table IV into the following accounting categories: additives for processing, including chemicals, reagents, magnetite

etc. - 40.1%; electrical power - 22.2%; repairs and replacements - 21.9% and operator labor - 15.8%.

Estimated operational and maintenance total cost for a  $4 \times 10^6$  liter/day conventional secondary aerobic activated sludge treatment plant operating between 90 - 110% capacity during 3rd quarter 1980 is \$89,482. Again, the cost is based upon EPA derived data for 1973-77 and was adjusted to 1980 using the simple dollar inflation estimate of 8.3% for 1978, 79 and 80.

The investment return or crossover point in the operation/maintenance, costs of HGMS versus capital expenditure costs for aerobic activated sludge digestion plants depend strongly on how the capital expenditure of the latter is financed. A small municipality might reasonably expect to sell a bond issue paying 10% interest annually with monthly compounding and a 20 year maturation rate. In such a case, the difference in cost between the aerobic activated sludge plant and the HGMS is given by the following equation

$$(4) \quad D = (.00965) (240) (CA-CH)$$

in which D is the difference in cost over 240 monthly compounded periods between CA, the capital expenditure for an HGMS plant. The factor 0.00965 is the monthly payment necessary to pay off a \$1.00 loan over 20 years at 10% annual rate compounded monthly<sup>23</sup>. The un-discounted difference in total costs between the 2 plants becomes substantial considering financing: \$4,255,656.90.

If the operation and maintenance costs are assumed to increase at a reasonable inflation rate of 9% per year, the difference in costs between the HGMS and the aerobic activated sludge plant over a 20 year period is calculable using the following series:

$$(5) \quad TDOM - IDOM (1+1.09^2 = \dots + 1.09^{19})$$

Table IV. Cost Comparison of 1 MGD HGMS Plant with an Aerobic Activated Sludge Secondary Treatment Plant, 3rd. Quarter 1980.

Cost	HGMS Treatment	2°Aerobic Treatment
Construction	\$ 741,313	\$ 2,578,816
Operation and Maintenance		
Processing Additives	55,472	
Electrical Power	30,710	
Repairs	30,295	
Labor	21,858	
Total	\$ 138,335	\$ 89,482



in which TDOM is the total difference in operation and maintenance costs over a 20 year period at 9% annual inflation and IDOM is the initial (1 year) difference in operation and maintenance costs between on HGMS plant and a secondary aerobic activated sludge plant. Calculating IDOM from Table IV and substituting into the series, TDOM = \$ 2,697,950.50.

If a 20 year plant life is assumed, the HGMS plant seems an attractive alternative with a net saving of \$1,577,706.40. However, the crossover point for the costs of the 2 processes occurs soon after the 20 year assumed lifetime namely at 24.5 years. The financial analysis is summarized in Table V.

### 3.7 Summary and Conclusions

The performance of seeded HGMS treatment of municipal wastes is comparable to aerobic activated sludge treatment. The HGMS treatment produces a dense, fairly easily dewaterable waste sludge which can be reclaimed for seed material. From the standpoint of capital expenditure and land use, an HGMS plant is a more attractive alternative than an aerobic activated sludge plant of  $4 \times 10^6$  liter/day capacity. However, maintenance and operation costs of the HGMS plant may make the aerobic plant competitive in the long term. The economic analysis might have favored the HGMS plant more, if the cost benefit of magnetite seed recovery and reuse had been included<sup>20</sup> and if a reasonable statewide index for average municipal land costs could have been derived.

Another aspect which favors HGMS is its electrical power requirements which, despite the use of high field electromagnets, is believed to be substantially lower than those necessary for 100% capacity operation of the aerobic activated sludge plant<sup>17,20</sup>.

Table V. Economic Analysis of Differences in Total Capital Expenditure and Operation/Maintenance Costs for Aerobic Activated Sludge Plant and HGMS Plant.

	<u>Cost AASP- Cost HGMS</u>	<u>Cost HGMS- Cost AASP</u>
Capital Expenditure 20 year, 10% annual financing rate	\$4,255,656.90	
Total Operation/Main- tenance cost for 20 years operation		\$ 2,697,950.50
Total Operation/Main- tenance cost for 22 years operation		\$ 3,321,676.50
Total Operation/Main- tenance cost for 24 years operation		\$ 4,062,725.40
Crossover point for capital expenditure and operation/main- tenance expenditure	24.5 years	

---

#### 4 Industrial Effluent Treatment

In December 1979, a project was begun with SK&F Lab. Co., Guayama, Puerto Rico to determine if wastes from its process units could be treated using HGMS. Results of tests made for purposes of gauging feasibility are contained in quarterly reports 1 and 2.

Basically, it was concluded that HGMS was only applicable if a substantial part of the waste had been acted upon by microbes in the aerated lagoon - x - 814. On those occasions when biological activity was inhibited or suspended in the lagoon through high pH or ionic strength load shocks, HGMS treatment was successful at a treatment level of about 10% - 20% COD removal, nowhere near sufficient to approach compliance.

On the other hand, COD removal of 30-40% using HGMS was routinely possible when the aerobic lagoon treatment was sufficient to lower the COD to 1000 mg/l or less. Thus, a preliminary step of converting organic loads to biological (i.e. cellular) colloidal material appeared to be necessary in order to effectively treat the lagoon wastes via HGMS.

Parameters of lagoon function were partially mapped during effluent characterization and our recommendation of segregation and separate disposal of blending and dilution of the caustic scrubber blowdown appears to have been adopted by SK&F Lab. Co. This is a very useful first step.

##### 4.1 Effluent Characterization and Testing

Effluent from manufacturing and production processes at SK&F Lab. Co., Cidra, P.R. and Millipore Corp., Cidra, P.R. were characterized with respect to suitability of treatment using aerobic activated sludge, aerobic lagooning and magnetic filtration. Rum slops from Bacardi Corp. and from Puerto Rico Distillers were treated to a level of 50-70% reduction

in absorbance, but only after mixture with raw sewage at a ratio of 1 part stillage to 5-10 parts raw sewage. This again indicates that HGMS is not very effective for loadings which are primarily soluble organics and which do not have colloidal cellular material present.

## 5 Publications and Conferences

Articles have been forwarded to journals: Revista Colegio de Químicos de Puerto Rico and Journal of the Water Pollution Control Federation. The former is entitled: "Pilot Plant Studies of High Gradient Magnetic Filtration at the Guaynabo Treatment Plant" by A.McB. Block, U. Ortabasi, M.B. Riesco, E.N. Laboy, L. de Andino, A. Mirabal, M.L. Fuentes, H. Miranda, I. García and J. Villamil.

The latter is entitled: "Sewage Treatment in Puerto Rico Using High Gradient Magnetic Separation" by A.McB. Block, M.B. Riesco and U. Ortabasi.

A conference entitled: "Análisis Económico de Tratamiento de Aguas Albañeras Usando Filtración Magnética de Alto Gradiente" was presented at the Association of Chemists of Puerto Rico Annual Meeting, October 23, 1980.

## 6 Technical Details of Investigative Projects

Technical details of projects undertaken in HGMS during 1980 are described in HGMS quarterly reports No. 1-3. Copies are available on request.

## References

1. Kolm, H.H., Oberteuffer, J. and Kelland, D., "High Gradient Magnetic Separation". *Scient. Amer.* 233 (5), 47 (1975).
2. Allen, D.M., Sargent, R.L., Oberteuffer, J.A. and Nowack, H.K.H., "High Gradient Magnetic Filtration - a Process for Municipal and Industrial Wastewater". *Industrieabwasser*, 20 (1978).
3. Oder, R.R., "High Gradient Magnetic Separation Theory and Applications". *IEEE Trans. Magn.* MAG-12, 428 (1976).
4. Liu, Y.A., ed., "Industrial Applications of Magnetic Separation". *IEEE Publ. No. 78CH1447-2 MAG* (1979).
5. Watson, J.H.P., "Theory of High Intensity Magnetic Separation". *Filtr. Sep.* 14, 242 (1977).
6. Watson, J.H.P., "Theory of Capture of Particles in Magnetic High-Intensity Filters". *IEEE Trans. Magn.* MAG-11, 1957 (1975).
7. Lawson, W.F., Jr., Simons, W.H. and Treat, R.P., "The Dynamics of a Particle Attracted by a Magnetized Wire". *J. Appl. Phys.* 48, 3213 (1977).
8. Sladek, T.A. and Cox, C.H., "Coal Beneficiation With Magnetic Fluids", *Coal Process. Technol.* 5, 19 (1979).
9. Bitton, G., Gifford, G.F. and Pancorbo, O.C., "Removal of Viruses from Water by Magnetic Filtration". *U.S. NTIS PB Rep. #PB-261494* (1976).
10. Mitchell, R., Bitton, G., DeLatour, C. and Maxwell, E., "Magnetic Separation: A New Approach to Water and Waste Treatment". *Prog. Water Technol.* 7, 349 (1975).
11. Oder, R.R. and Horst, B.I., "Wastewater Processing with High Gradient Magnetic Separators". *Proc. 2nd. Nat'l. Conf. Complete Water Reuse 887* (1976).
12. Harland, J.R. and Nichols, R.M., "High Gradient Magnetic Filters for Boiler Water Treatment". *Proc. Int. Water Conf., Eng. Soc. West. Pa.* 37, 193 (1977).
13. Palmer, R.E., Calderwood, A.S., Troy, M. and Sargent, R.L., "Magnetic Filtration of Feed water Corrosion Products". *Proc. Amer. Power Conf.* 40, 969 (1978).
14. DeLatour, C., "Seeding Principles of High Gradient Magnetic Separation". *J. Amer. Water Works Assoc.* 68, 443 (1976).
15. Watson, J.H.P., Personal communication. (1978).

16. Block, A.McB., De Andino, L., Laboy, E.N., Mirabal, A., Ortabasi, U., Riesco, M.B. and Villamil, J. "Processing of Raw Sewage Using Magnetic Separation". Scient. Staff Contrib. CEER to Tech. Cong. Investig. Conserv. Energ. Resources, San Juan, Puerto Rico. p. 1 (1979).
17. Ortabasi, U. ed., "An Assessment of Magnetic Filtration: A New Approach to Puerto Rico's Effluent Pollution Problems" CEER/DOE Tech. Publ. (un-numbered) (1979).
18. APHA-AWWA-WPCF, "Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 14th. ed." APHA, 1015 Eighteenth St., NW; Washington, D.C. 20036 (1975).
19. Allen, D.M., "Treatment of Combined Sewer Overflows by High Gradient Magnetic Separation", MERL - U.S. EPA Contract No. 68-03-2218.
20. Original cost estimates obtained from the engineering staff, Sala Magnetics, Inc.; 247 Third Street; Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142 (1980).
21. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Construction Costs for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants: 1973-77". EPA 430-9-77-013 (1977).
22. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Analysis of Operations and Maintenance Costs for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Systems". EPA 430-9-77-015 (1977).
23. "Financial Compound Interest and Annuity Tables". 5th. ed. C.H. Gushee, ed. Financial Publ. Co., Boston (1970).