

Oxic chamber

s.w.d. 3.2 m

**Ejemplo # 2 Aireación Extendida
CM tank model**

	mgd	U.S. GPM
wastewater flow	1990 m ³ /day 0.526	365.1
BOD in (mg/L)	147	644.6 lbBOD/day 966.9 lbO ₂ /day
TKN in (mg/L)	35	153.5 lbTKN/day 706.0 lbO ₂ /day
	AOR	1672.8 lbO ₂ /day 69.7 lbO ₂ /hr

oxic cell data

length	26 m	HP/mg	HP for mixing	if CFM for mixing
width	12 m	80	21.1	403 CFM
s.w.d.	3.2 m	90	23.7	
	10.496 (feet)	100	26.4	

	lbBOD/day 1000 cu.ft.	18.3	MLSS	3000	hi speed	low speed
	lbBOD/day acre	8360.8	f/m	0.098	39.8	30.6
total tankage volume	0.264 mg					
total residence time	0.50 days					

AOR	AOR/SO	SOR	HP at 2.5 lb/h per de-rate 5	de-rate 1	de-rate 15	HP/mg	HP for mixing	power density
69.7	0.7	99.6	39.8	41.9	44.3	46.9	80	21.1
69.7	0.6	116.2	46.5	48.9	51.6	54.7	90	23.7
69.7	0.5	139.4	55.8	58.7	62.0	65.6	100	26.4
								HP per 1,000 cu.ft.
								1.13
								1.32
								1.58

quick-and-dirty diffused aeration estimates

CFM for diffused aeration/oxygen tr	1126 CFM	AOR/SOR = .37	1.7% per feet	1464 CFM	2488 m ³ /h
HP estimate for oxygen	40.9 HP			with 1.3 safety factor	
				5.63 psig	388 mbar
				6.13 psig(PeakOverdes)	423 mbar

notes:

2. some presumed TKN is used at full value for HP calculation, although some nitrogen would be used up for normal biological/BOD processes
3. approach would be extended/activated sludge alternative using f/m= c. 0.1 and 300 gpd/sq.ft. for a secondary clarifier
4. Possible preliminary quote:

about 32.8 HP if low speed units
 about 183 1-m tubes at 8 CFM per tube with 1.3 safety fa or suitable disc make/model
 53.2 HP blowers

other related calcs:

secondary clarifier diameter at 300 gpd/sq.ft.	14.4 m	area (m ²)	162.8	3347 ft lb torque	8					
waste sludge flow Qw for various sludge age values, 30 mg/L SSout, unde			0.5 %	Hammer.412						
	WAS (see footnote # 1)	RAS (see foot note #2)	tentative at	hr/day	thickene					
age days	Qw mgd	Qw gpd	Qw gpm/lb/day	dryQw/flow in	Qr mgd	Qr/Q	BFP gpm at 4%	regime	diam. (m)	torque
5	0.0285	28499	19.8	1187.0	5.4 %	0.7095	134.9 %	7.4	5.3	3780
10	0.0127	12672	8.8	527.8	2.4 %	0.7491	142.5 %	3.3	3.5	1681
14.5	0.0078	7760	5.4	323.2	1.5 %	0.7614	144.8 %	2.0	2.8	1029
15	0.0074	7397	5.1	308.1	1.4 %	0.7623	145.0 %	1.9	2.7	981
25	0.0032	3176	2.2	132.3	0.6 %	0.7728	147.0 %	0.8	1.8	421

dry weight sludge as predicted by Hammer.440 Figure 11-40 as a function of f/m known to be "reasonable" for municipal but may differ considerably if industrial ww

lb/day dr	438.6	2 * K * mgd * 8.33 * BOD5 mg/L
tentative BFP gpm for possible inlet SS settin	ballpark/alternate figures at above specified net BFP hours per day	
3.7	3%	1755 gpd
3.1	3.5%	1505 gpd
2.7	4%	1316 gpd

dewatering block subject to review/actual operating regime

foot note # 1 Assuming treated wastewater exits clarifier with say 30 mg/L SS and using entered/calculated tank MLSS,V solving for Qw in sludge age equation (11-12- Hammer.412) for various age settings results in WAS estimates as shown

foot note # 2 Tentative Qr's result from performing somewhat crude mass balance around secondary clarifier (solving for RAS):
 (Q+Qr) * MLSS = Q * 30 mg/L + (Qw+Qr) * underflow SS in mg/L
 Return sludge rates to be fine tuned as will probably operate in an A2/O fashion - more later
 (It all depends how lucky we are with underflow SSs: 0.5 - 2%)

Although not shown, it is assumed some thickener/DAF is used to concentrate settler underflow up to 4%
 (Hammer.443: "As a general rule, the solids content must be at least 4 percent for feasible dewatering")

quotables/summary (tentative)

surface aerators
 retrievable tubes & blowers local sourcing of PE/PVC pipe/panel/other