

Comparing the performance of a High Rate Algal Pond with a Waste Stabilisation Pond in rural South Australia



Alan Neil Buchanan B.V.Sc.
(Hons)

School of the Environment
Faculty of Science &
Engineering

Flinders University

6/6/2014



Early Sanitation:- Latrines inside Housesteads Fort, Hadrians Wall. Northumberland, UK - circa 124 A.D.

CONTENTS

Contents	(iii)
Abstract	(xiii)
Declaration.....	(xv)
Acknowledgements.....	(xvi)
Table of Figures	(xviii)
Table of Tables	(xxxix)
Table of Plates	(xxxviii)
Table of Equations	(xxxix)
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION, HYPOTHESIS & LITERATURE REVIEW	15
1.1 PROJECT AIMS	15
1.2 BACKGROUND	16
1.3 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS	17
1.4 Wastewater disposal and local government in South Australia	17
1.4.1 Funding & Structure of the project – initial plan, modified plan	18
1.5 LITERATURE REVIEW	20
1.5.1 OVERVIEW OF WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT	20
1.5.2 Primary Treatment	23
1.5.3 Secondary Treatment	23
1.5.4 Prevention of Eutrophication	24
1.5.5 Disinfection	24
1.5.7 WASTE STABILISATION PONDS	24
1.5.7.1 The structure of a WSP system	24
1.5.7.11 Dispersed flow hydraulic model for WSP design	40
1.5.7.12 Peclet Number	45
1.5.7.13 Simplified and unified WSP design	46
1.5.7.14 Secondary factors not included in design	47
1.5.7.15 Computational Fluid Dynamics	49
1.5.7.16 Summary of performance prediction and the design of WSPs.	50

1.5.8 The role of facultative ponds in the WSP system	50
1.5.8.1 Zones in facultative ponds	50
1.5.8.2 BOD removal from facultative ponds	51
1.5.8.3 Thermal Stratification in Facultative Ponds	53
1.5.9 THE EFFECT OF WIND ON WSP PERFORMANCE	56
1.5.10 THE ROLE OF MATURATION PONDS IN THE WSP SYSTEM	60
1.5.11 HIGH RATE ALGAL PONDS (HRAPs)	61
1.5.11.1 Definition of HRAP	61
1.5.11.2 The History and Underlying Biology of High Rate Algal Ponds	61
1.5.11.3 Mixing in the HRAP	66
1.5.11.4 Detention Period	67
1.5.11.5 HRAP Depth	68
1.5.11.6 Balancing oxygen production and consumption in HRAPs	71
1.5.12 ALGAL GROWTH	71
1.5.12.1 Reporting Conventions	71
1.5.12.2 Algal Productivity vs Biomass Productivity	72
1.5.12.3 Importance of Algal Growth in HRAPs	73
1.5.12.4 Control of Algal Growth Rate	73
1.5.12.5 Modelling Algal Growth Rates and Biomass productivity	74
1.5.13 Limitations to Algal Growth	77
1.5.13.1 Photo-inhibition limitations to Algal Growth	77
1.5.13.2 Areal density limitations to Algal Growth	79
1.5.13.3 Possible sunlight limitation to algal biomass production	80
1.5.13.4 Possible Ammonia toxicity to algae	80
1.5.13.5 Possible Carbon limitation to algal growth	82
1.5.14 BACTERIAL AND VIRAL DIE-OFF/REMOVAL	84
1.5.14.1 INDICATOR ORGANISMS	85
1.5.15 DISINFECTION IN NATURAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS ...	89
1.5.15.1 BACTERIAL MORTALITY IN WASTE STABILISATION PONDS	90
1.5.15.2 OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CAUSES OF MICROBIAL MORTALITY IN POND WATERS	94
1.5.16 High Rate Algal Pond Disinfection	103

1.5.16.1 Summary of HRAP disinfection	104
1.5.17 CHEMICAL DISINFECTION	105
1.5.17.1 Chlorine	105
1.5.17.2 Chlorine Dioxide	106
1.5.17.3 Ozone	106
1.5.17.4 Ultraviolet	106
1.5.18 NUTRIENT AND BOD5 REMOVAL FROM NATURAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS	107
1.5.18.1 Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) Biology and BOD Removal	107
1.5.18.1.1 THE USE OF BOD IN POND DESIGN	109
1.5.18.2 Nitrogen Biology and N removal	112
1.5.18.3 PHOSPHOROUS BIOLOGY AND REMOVAL	120
1.5.19 COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE OF HRAP AND WSPs	124
CHAPTER 2 MATERIALS & METHODS	133
2.1 The Ponds	134
2.1.1 Original Design of HRAP and rebuilt design –	135
2.1.2 Revised site design	136
2.1.3 HRAP study design (see also Table 2-1 & 2-2)	138
2.1.4 WSP study design.....	138
2.1.5 The WSP at Lyndoch – size and retention times,	139
2.1.6 WSP Bathymetry	140
2.1.8 Measuring flow rates	142
2.2 Water sample collection and analysis	142
2.2.1 Water sampling techniques	142
2.2.2 WSP Sampling Schedule	144
2.2.3 HRAP Sampling Schedule	144
2.3 Water Measurements	146
2.3.2 Water Dissolved Oxygen	146
2.3.3 Water pH	146
2.3.4 Wastewater Ammonia (NH ₄ -N)	146

2.3.5 Wastewater Nitrate (NO ₃ -N)	146
2.3.6 Wastewater Nitrite (NO ₂ -N)	147
2.3.7 Wastewater Orthophosphate (PO ₄ -P)	147
2.3.8 Wastewater Suspended Solids	147
2.3.9 Wastewater Turbidity	147
2.3.9 Wastewater chlorophyll <i>a</i>	148
2.3.10 Wastewater BOD ₅	148
2.3.11 Wastewater <i>E. Coli</i> Enumeration	149
2.4 <i>E. coli</i> and MS2 dark die-off	151
2.5 Data Interpretation and Statistical Analysis	152
2.5.1 Comparing <i>E. coli</i> removal – Log ₁₀ Reduction Values, inlet to outlet ratio, removal efficiency.	152
2.5.2 Predictive Models of Algal and Biomass Productivity	153
2.5.3 Comparison of Algal Productivity model predictions with this data..	153
2.5.4 Modelling <i>E. coli</i> removal	155
2.5.5 Seeking possible causal relationships - Linear Regression, Regression Tree Analysis	156
2.5.6 Comparing nutrient removal performances – daily removal rates, removal efficiency	159
2.5.7 The R statistical and graphics tool	159
2.5.7.1 Comparing distributions between groups	160
a. violinplot	162
b. beanplot	162
2.5.7.2 Time series	163
2.5.7.3 Tree regression analysis.....	163
2.5.8 Dark Die-Off	164
REFERENCES Chapter 2	165
CHAPTER 3 HRAP RESULTS & DISCUSSION	168
3.1 High Rate Algal Pond – Period 1, May 2010 to April 2011 – High Strength Influent (HSI)	168

3.1.1 Environmental Factors – air temperature, wind speed & direction, total solar radiation, UV radiation, rainfall	168
3.1.1.1 Prevailing weather	168
3.1.1.2 Seasons used for comparative performance	169
3.1.1.3 Exceptional weather	169
3.1.2 HRAP Operational Conditions & Wastewater Physico-chemical Parameters	170
3.1.2.1 Air & Water Temperatures	170
3.1.2.2 Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	171
3.1.2.3 pH	172
3.1.3 Wind Speed & Direction	175
3.1.4 Inlet Wastewater	176
3.1.5 Areal and Volumetric Loading Rates	176
3.1.6 Algal Growth in the HRAP fed septic tank effluent	181
3.1.6.1 Biomass & Algal Productivities	183
3.1.6.2 Possible Photo-inhibition	187
3.1.6.3 Possible in-pond light climate inhibition to algal growth	188
3.1.6.4 Possible algal growth limitations by nutrients	189
3.2 Key Performance Indicators – nutrient removal, <i>E.coli</i> LRV, chlorophyll α	190
3.2.1 HRAP1 fed treated septic tank effluent: Performance at three operational depths	192
3.2.1.2 BOD5 Removal	194
3.2.1.3 Inorganic-N Removal	196
3.2.1.4 PO4-P Removal	199
3.2.1.5 Suspended Solids areal density or standing crop	203
3.2.1.6 <i>E. coli</i> LRV	205
3.3 High Rate Algal Ponds – Phase 2, Inlet Water derived from adjacent facultative pond pre-treating septic tank effluent. July 2011 to February 2012 ...	209
3.3.1 Environmental Factors – air temperature, wind speed & direction, total solar radiation, UV radiation, rainfall	209

3.3.2 HRAP2 Operational Conditions & Wastewater Physico-chemical Parameters	210
.....	
3.3.3 Inlet Wastewater Characteristics	211
3.3.4 Algal Growth in the HRAP2 fed effluent pre-treated in a facultative pond.	213
.....	
3.3.5 Key Performance Indicators – nutrient removal, <i>E.coli</i> LRV, chlorophyll α.	214
.....	
3.4 HRAP2 Fed facultative pond effluent: Performance at three operational depths	216
.....	
3.4.1. Nutrient Removal	218
3.4.2 BOD5 Removal	218
3.4.3. Inorganic-N Removal (including NH₄-N)	219
3.4.3. PO₄-P Removal	222
3.4.5 Algal & Alabazod Standing Crop and Productivity	225
3.4.6 <i>E. coli</i> LRV	226
REFERENCES Chapter 3	228
CHAPTER 4 LYNDOKH WSP RESULTS & DISCUSSION.	232
4.1 Environmental Factors – air temperature, wind speed & direction, total solar radiation, UV radiation, rainfall	234
.....	
4.1.1. Prevailing weather	234
4.1.2. Exceptional weather	235
4.1.3 WSP Operational Conditions & Wastewater Physico-chemical Parameters	235
.....	
4.1.3.1 Air & Water Temperatures	235
4.1.3.2 Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	237
4.1.3.3 pH	237
4.1.4 Wind Speed & Direction	237
4.1.5 Pond Temperature as measured by thermistor strings	239
Some sample recordings are shown in Fig 4-3a-d for four different times of year of the pond temperature at 0.3m, 0.45m and 0.65m.....	239
4.2 Inlet Wastewater	241

4.2.1. Inlet flow volumes	241
4.2.2 Inlet wastewater composition	242
4.2.3 BOD5 Loading Rates	242
4.3 Pond Water Physico-chemical Parameters	243
4.3.1 Algal Growth in the Lyndoch WSP system fed septic tank effluent. ..	243
4.4 Lyndoch WSPs: Key Performance Indicators – Nutrient Removal and <i>E. coli</i> Log 10 Reduction Value (LRV).....	251
4.4.1 <i>E. coli</i> removal	255
4.4.2 Inorganic N (including NH ₄ -N) removal	257
4.4.3 BOD5 removal	259
4.4.4 PO ₄ -P removal	261
REFERENCES Chapter 4.....	263
CHAPTER 5 PREDICTING HRAP PERFORMANCE	266
5.1 The need to understand pond performance - for wastewater treatment management and for predicting biomass productivity	266
5.1.1 Performance Prediction by regression tree analysis	268
5.1.2 Performance indicators analysed	269
5-2 Identification of predictors of <i>E. coli</i> Removal	270
5.2.1 The rpart tool for predicting <i>E. coli</i> LRV	271
5.2.2 The randomForest tool	274
5.2.3 The cForest tool	274
5.2.4 Comparison of the relative importance of predictors by the three regression tree techniques	275
5-3 Identification of predictors of BOD5 Removal	278
5.3.1 The rpart tool for predicting BOD5 Removal	278
5.3.2 The randomForest tool for predicting BOD5 Removal Efficiency	279
5.3.3 The cForest tool for predicting BOD5 Removal Efficiency	280
5.3.4 Comparison of the relative importance of predictors by the three regression tree techniques	281
5-4 Identification of predictors of NH ₄ -N Removal Efficiency	283

5.4.1 Comparison of the relative importance of predictors by the three regression tree techniques	284
5-5 Identification of predictors of Biomass Productivity	286
5.5.1 Comparison of the relative importance of predictors by the three regression tree techniques	286
5.6 IDENTIFICATION OF PREDICTORS WHEN DATA IS COMBINED FROM BOTH HRAPs	289
5.6.1 Identification of predictors of <i>E. coli</i> LRV – HRAP 1 & 2 combined.....	289
5.6.2 Identification of predictors of BOD5 Removal – HRAP 1 & 2 combined	291
5.6.3 Identification of predictors of NH4-N Removal – HRAP 1 & 2 combined	294
5.7 Summary of factors that influence the performance of HRAPs	296
REFERENCES Chapter 5.....	297
CHAPTER 6 COMPARING HRAP & WSP PERFORMANCE.	299
6.1 CLIMATE	300
6.1.1 Temperature and Global Solar Energy.....	300
6.2 HRAP 1 AND WSP 1 (Facultative Pond) – both septic tank overflow fed:- PERFORMANCE STATISTICAL SUMMARY	302
6.3 Comparison of inlet wastewater composition to the Lyndoch facultative WSP and the HRAP at Kingston on Murray.	304
6.4 TREATED WASTEWATER PARAMETERS FOR THE LYNDOCH FACULTATIVE WSP AND THE HRAP AT KINGSTON ON MURRAY EFFLUENT PRE-TREATED IN SEPTIC TANKS.	305
6.5 <i>E. coli</i> INACTIVATION	306
6.6 NUTRIENT REMOVAL	308
6.6.1 BOD5 Removal Efficiency	308
6.6.2 NH4-N Removal Efficiency.....	310
6.6.3 PO4-P Removal Efficiency	313
6.7 ALGAL CONCENTRATION & PRODUCTIVITY	315

6.8 STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF THE KINGSTON ON MURRAY HRAP:- FED FACULTATIVE POND EFFLUENT AND LYNDOKH WSP 2 & 3 (MATURATION)	317
6.9 INLET WATER	320
6.10 TREATED WASTEWATER PARAMETERS FOR THE LYNDOKH FACULTATIVE WSP AND THE HRAP AT KINGSTON ON MURRAY FED EFFLUENT PRE-TREATED IN A FACULTATIVE WASTE STABILISATION POND.	322
6.11 <i>E. coli</i> INACTIVATION	324
6.12 NUTRIENT REMOVAL	325
6.12.1 BOD5 Removal Efficiency	326
6.12.2 NH4-N Removal Efficiency	327
6.12.3 PO4-P Removal Efficiency	328
6.13 ALGAL & SUSPENDED SOLIDS CONCENTRATION	329
6.14 COMPARISON OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS	332
6.15 RELATIVE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF WSP AND HRAP WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS	333
6.15.1 Advantages of the HRAP over the WSP	333
6.15.1.1 Land requirement	333
6.15.1.2 Construction Costs	334
6.15.1.3 Performance consistency	334
6.15.1.4 Evaporative Losses	335
6.15.1.5 Desludging	335
6.15.2 Advantages of the WSP over the HRAP	335
6.15.2.1 Paddlewheel and power supply	335
REFERENCES Chapter 6	336
CHAPTER 7 A MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR <i>E. coli</i> REMOVAL IN THE HRAP.	338
7.1 BACKGROUND	339
7.2 Development of a mathematical model for the prediction of <i>E. coli</i> inactivation within continuously fed HRAPs	341
7.2.1 Model Structure	341
7.3 Sunlight mediated <i>E. coli</i> inactivation	342
7.4 Dark (light independent) die-off	343

7.4.1 Establishing a figure for <i>E. coli</i> Dark Die-Off Rate	343
7.4.2 Results obtained from <i>E. coli</i> dark inactivation rate determinations in vitro	344
7.5 Exclusion of other well-known die-off related factors (pH and DO) from the model.....	347
7.5.1 Other model inputs	347
7.5.2 HRAPIN output and the ability to observe effects of changing input parameters	348
7.6 Intensive Study Periods	350
7.6.1 Results of Intensive Study Periods	350
7.6.2 Comparing combined intensive study results to model predictions	355
7.7 HRAPIN Model Summary	358
REFERENCES Chapter 7.....	359
CHAPTER 8 SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS	364
PROJECT AIMS	364
RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS	365
8.1 WSP Performance Summary	366
8.1.1 The environment & pond environment	366
8.1.2 Understanding WSP Performance Indicators	367
8.1.3 Algal Concentration and Productivity	368
8.1.4 Overall Summary	369
8.2 HRAP Performance Summary	369
8.2.1 The environment & pond environment	369
8.2.2 Understanding HRAP Performance Indicators	370
8.2.3 Algal Concentration, Algal and Albazod Productivity	372
8.2.4 Predicting HRAP Performance	374
8.2.5 HRAPIN Model for <i>E. coli</i> removal from HRAPs	375
8.3 Comparing HRAP & WSP performance	376
8.4 Optimising HRAP Design and Operating Criteria for South Australian conditions.....	379
8.5 Has the hypothesis been proven?	381

8.6 Recommendations for further work	382
REFERENCES Literature Review	384

ABSTRACT

This study compares the performance of two natural wastewater treatment systems; waste stabilisation ponds (WSP) and High Rate Algal Ponds (HRAP) in rural South Australia. The systems were located in similar geographic and climatic zones, East North East of Adelaide.

The WSP treated the domestic wastewater from the township of Lyndoch, with an approximate population of 1,750 inhabitants, and daily treatment plant influent of 165 kL. The HRAP treated domestic wastewater from the smaller township of Kingston-on-Murray, with an approximate population of 140 producing daily treatment plant influent of 12 kL. All households in both townships had domestic septic tanks connected to a reticulation system to harvest their overflow to a central sump and pump station that pumped to the treatment plant. The WSP treatment plant was a three cell system with gravity feed between ponds, and a theoretical hydraulic retention time of 36 days in pond 1 and 15 days each in pond 2 and 3, for a total of 66 days. This system was observed over a period of two years. The HRAP was a single raceway 30 m x 5 m with adjustable depth settings. The HRAP was run at 0.32 m ($\theta=4.7$ d), 0.42 m ($\theta=6.6$ d) and 0.55 m ($\theta=9.2$ d). The depth setting was altered regularly to encompass observation periods in all seasons at all depths. This system was observed for a year. A second period of 9 months of HRAP observations was made in a similar manner, this time using wastewater that had already spent approximately 36 days in a facultative pond.

Parameters measured at both sites in all ponds were:-

- Continuously logged water temperature, dissolved oxygen and pH
- Continuously logged weather data – temperature, wind speed & direction, total solar radiation, UV radiation, rainfall.

- Water samples collected at regular intervals from inlets and all ponds and returned to the laboratory for estimations of the following:-
 - *E. coli* enumeration
 - Chlorophyll a
 - Suspended solids
 - Turbidity
 - BOD₅
 - Nutrients:– NH₄-N, NO₂-N, NO₃-N, PO₄-P

The results were analysed to compare both the disinfection performance of the two systems and the relative ability to remove nutrients. A comparison was also made of the algal productivity of the two systems.

A mathematical model to predict the *E. coli* concentration in the HRAP effluent was constructed and the model outputs were compared with eight separate periods of intensive observation of *E. coli* numbers over periods of two to five days at a time. There was good correlation between model output and *E. coli* concentration observations.

The study answered in the affirmative the question of whether a High Rate Algal Pond system could replace a Waste Stabilisation Pond system in rural South Australia. It also offers clear advice on the design and operation of a High Rate Algal Pond system in rural South Australia.

DECLARATION

I, Alan Neil Buchanan certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signed

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project is dedicated to my grandchildren and all of their generation. It is the only way I know to contribute to their future well-being in a world reluctant to acknowledge the fast approaching end of boundless resources – primary amongst those, water and energy. Only my family really understand the personal sacrifices needed to complete this task. Their unquestioning support remains critical to the mission.

Many people contribute over the extended journey that is the candidature involved in the creation of a thesis of this size. Primary amongst those are the two academic supervisors, Professors Howard Fallowfield and Nancy Cromar. Their enthusiasm for the task was palpable and infectious and advisory in good measure. They jointly and gently taught me the process of research, knowledge of which I have hankered after for many decades now. Remarkably, they eased me past the University bureaucracy. When I first arrived, I still carried the scars of too much ‘other’ bureaucracy, and they have helped the slow healing with their gentle good humour. Their years of ‘hands-on’ experience cannot be overrated as a resource when taking on a project of this complexity.

Dr Simon Williams provided all the mathematical grunt to distill complex biological activity into a series of formulas able to accurately predict outcomes.

The project arose from a collaboration between the Local Government Association (LGA) of South Australia and Flinders University. Within the LGA, Rick Gayler played an outstanding role as project champion and keeper of the funds. He almost single-handedly kept the project afloat as many initial capital intensive changes had to be made. He really believes in what we are trying to achieve and that makes all the difference.

Michael Clark, wastewater treatment manager for Barossa Council also deserves special mention for his ‘freeing-up’ of access to the Lyndoch waste stabilisation ponds for a number of years as we deployed various instruments in and around them. His long experience in the wastewater treatment industry meant he was always good for practical advice. We could always count on Michael’s help when required, otherwise he

stayed in the background and left us to get on with the job. Loxton-Waikerie Council also contributed greatly with their willingness to let us get on with the job, and to offer practical assistance with pumping on the occasions that the site flooded. It is my fervent hope that good use will be made of the treated wastewater available to them.

Coming into a University laboratory as an older student with no particular lab skills creates interesting inter-generational dynamics. To their credit, the younger cohort taught me well and soon treated me as their colleague and peer. I value that greatly. Over the time, a number stood out for their willingness to engage, including (in no particular order), Guaxin Huang, Yu Lian, Lei Mai, Ryan Cheng, Jess Hall, Michael Taylor and in particular, Natalie Bolton, who was always available to discuss techniques, and interpretation of results. Great assistance was also received from the laboratory manager, Raj Indela.

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Fig. 1-1 Key milestones in sanitary waste disposal and reuse. Adapted from (Asano and Levine, 1996)	21
Fig. 1-2. Schematic Representation of General Types of Oxidation Ponds – as published by Oswald et. al (Oswald et al., 1955)	31
Fig. 1-3 A Wehner & Wilhem BOD design formula chart, adapted from (Polprasert and Bhattarai, 1985)	43
Fig. 1-4 Design formula chart for bacterial reduction in WSPs; adapted from (Polprasert and Bhattarai, 1985)	44
Fig. 1-5 Facultative Ponds Areal Organic Loading Crash Lines as proposed by various authors (Power_and_Water_Corporation, 2011)	52
Figure 1-6 The major process occurring within an algal – bacterial wastewater treatment system (Fallowfield and Garrett, 1985a, Oswald, 1963, Oswald et al., 1957)	65
Fig. 1-7 General relationship between algal growth rates (μ) and environmental parameters (a.) limiting nutrient (S), (b.) light intensity (I), (c.) temperature (T) and (d.) light intensity for varying temperatures. Adapted from (Goldman, 1979)	74
Fig. 1-8 stylised representation of a P-I (photosynthesis-irradiance) curve, demonstrating the calculation of parameters such as K_{max} (notated as P_{max} on the y axis), half-velocity constant (K_i on the x axis) and photoinhibition.	78
Fig. 1-9 Productivity against areal density as calculated by the Grobbelaar et al. (1990) model for temperatures ranging from 5 to 35°C and irradiances from 0 to 8 Einst./m ² /h.	80
Fig 1-10. Relative proportion of ammonia and ammonium ion as a function of	81

Figure	Page
pH at 25°C (Adapted from (Konig et al., 1987).	
Figure 1-11 Reduction potentials for oxygen species. 1 M dioxygen is used as the standard state for the first step. Adapted from Imlay (2003)	93
Fig. 1-12 A proposed stepwise approach for the design of primary facultative ponds (Silva et al., 2010)	113
Fig. 1-13 Free ammonia concentration variation with temperature and pH – assuming combined NH₄⁺ and NH₃ level of 50 mg/L in <i>Scenedesmus obliquus</i>. Arrows indicate photosynthetic inhibition levels of 10% (green), 50% (red) and 90% (blue). (Azov and Goldman, 1982)	114
Fig. 1-14 Diagrammatic representation of Nitrogen transformation and removal in WSPs (Senzia et al., 2002)	116
Fig. 1-15 Where incoming nitrogen went in a facultative pond in Tanzania (Senzia et al., 2002)	120
Fig. 1-16 Evolution of faecal coliforms in the influent (-), in stabilization pond (- □-) and HRAP (- Δ -) effluents. Picot et al. (1992)	127
Fig. 1-17 Removal efficiency of faecal coliforms (log₁₀) in stabilization pond ■ and HRAP pilot plants (B35 ■, B30 □, B45 ▨ and B60 ▩). Picot et al. (1992)	127
Fig 1-18 Removal efficiency of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus pollution forms and suspended solids in stabilization pond ■ and HRAP pilot plants (B35 ■, B30 □, B45 ▨ and B60 ▩). Picot et al. (1992)	127
Fig. 1-19 Ammonia removal efficiency in Stabilization Pond (SP) and in High Rate Algal Pond (HRAP). Picot et al. (1992)	128
Fig. 1-20 Plan view (not to scale) of the WSP:HRAP comparison ponds at Meze, France (Picot et al., 1992)	128
Fig. 1-21 HRAP operation configurations used at Grahamstown (Wells, 2005)	129
Figure 1-22. Ammonium levels at discharge from the treatment elements in Flow C	130

Figure	Page
(Wells, 2005)	
Figure 1-23. Nitrate levels at discharge from the treatment elements in Flow C (Wells, 2005)	131
Figure 1-24. Phosphate levels at discharge from the treatment elements in Flow C (Wells, 2005)	131
Figure 1-25. Log ₁₀ <i>E. coli</i> levels at discharge from the treatment elements in Flow C (Wells, 2005)	131
Fig.2-1 Section taken from the site plan of the Kingston on Murray Community Waste Management Scheme incorporating a 5 cell waste stabilisation pond system and a high rate algal pond and a storage pond.	136
Fig.2-2 HRAP site plan with modified design overlain	138
Fig. 3-1 HRAP1 Daily maximum & minimum and 5 day average for:- a. air temperature and rainfall b. Water Temperature c. dissolved oxygen and d. pH recorded on-site at Kingston-on-Murray during the study period.	168
Fig. 3-2 Scatterplots with linear regressions and 95% confidence intervals in grey shade of (a.) PO ₄ -P concentration against minimum pH and (b.) chlorophyll a concentration against maximum pH.	171
Fig. 3-3 Daily average wind speed and direction recorded on-site at Kingston-on-Murray for the period April 2010 to May 2012.	172
Fig 3-4 Violinplots for HRAP1 fed septic tank effluent showing areal BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /ha/d) by pond depth; 0.32m (Shlw); 0.43m (Med) and 0.55m (Deep) at wastewater temperatures <17.6 °C (Cold) or >17.6 °C (Hot) the median wastewater temperature throughout this study period.	176
Fig 3-5 Violinplots for HRAP1 fed septic tank effluent showing areal <i>E. coli</i> loading rate (log ₁₀ /ha/d) by pond depth; 0.32m (Shlw); 0.43m (Med) and 0.55m (Deep) at wastewater temperatures <17.6 °C (Cold) or >17.6 °C (Hot) the median wastewater temperature throughout this study period.	177

Figure	Page
Fig 3-6 Violinplots for HRAP1 fed septic tank effluent showing areal Inorganic-N loading rate (kg Inorg-N /ha/d) by pond depth; 0.32m (Shlw); 0.43m (Med) and 0.55m (Deep) at wastewater temperatures <17.6°C (Cold) or >17.6 °C (Hot) the median wastewater temperature throughout this study period.	178
Fig. 3-7 Time series for the HRAP1 fed septic tank effluent showing the relationship between pond chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration and (a) the daily total solar insolation, and (b) 5 day average pond temperatures with median temperature as blue line.	179
Fig. 3-8 Scatterplots and linear regression lines with 95% confidence interval shading of – (a.) measured Algal Productivity 2 against Algal Productivity as predicted by the Oswald equation in the cold period, and (b.) measured Algal Productivity 2 against Algal Productivity as predicted by the Oswald equation in the hot period	183
Fig. 3-9 Algal Productivities (g/m ² /d) and 95% CI bars as calculated by (a.) Oswald equation predictions, black line (b.) Measured albazod & assuming algae as 60% of albazod, red dashed line (c.) Measured chlorophyll a & assuming algae containing 2% chlorophyll a, green dashed line	183
Fig. 3-10 Typical 4 day periods of daily solar irradiance in (a) summer and (b) winter at the HRAP site compared to the irradiance known to initiate photoinhibition (65.7 W/m ²) drawn in as the horizontal dark blue line.	185
Fig 3-11 Beanplot showing proportion of BOD ₅ removed from the HRAP1 fed septic tank treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C, hot or cold respectively)	192
Fig 3-12 Beanplot showing proportion of NH ₄ N removed from the HRAP1 fed septic tank treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C hot or cold respectively)	192
Fig. 3-13 HRAP 1 loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for Inorganic-N incoming (red) and outgoing (blue), outgoing as algal-N (green) and outgoing as ammonia (purple) over time	193
Fig 3-14 Beanplot showing Inorganic-N removal by the HRAP1 fed septic tank treated	195

Figure	Page
effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C hot or cold respectively)	
Fig 3-15 Beanplot showing proportion of PO ₄ -P removed from the HRAP1	195
fed septic tank treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C hot or cold respectively)	
Fig. 3-16 HRAP 1 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for Chlorophyll a (green) & PO ₄ -P (brown) over time	198
Fig. 3-17 HRAP 1 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for PO ₄ -P incoming (red) and outgoing (blue) and outgoing as algal-P (green) over time	198
Fig 3-18 Beanplot showing the concentration of Suspended Solids (volumetric) exiting the HRAP1 fed septic tank treated effluent - displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C hot or cold respectively)	199
Fig 3-19 Beanplot showing the areal density or standing crop (g/m ²) of suspended solids in the HRAP1 (excluding Feb. data) fed septic tank treated effluent - displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C hot or cold respectively)	200
Fig 3-20 Beanplot showing <i>E.coli</i> LRV by the HRAP1 fed septic tank treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>17.6°C or <17.6°C hot or cold respectively)	201
Fig 3-21 HRAP1 95% family-wise confidence level of comparison of means of <i>E. coli</i> LRV by Pond Depth & Pond Temperature	204
Fig. 3-22 HRAP 1 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for <i>E. coli</i> concentration incoming (red) and outgoing (blue) over time	205
Fig. 3-23 HRAP2 receiving facultative pond effluent: Daily maximum & minimum and 5 day average for:- a. air temperature and rainfall b. Water Temperature c. DO and d.	206

Figure	Page
pH recorded on-site at Kingston-on-Murray during the study period.	
Fig 3-24 Violinplots for HRAP2 fed facultative pond effluent showing areal BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /ha/d) by pond depth; 0.32m (Shlw); 0.43m (Med) and 0.55m (Deep) at wastewater temperatures <18.3 °C (Cold) or >18.3 °C (Hot) the median wastewater temperature throughout this study period.	209
Fig 3-25 Violinplots for HRAP2 fed facultative pond effluent showing areal Inorganic-N loading rate (kg Inorg-N /ha/d) by pond depth; 0.32m (Shlw); 0.43m (Med) and 0.55m (Deep) at wastewater temperatures <18.3 °C (Cold) or >18.3 °C (Hot) the median wastewater temperature throughout this study period.	209
Fig 3-26 Violinplots for HRAP2 fed facultative pond effluent showing areal <i>E. coli</i> loading rate (log ₁₀ <i>E. coli</i> /ha/d) by pond depth; 0.32m (Shlw); 0.43m (Med) and 0.55m (Deep) at wastewater temperatures <18.3 °C (Cold) or >18.3 °C (Hot) the median wastewater temperature throughout this study period.	210
Fig. 3-27 Time series for the HRAP2 fed facultative pond effluent showing a) chlorophyll a concentration and total solar irradiance and b) the chlorophyll a and HRAP2 wastewater temperatures (with blue 18.3°C median line) over the period 1 May 2010 to 1 Apr 2011.	211
Fig 3-28 Beanplot showing proportion of BOD ₅ removed from the HRAP2 - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	216
Fig 3-29 Beanplot showing proportion of NH ₄ -N removed from the HRAP2 - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	216
Fig. 3-30 HRAP 2 loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for Inorganic-N incoming (red) and outgoing (green), outgoing as algal-N (blue) and outgoing as ammonia (purple) over time	217

Figure	Page
Fig 3-31 Beanplot showing Inorganic-N removal by the HRAP2 - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	219
Fig 3-32 Beanplot showing proportion of PO ₄ -P removed from the HRAP2 - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	219
Fig. 3-33 HRAP 2 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for PO ₄ -P incoming (red) and outgoing (green) and outgoing as algal-P (blue) over time	220
Fig 3-34 Beanplot showing the volumetric amounts of Suspended Solids exiting the HRAP2 - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	221
Fig 3-35 Beanplot showing the Areal amounts of Suspended Solids exiting the HRAP2 - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	221
Fig 3-36 Beanplot showing <i>E.coli</i> LRV by the HRAP - fed facultative pond treated effluent- displayed by pond depth (Shlw, 0.32m, Med, 0.42 m & deep, 0.55m) and wastewater temperature (>18.3°C or <18.3°C, hot or cold respectively)	223
Fig. 3-37 HRAP 2:- Mean and standard deviation of <i>E. coli</i> LRV by pond depth and temperature	224
Fig. 3-38 HRAP 2 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for <i>E. coli</i> concentration incoming (red) and outgoing (blue) over time	224
Figure. 4-1 Environmental & Operating average, maxima and minima conditions for Lyndoch WSP1. (a). daily air temperature and rainfall (vertical bars), (b). pond water temperature, (c) dissolved oxygen and (d) Ph	232

Figure	Page
Figure 4-2 Daily average wind speed and direction recorded on-site at Lyndoch during the study period. Wind strength indicated by colour coding and lower bar scale. Approximate orientation of WSPs indicated by green rectangle.	235
Fig. 4-3 WSP 1 Pond Temperatures (°C) at 0.3m (red), 0.45m (blue) & 0.65m (green) for time periods in (a) April (b) June (c) October and (d) January	236/7
Fig. 4-4 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 (2010-2012) Scatterplot and loess-fit time line curves with 95% CI of chlorophyll a concentration for the three WSPs sequentially from top to bottom WSP1, WSP2 & WSP3.	241
Fig. 4-5 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 (2010-2012) Scatterplot and loess-fit time line curves with 95% CI of algal concentration levels for the three WSPs sequentially from top to bottom WSP1, WSP2 & WSP3.	241
Fig. 4-6 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 (2010-2012) Scatterplot and loess-fit time line curves with 95% CI of algal productivity (g/m ² /d) for the three WSPs sequentially from top to bottom WSP1, WSP2 & WSP3.	242
Fig. 4-7 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 (2010-2012) Scatterplot and loess-fit time line curves with 95% CI of albedo productivity (g/m ² /d) for the three WSPs sequentially from top to bottom WSP1, WSP2 & WSP3.	243
Fig. 4-8 Time series for the Lyndoch WSP1 showing the relationship between pond chlorophyll a (green bar) and a) daily average pond temperatures (°C; red line), and b) the daily total solar radiation (MJ/m ² ; red line).	245
Fig. 4-9 Time series for the Lyndoch WSP2 showing the relationship between pond chlorophyll a (green bar) measurements and a) daily average pond temperatures (°C; red line), and b) the daily total solar radiation (MJ/m ² ; red line).	245
Fig. 4-10 Time series for the Lyndoch WSP3 showing the relationship between pond chlorophyll a (green bar) measurements and a) daily average pond temperatures (°C; red line), and b) the daily total solar radiation (MJ/m ² ; red line).	246
Fig. 4-11 WSP 1. Time series for Algal Mass compared to two main nutrients, NH ₄ -N and PO ₄ -P	246

Figure	Page
Fig. 4-12 WSP 2. Time series for Algal Mass compared to two main nutrients, NH ₄ -N and PO ₄ -P	247
Fig. 4-13 WSP 3. Time series for Algal Mass compared to two main nutrients, NH ₄ -N and PO ₄ -P	247
Fig 4-14 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 (2010-2012) Scatterplot and loess-fit curve with 95% CI of log ₁₀ <i>E. coli</i> / 100mL as it passes through each of the three ponds sequentially from top to bottom Inlet(red), WSP1 (blue), WSP2 (green) & WSP3 (purple)	252
Fig 4-15 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 2010/12 Scatterplot and loess-fit curve with 95% CI of NH ₄ -N as it passes through each treatment phase for the three ponds sequentially from top to bottom Inlet(red), WSP1 (blue), WSP2 (green) & WSP3 (purple)	254
Fig. 4-16 WSP 1 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for Inorganic-N incoming (red), outgoing (blue), outgoing as algal-N (green) and removed by NH ₃ volatilisation (purple) over time	255
Fig. 4-17 WSP1 - loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for the percentage of inorganic-N removed via ammonia volatilisation over time	255
Fig 4-18 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 2010/12 Scatterplot and loess-fit curve with 95% CI of BOD ₅ as it passes through each treatment phase for the three ponds sequentially from top to bottom Inlet(red), WSP1 (blue), WSP2 (green) & WSP3 (purple)	256
Fig. 4-19 WSP 1 – loess fit and 95% confidence intervals for PO ₄ -P incoming (red), outgoing (purple), outgoing as algal-P (green) and removed by internal precipitation (blue) over time	258
Fig 4-20 Lyndoch WSP1, 2 & 3 2010/12 Scatterplot and loess-fit curve with 95% CI of PO ₄ -P concentration as it passes through each treatment phase for the three ponds sequentially from top to bottom Inlet(red), WSP1 (blue), WSP2 (green) & WSP3 (purple)	259
Fig 5-1 HRAP 1 fed septic tank effluent: Time series showing, from the top the relationship between <i>E.coli</i> LRV (purple bars at top) and Global Solar Energy (orange line) , chlorophyll <i>a</i> (green bars) concentrations and the operational pond depth	266

Figure	Page
(pink columns)	
Fig. 5-2 HRAP1 fed septic tank effluent operated at 0.32, 0.42 and 0.55m, rpart Decision Tree for <i>E. coli</i> LRV, where the variables selected for analysis by rpart were, Node1 - theoretical hydraulic retention time (THRT, d), Node 2 - maximum daily dissolved oxygen (DOMax, mg/L), Node 3 - 5 day average water temperature (WatTemp5DAvg, °C); Node 4 - minimum water pH (pHMin); Node 5 - 5 day average Solar Energy (SolEn5Da, W/m ²); Node 6 - 5 day average water pH (pH5DAvg); and Node 7 - average water pH (pHAvg) The mean <i>E. coli</i> LRV for that group and the number of observations (n) analysed is presented inside the red rectangle for each node; and for each green rectangle at each leaf.	269
Fig. 5-3 Chart showing relative importance of predictors used in a cForest bootstrap enhanced HRAP1 Decision Tree for <i>E. coli</i> LRV	273
Fig. 5-4 HRAP1 rpart Decision Tree for predicting BOD ₅ Removal Efficiency; inflow (kL/d), BOD Areal Load Rate (kg/ha/d); NO ₂ (mg NO ₂ -N /L); MaxAirT (maximum air temperature, °C), NO _x (oxidised nitrogen, mg N/ L) and pHVar (diurnal variation in pH)	277
Fig. 5-5 Chart showing relative importance of predictors used in a bootstrap enhanced HRAP1 Decision Tree for BOD ₅ Removal	279
Fig. 6-1 Time series comparison of daily air temperatures – maximum, minimum, and average of the WSP site at Lyndoch and the HRAP site at Kingston – recorded on site at the respective location over the study period.	299
Fig. 6-2 Bureau of Meteorology (2012) Global Solar Energy at Moorook (5 km from the HRAP at Kingston on Murray)) and Lyndoch proximate to and including the study period.	299
Fig. 6-3 Violinplots of comparative inlet water for the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 and the facultative pond at Lyndoch with internal boxplot showing the mean (open circle) and median (black line) of all respective data sets; A). log ₁₀ <i>E. coli</i> /100ml, b.) BOD ₅ (mg/L) c.) NH ₄ -N (mg/L) and d.) PO ₄ -P (mg/L)	302

Figure	Page
Fig. 6-4 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the wastewater treatment performance of Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 (purple) with the Lyndoch WSP 1 (green) both fed wastewater pre-treated in on-site septic tanks; a.) <i>E. coli</i> log reduction value (LRV log ₁₀) b.) BOD ₅ removal efficiency c.) NH ₄ -N removal efficiency and d.) PO ₄ -P removal efficiency	305
Fig. 6-5 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the wastewater treatment performance of Kingston on Murray HRAP 2 (purple) with Lyndoch WSP 2 & 3 (greens). (a.) BOD ₅ concentration (mg/L) (b.) NH ₄ -N concentration (mg/L) and (c.) PO ₄ -P concentration (mg/L)	307
Fig. 6-6 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the proportion of incoming wastewater N removed as algal N by treatment at the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 (purple) or the Lyndoch WSP 1 (green) - both fed wastewater pre-treated in on-site septic tanks.	309
Fig. 6-7 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the proportion of incoming wastewater N removed as NH ₃ -N by treatment at the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 (purple) or the Lyndoch WSP 1 (green) - both fed wastewater pre-treated in on-site septic tanks.	309
Fig. 6-8 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the proportion of incoming wastewater PO ₄ -P removed as algal P by treatment at the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 (purple) or the Lyndoch WSP 1 (green) - both fed wastewater pre-treated in on-site septic tanks.	311
Fig. 6-9 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the wastewater treatment performance of Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 (purple) with Lyndoch WSP 1 (green). a. Algal concentration (mg/L) b. Algal productivity (g/m ² /d)	312
Fig. 6-10 Kingston on Murray HRAP and the Lyndoch WSP 2 & 3 fed facultative pond treated effluent. Violinplots of comparing inlet wastewater composition, f including internal boxplot showing the mean (open circle) and median (black line) of all data sets. a.) <i>E. coli</i> (log ₁₀ /100ml), b.) BOD ₅ (mg/L) c.) NH ₄ -N (mg/L) and d.) PO ₄ -P (mg/L)	316

Figure	Page
Fig. 6-11 Time series for dissolved oxygen and pH in Lyndoch WSP 2 (a. and b.) and WSP 3 (c. and d.)	318
Fig. 6-12 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the wastewater treatment performance of Kingston on Murray HRAP 2 (purple) with Lyndoch WSP 2 & 3 (green). a.) <i>E. coli</i> LRV ($\log_{10}/100\text{ml}$) b.) BOD ₅ removal efficiency c.) NH ₄ -N removal efficiency and d.) PO ₄ -P removal efficiency	320
Fig. 6-13 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the wastewater treatment performance of Kingston on Murray HRAP 2 (purple) with Lyndoch WSP 2 & 3 (greens). (a.) BOD ₅ concentration (mg/L) (b.) NH ₄ -N concentration (mg/L) and (c.) PO ₄ -P concentration (mg/L)	322
Fig. 6-14 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the Lyndoch WSP 1, 2 & 3 a. suspended solids concentration (mg/L) and b. algal concentration (mg/L)	326
Fig. 6-15 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the Kingston-on-Murray HRAP inlet and outlet a. suspended solids concentration (mg/L) and b. algal concentration (mg/L)	326
Fig. 6-16 Loess smooth lines with shaded 95% CI comparing the performance of the WSP 2&3 (greens) with HRAP 2 (purple) (both fed facultative pond outlet) a. algal concentration (mg/L) and b. algal productivity (g/m ² /d)	328
Fig. 7-1 <i>In-vitro</i> determination of <i>E. coli</i> die-off rates in wastewater stored in the dark in the laboratory at either 23°C (a. & b.) or 2.5°C (c). A ‘shoulder’ showing there was a lag period before <i>E. coli</i> die-off commenced is visible in (a; 30h) and (c; 83h). Note the time scales are not the same for each graph.	340
Fig. 7-2 HRAPIN model of the output of <i>E. coli</i> inactivation in HRAPs, comparing dark die-off set at (a) 0.00685 h ⁻¹ and (b) 0.065 h ⁻¹ . All other HRAP conditions were set at the same values: – depth = 0.32 m, θ = 4.6 days, 4h interval between influent loadings.	344
Fig. 7-3 Measured <i>E. coli</i> (\log_{10} MPN/100mL; in red) and hourly UV Radiation (in purple) recorded in the HRAP over three periods of intensive observation in the months of (a) May 2010 (2 hourly observations.) (b) June 2010 (6 hourly	348

Figure	Page
observations.) and (c). July 2010 (6 hourly observations.)	
Fig. 7-4 Actual <i>E. coli</i> numbers (\log_{10} MPN/100mL; in red) and hourly UV radiation (in purple) recorded in the HRAP over three periods of intensive observation in the months of a. August 2010 (8 hourly obs.) b. September 2010 (8 hourly obs.) and c. October 2010 (8 hourly obs.) . UV radiation on y-axis set to maximum of 20 W/m ²	349
Fig. 7-5 Comparing the HRAPIN model predicted <i>E. coli</i> concentration and an amalgam of <i>E. coli</i> concentrations measured during eight separate periods of intensive observation over six months from May to October 2010	351
Fig.7-6 Correlograms for the HRAPIN predicted and measured dark die-off intensive study	352

TABLE OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
TABLE 1-1. Comparison of Removal Rates in Different Wastewater Treatment Processes. Adapted from (James, 1987)	33
Table 1-2 Oxidation states of nitrogen	112
Table 1-3 Mean ± Std Dev of physico-chemical and bacteriological characteristics of influent and effluent WSP & HRAP wastewater over the years 1988 – 1990 as reported by Picot et al. (1992)	125
Table 2-1: Sampling dates for HRAP system fed septic tank effluent (n, number of samples analysed)	144
Table 2-2: Sampling dates for HRAP system fed facultative pond effluent (n, number of samples analysed)	145
Table 2-3 Sample volume (mL) for BOD range required using the OxiTop system	148
Table 3-1. Historical ground weather station and satellite data, Moorook (5 km from study site) – 30 year climate data averages (Bureau-of-Meteorology, 2012)	167
Table 3-2 HRAP 1 Inlet Wastewater septic tank effluent, volume & composition, where n = number of samples analysed.	173
Table 3-3 HRAP fed septic tank influent; - Areal BOD₅ Loading Rates (kg BOD₅ /ha/d); n = number of observations	175
Table 3-4 HRAP fed septic tank influent; - Volumetric BOD₅ Loading Rates (g BOD₅ /m³ /d); n = number of observations	175
Table 3-5 HRAP1 fed septic tank effluent; Areal <i>E. coli</i> Loading Rates (log₁₀ <i>E. coli</i> /ha/d); n = number of observations	176

TABLE	PAGE
Table 3-6 HRAP 1; Areal Inorganic-N Loading Rates (kg Inorganic-N /ha/d); n = number of observations	177
Table 3-7. Albazod & Algal Productivity (g/m ² /d) mean±standard deviations & ranges, as calculated by assuming – (1) Albazod including Feb.data (2) Albazod excluding Feb.data (3) Algae as 60% of albazod, (4) Algae containing 2% chlorophyll a, and (5) As predicted by the Oswald equation (Eq. 2-6) split by pond operating temperature and depth	181
Table 3-8 Standing crop (areal density) (g(dm)/m ²) of albazod in HRAP 1 by pond depth and temperature	186
Table 3-9 Half-velocity constants for algal nutrients determined empirically after fitting to the Hill & Lincoln algal growth model. After Hill and Lincoln (1981), compared with the range of measured concentrations in HRAP 1.	186
Table 3-10 HRAP1 inlet, outlet values and removal efficiencies at all depths for a range of performance related parameters	188
Table 3-11 HRAP 1 receiving septic tank treated influent operated at a depth of 0.32 m. HRAP treated effluent composition (n=58)	190
Table 3-12 HRAP 1 receiving septic tank treated influent operated at a depth of 0.42 m. Composition of the HRAP treated effluent (n=35)	190
Table 3-13 HRAP 1 receiving septic tank treated influent operated at a depth of 0.55 m. HRAP treated effluent composition (n=31)	190
Table 3-14 HRAP1 removal efficiency performance parameters by pond depth shallow (0.32m), medium (0.42m) and deep (0.55m)	190
Table 3-15 Summary of HRAP1 Anova Model of <i>E. coli</i> LRV by Pond Depth & Pond Temperature	203
Table 3-16 HRAP1 Numerical Summary of <i>E. coli</i> LRV by Pond Depth & Pond Temperature	203

TABLE	PAGE
Table 3-17 HRAP1 Multiple Comparisons of pairs of Means of <i>E. coli</i> LRV by Pond Depth & Pond Temperature: Tukey Contrasts	203
Table 3-18 HRAP1 95% family-wise confidence level of comparison of means of <i>E. coli</i> LRV by Pond Depth & Pond Temperature	204
Table 3-19 HRAP 2 Inlet Wastewater - facultative pond effluent – Volume & Composition, where n = number of samples analysed.	208
Table 3-20 HRAP 2 fed facultative pond effluent: Areal BOD₅ Loading Rates (kg BOD₅ /ha)	208
Table 3-21 HRAP 2 fed facultative pond effluent: Volumetric BOD₅ Loading Rates (g BOD₅ /m³)	209
Table 3-22 HRAP2 inlet & outlet values and removal efficiencies at all depths for a range of performance related parameters	212
Table 3-23 HRAP2 receiving facultative pond treated influent operated at a depth of 0.32 m. HRAP treated effluent composition (n=32).	213
Table 3-24 HRAP2 receiving facultative pond treated influent operated at a depth of 0.42 m. HRAP treated effluent composition (n=24)	213
Table 3-25 HRAP2 receiving facultative pond treated influent operated at a depth of 0.55 m. HRAP treated effluent composition (n=19)	214
Table 3-26 HRAP2 removal efficiency performance parameters by pond depth; shallow (0.32m), medium (0.42m) and deep (0.55m)	214
Table 3-27 HRAP 2 Mean ± Standard Deviation and Median for Albazod Standing Crop (g/m²), Algal Productivity (g/m²/d) and Albazod Productivity (g/m²/d) for 0.32, 0.42 and 0.55 m depths and overall.	222
Table 3-28 Numerical summary of HRAP 2 <i>E. coli</i> LRV at each pond configuration	224
Table 4-1. Historical Bureau of Meteorology data for Lyndoch – ground weather station & satellite climate data - Sixty year averages (Bureau-of-Meteorology, 2012)	231

TABLE	PAGE
Table 4-2. On-site recorded data for the 2010/2011 portion of the study period; temperature and rainfall at Lyndoch	231
Table 4-3 Lyndoch WSP1 Inlet Wastewater Composition -Septic tank effluent, where n = number of samples analysed.	238
Table 4-4 Lyndoch Facultative Pond (WSP1) areal BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /ha/d) & volumetric BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /m ³ /d)	239
Table 4-5 Lyndoch Maturation Pond 1 (WSP2) areal BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /ha/d) & volumetric BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /m ³ /d)	239
Table 4-6 Lyndoch Maturation Pond 2 (WSP3) areal BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /ha/d) & volumetric BOD ₅ loading rate (kg BOD ₅ /m ³ /d)	239
Table 4-7 Half-velocity constants for algal nutrients determined empirically by Hill & Lincoln after fitting to their algal growth model (1 st column) compared with the range of measured concentrations in WSP 1, 2 & 3; after Hill and Lincoln (1981)	243
Table 4-8 WSP 1 inlet, outlet values and removal efficiencies for a range of performance related parameters, where n= number of samples analysed.	248
Table 4-9 WSP 2 inlet, outlet values and removal efficiencies for a range of performance related parameters, where n= number of samples analysed.	249
Table 4-10 WSP 3 inlet, outlet values and removal efficiencies for a range of performance related parameters, where n= number of samples analysed.	250
Table 5-1 HRAP1:- table of the ranking and relative importance of each predictor for <i>E. coli</i> LRV arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 2). Importance in cForest ranking is listed in Column 3 and importance in rpart is listed in Column 4. The top ten ranked variables in randomForest are highlighted in yellow for cForest and rpart.	273
Table 5-2 HRAP1:- table of the ranking and relative importance of each predictor for BOD ₅ removal efficiency arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 2). Importance in cForest	279

TABLE	PAGE
ranking is listed in Column 3 and importance in rpart is listed in Column 4. The top ten ranked variables in randomForest are highlighted in yellow for cForest and rpart.	
Table 5-3 HRAP1:- table of the ranking and relative importance of each predictor for NH ₄ -N removal efficiency arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 2). Importance in cForest ranking is listed in Column 3 and importance in rpart is listed in Column 4. The top ten ranked variables in randomForest are highlighted in yellow for cForest and rpart.	281
Table 5-4 HRAP1:- table of the ranking and relative importance of each predictor for biomass productivity arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 2). Importance in cForest ranking is listed in Column 3 and importance in rpart is listed in Column 4. The top ten ranked variables in randomForest are highlighted in yellow for cForest and rpart.	284
Table 5-5 HRAP 1&2 combined:- ranking and relative importance of each predictor for <i>E. coli</i> LRV arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 3). Importance in rpart is listed in Column 4.	287
Table 5-6 HRAP 1 & 2: - ranking and relative importance of each predictor for BOD ₅ removal efficiency arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 3). Importance in rpart ranking is listed in Column 4.	289
Table 5-7 HRAP 1 & 2: - ranking and relative importance of each predictor for NH ₄ -N removal efficiency arranged in descending order of importance as ranked by the increase of node purity in randomForest (Column 3). Importance in rpart is listed in Column 4.	291
Table 6-1 Summary of the physical and of performance related parameters (mean ± standard deviation) comparing the facultative WSP at Lyndoch with the HRAP at Kingston on Murray , both receiving wastewater pre-treated in on-site septic tanks, over the period May 2010 to March 2011.	299

TABLE	PAGE
Table 6-2 Standard statistical comparisons of the nutrient removal efficiency of the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 and the Lyndoch facultative WSP 1 both fed septic tank treated effluent.	305
Table 6-3 Standard statistical comparisons of the proportions of incoming N & P removed as algal N & P and NH ₃ -N from the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 and the Lyndoch facultative WSP 1 both fed septic tank treated effluent.	309
Table 6-4 Standard statistical comparisons of the algal concentration and productivity of the Kingston on Murray HRAP 1 and Lyndoch WSP 1	312
Table 6-5 Summary of the physical and mean ± standard deviation of performance related parameters comparing the physico-chemical and performance parameters of two maturation WSPs combined, with the HRAP 2 over the period Jul 2011 to Feb 2012.	313
Table 6-6 Standard statistical comparisons of the nutrient removal performance of the Kingston on Murray HRAP 2 and Lyndoch WSP 2&3	320
Table 6-7 Standard statistical comparisons of the algal concentration and productivity of the Kingston on Murray HRAP 2 and Lyndoch WSP 2&3	326
Table 7-1 <i>E. coli</i> dark inactivation at 23°C: Results of the statistical comparison between measured and fitted data (Fig 7-1(a)) using the method of Geeraerd et al. (2005).	340
Table 7-2 <i>E. coli</i> dark inactivation at 23°C: Results of the statistical comparison between measured and fitted data (Fig 7-1(b)) using the method of Geeraerd et al. (2005).	340
Table 7-3 <i>E. coli</i> dark inactivation at 2.5°C: Results of the statistical comparison between measured and fitted data (Fig 7-1(c)) using the method of Geeraerd et al. (2005).	341
Table 7-4. The eight periods of intensive observation of the average UV radiation (Wm ⁻²), pond temperature (°C), hydraulic retention time (d) and pond depth (m)	345

TABLE

PAGE

recorded on those days.

TABLE OF PLATES

PLATE	PAGE
Plate 2-1 Original HRAP configuration	137
Plate 2-2 modified HRAP configuration and weather station	137
Plate 2-3 Lyndoch Wastewater inlet to Pond 1, with running inlet water visible during a pumping period	139
Plate 2-4 Lyndoch Wastewater - all 3 ponds WSP 1 on left hand side, WSP 2 & 3 on right hand side	139
Plate 2-5 WeatherMaster 2000™ photograph	140
Plate 2-6 WeatherMaster 2000™ diagram of parts	140
Plate 2-7 Installed solar powered DO, pH and temperature monitoring box in mid-pond position.	141
Plate 2-8 Thermistor chain before installation mid-pond	141
Plate 2-9 HRAP - Sampling directly from the inlet splitter box as the wastewater is flowing	142
Plate 2-10 HRAP - from the stand-pipe in the outlet control pipe.	142
Plate 2-11 ISCO Avalanche refrigerated multi sampler in-situ at the KoM HRAP site	143
Plate 2-12 overflow weir sample collection site at the exit point of WSP 1	143
Plate 2-13 Incubated Quanti-Tray showing blue fluorescence in positive cells under a UV light source.	150

TABLE OF EQUATIONS

EQUATION NUMBER	EQUATION	PAGE
1-1	$\frac{C}{C_0} = \frac{1}{1 + k_T \theta}$	36
1-2	$\frac{C}{C_0} = e^{-k_T \theta}$	36
1-3	$\theta = \frac{V}{Q}$	37
1-4	$e.v.r = \frac{V_{eff}}{V_{total}} = \frac{MHRT}{\theta}$	38
1-5	$e.v.r = 0.84 \left\{ 1 - e^{(-0.59(L/W))} \right\}$	38
1-6	$N = \frac{N_0}{1 + \theta K_b}$	38
1-7	$K_b = 3.6(1.19)^{T-20}$	39
1-8	$\frac{C}{C_0} = \frac{1}{(1 + k_T \theta)^n}$	39
1-9	$C_e = \frac{C_i 4a e^{0.5d}}{(1+a) e^{\frac{a}{2d}} - (1+a)^2 e^{-\frac{a}{2d}}}$	40
1-10	$\frac{C_e}{C_i} = \frac{4ae^{1-a/2d}}{(1+a)^2}$	41
1-11	$\frac{C_e}{C_i} = e^{-k\theta}$	41
1-12	$d = \frac{(L/B)}{-0.261 + 0.254(L/B) + 1.014(L/B)^2}$	44
1-13	$d = 1/(L/B) = (L/B)^{-1}$	45

EQUATION NUMBER	EQUATION	PAGE
1-14	$Pe = \frac{Q \times L}{W \times Z \times D}$	46
1-15	$Pe = 0.31 \times \frac{L}{W} + 0.055 \times \frac{L}{Z}$	46
1-16	$Pe = 0.35 \times \frac{L}{W} + 0.012 \times \frac{L}{Z}$	46
1-17	$N = N_0 e^{-kt}$	50
1-18	$W_{O_2} = KFS$	67
1-19	$W_{O_2} = \frac{K_2 d L}{t}$	68
1-20	$t = \frac{d L}{F S}$	68
2-21	$d = \frac{(\ln I_0 - \ln I_d)}{C_a \alpha}$	68
1-22	$O_2 = 1.67 C_a \text{ (approx)}$	69
1-23	$C_a = 0.1 \times \frac{F S}{h} \times \frac{\theta}{d}$	69
1-24	$C_a = \alpha_w x$	70
1-25	$C_a = a \left(\frac{\theta}{d} \right)^\alpha S^\beta T^\gamma$	70
1-26	$3.6 CO_2 + 0.543 NH_4^+ + 0.034 HPO_4^{2-} + 2.19 H_2O$ $\rightarrow 0.034 C_{106} H_{180} O_{45} N_{16} P + 0.4755 H^+ + 4 O_2$	74
1-27	$SUB^\mu = \frac{SUB^{\hat{\mu}} \times [SUB]}{SUB^{KS} + [SUB]}$	75
1-28	$RAD^\mu = \frac{RAD^{\hat{\mu}} \times [RAD]}{RAD^{KS} + [RAD]}$	75
1-29	$PROD \text{ (mg(dry wt)/m}^2\text{/h)} = PRD - RES - INB$	76

EQUATION NUMBER	EQUATION	PAGE
1-30	$PRD=(A_1X_1(A^T_2))((I_zI_s(A^T_3))/(I_z + I_s(A^T_3)))$	76
1-31	$T= (T_t-10)/10$	76
1-32	$RES = X_1((1.5^T-0.54)/100)$	77
1-33	$INB = PRD((2.5^T/75) I_z)$	79
1-34	$NH_4^+ + OH^- \leftrightarrow NH_3 + H_2O$	81
1-35	$HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow CO_2 + OH^-$	82
1-36	$\mu = \hat{\mu} \left[\frac{S}{K_s + S} \right]$	83
1-37	$I_z = I_0 e^{-kz}$	90
1-38	$CO_2 + H_2O \leftrightarrow H_2CO_3 \leftrightarrow H^+ + HCO_3^- \leftrightarrow H^+ + CO_3^{2-}$	95
1-39	$k = k_{d,20} \theta^{(T-20)} + \frac{\alpha \cdot I_{0,avg}}{\eta \cdot z_e} [1 - e^{(-\eta z_e)}] + \frac{v}{z_e}$	100
1-40	$\frac{\alpha \cdot I_{0,avg}}{\eta \cdot z_e} [1 - e^{(-\eta z_e)}] = k_i$	100
1-41	$C_n H_a O_b N_c + \left(n + \frac{a}{4} - \frac{b}{2} - \frac{3}{4} c \right) O_2$ $\rightarrow nCO_2 + \left(\frac{a}{2} - \frac{3}{2} c \right) H_2O + cNH_3$	107
1-42	$k' C = -\frac{dC}{dt}$	107
1-43	$k \cdot t = \ln \left(\frac{C_i}{C_e} \right)$	109
1-44	$C_e = \frac{C_i}{(1 + k \cdot HRT)}$	109
1-45	$C_e = C_i \cdot e^{-k \cdot HRT}$	109
1-46	$k = 0.3(1.05)^{T-20}$	109

EQUATION NUMBER	EQUATION	PAGE
1-47	$k = 0.71(1.09)^{T-20}$	109
1-48	$k = 2.622 \times 10^{-3} \lambda_S - 0.194$	110
1-49	$\lambda_S = 350(1.107 - 0.002T)^{T-25}$	111
1-50	$NH_3 + H_2O \leftrightarrow NH_4^+ + OH^-$	112
1-51	$N_2O_3 + H_2O \leftrightarrow 2H^+ + 2NO_2^-$	112
1-52	$N_2O_5 + H_2O \leftrightarrow 2H^+ + 2NO_3^-$	112
1-53	$2NH_3 + 3O_2 \rightarrow 2NO_2^- + 2H^+ + 2H_2O$	115
1-54	$2NO_2^- + O_2 \rightarrow 2NO_3^-$	116
1-55	$r_n = \frac{\mu_n}{Y_n} \left(\frac{NH_4}{k_1 + NH_4} \right) \left(\frac{DO}{k_2 + DO} \right) C_T C_{pH}$	116
1-56	$k_1 = 1^{(0.051(T-1.58))}$	116
1-57	$C_T = e^{\alpha(T-T_0)}$	116
1-58	$C_{pH} = 1 - 0.833(7.2 - pH)$	117
1-59	$r_d = R2_{20} \theta^{(T-20)} NO_3 - N$	117
1-60	$r_v = \frac{NH_3 \times K_L}{d}$	117
1-61	$r_s = R1(Org - N)$	117
1-62	$r_1 = \mu_{max20} \theta^{T-20} \left[\frac{NH_3 - N}{K_3 + NH_3 - N} \right] (Org - N) \times P1$	118
1-63	$r_2 = \mu_{max20} \theta^{T-20} \left[\frac{NO_3 - N}{K_4 + NO_3 - N} \right] (Org - N) \times P2$	118
1-64	$Na_4P_2O_7 + H_2O \leftrightarrow 2Na_2HPO_4$	121

EQUATION NUMBER	EQUATION	PAGE
1-65	$pH = pK_2 + \log\left(\frac{CO_3^{2-}}{HCO_3}\right)$	122
1-66	$3HPO_4^{2-} + 5Ca^{2+} + 4OH^- \leftrightarrow Ca_5(OH)(PO_4)_3 + 3H_2O$	122
2-1	$C_a = 11.85(OD664) - 1.54(OD647) - 0.08(OD630)$	147
2-2	$PROD \text{ (mg(dry wt.)/m}^2\text{/h)} = PRD - RES - INB$	152
2-3	$RES = X_1((1.5^T - 0.54)/100)$	153
2-4	$INB = PRD((2.5^T/75) I_z)$	153
2-5	$Pr_{alg} = 10 \times \frac{E_t \times I}{J}$	154
2-6	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \varepsilon$	155
2-7	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta^T X + \varepsilon$	155
2-8	$Y = \beta_0 + \beta^T X + \gamma XX^T + \varepsilon$	155
3-1	$\begin{aligned} & \textit{Algal Productivity 1} \\ & = 3.617 \times \textit{Algal Productivity 2} - 2.562 \end{aligned}$	181
5-1	$\begin{aligned} \text{Suspended Solids Productivity (g/m}^2\text{/d)} &= 0.73(5 \text{ day avg. Total} \\ &\text{Solar Radiation}) - 7.83(\text{THRT}) - 0.52(\text{NH}_4\text{-N}) + 78.4 \end{aligned}$	285