

ESTIMATING THE CARBON FOOTPRINT OF WASTE STABILIZATION PONDS

G. G. S. Lekha

(198492 E)

Degree of Master of Science in Environmental Engineering and
Management

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

June 2024

ESTIMATING THE CARBON FOOTPRINT OF WASTE STABILIZATION PONDS

G. G. S. Lekha

(198492 E)

Thesis/Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree Master of Science in Environmental Engineering and Management

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

June 2024

Declaration

Declaration of the candidate:

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis/dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature of the candidate:

Date: 28/06/2024

Declaration of the Supervisor:

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters Dissertation under my supervision.

Name of the supervisor : Prof. J. N.A. Manatunge

Signature of the supervisor :

Date: 28/06/2024

Declaration of the Supervisor:

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters Dissertation under my supervision.

Name of the supervisor : Eng. D.N. de S. Gunatileke

Signature of the supervisor :

Date: 28/06/2024

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my gratitude to all who helped me to make this study successful. I am grateful to the National Water Supply & Drainage Board (NWSDB) for allowing me to pursue this Master's and for financially supporting this successful study. Also, my gratitude is forwarded to the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for providing me with this valuable opportunity, including laboratory testing facilities.

I am especially indebted to my course supervisor, Professor Jagath Manatunge, in Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, for the valuable academic advice and support that he gave me to succeed in this study. His dedicated attention to the quality of my research and continuous encouragement is highly appreciated.

My special appreciation is goes to my supervisor, Eng. Dhanesh Gunatileke, Addl. General Manager (Water Reclamation), National Water Supply & Drainage Board, for initiating this research, taking his valuable time to review the thesis and make suggestions, and for his positive criticism and guidance, which helped to accelerate this study.

Also, Grateful acknowledgement is given to Eng L. K. M. C. B. Jayawardene, the Specialist (Water Reclamation) in NWSDB, who helped me at any time to overcome many difficulties regarding wastewater treatment. I gratefully appreciate Mr. L. P. R. J. Wijesinghe, Assistant General Manager (Laboratory Service), and his staff of Central Laboratory, NWSDB, and Mrs. D.S.S. Zoysa, Senior Chemist, Regional Laboratory, Water Treatment Plant Wakwella, Galle and her laboratory staff for helping me for sampling and quality testing within the very short-time notice.

The support received from the Office In-Charge, Mr. Pubudu Wijekerthi, and his staff members at Hikkaduwa Sewage Treatment Plant is thankfully acknowledged and highly appreciated. I thank Mr. Justin, the Lab Assistant at the University of Moratuwa, for helping me with sampling work and quality testing.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their enduring love, dedication, and support throughout this study.

ABSTRACT

Waste stabilization ponds (WSPs) are natural treatment systems extensively employed for wastewater treatment because they efficiently remove BOD, COD, organic matter, and pathogenic microorganisms from domestic wastewater. Wastewater treatment generates significant amount of greenhouse gases, primarily carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). In this study, identification and estimation of direct and indirect emission of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from WSP in a series of facultative pond 1 (primary facultative pond), facultative pond 2, and maturation pond for treatment of municipal wastewater at Hikkaduwa are presented and compared with hypothetical anaerobic pond, which comprising of typical WSP system. In addition, GHG emissions in the entire WSP are compared with the hypothetical activated sludge extended aeration (ASEA) treatment process with the same wastewater characteristics in similar climate conditions. All the calculation approaches of GHG emissions and emission factors are based on literature studies.

GHG emissions during the wastewater and sludge treatment are known as direct GHG emissions, and indirect GHG emissions are generated due to the power consumption of plant operation, which were discussed.

The high rate of CO₂ and CH₄ emissions were observed at the primary facultative pond (FP1) and significantly low in FP2 and MP at HSTP and the amount of production of CO₂ was more significant than that of the production of methane in a series of WSP. However, methane is the main source of carbon footprint in WSP system, which follows the two facultative ponds and maturation pond due to high global warming potential (GWP). It is obvious that WSPs are the minor source of nitrous oxide emission, although GWP over 100 years of N₂O is 298. The results showed that the FP1 was the major direct GHG emission source for HSTP and approximately 75% of GHG emitted that of WSP.

The results further showed that the anaerobic pond was the main source of direct GHG emissions, 40% higher than the FP 1, followed by the FP 2 and the MP. Indirect emissions had the highest contribution to the total carbon footprint in the ASEA treatment process than direct emission.

The ASEA system contributed the highest to the total carbon footprint (3.5 times) than WSP, although direct GHG emission is significantly higher in WSP (72%). The results showed that carbon footprints are highly dependent on the treatment process of WWTPs.

Keywords:

Carbon footprint; direct & indirect emissions; greenhouse gas (GHG) emission; wastewater treatment;

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration of the candidate & Supervisor	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of content	iv
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables	vii
List of abbreviations	viii
List of Appendices	x
List of Annexes	x
List of Nomenclature	xi
01. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Definition of Carbon Footprint	3
1.3 Utilizing Carbon Credits in Waste Stabilization Ponds	3
1.4 Challenges, Limitations, and Gaps in Estimating Carbon Footprints	4
1.5 Objective of the Study	6
02. STUDY AREA.....	7
2.1 Waste Stabilization Pond (WSP) system.....	7
2.2 Activated Sludge Extended Aeration (ASEA) treatment process	9
03. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
3.1 General.....	11
3.2 Global Warming Potential.....	11
3.3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions.....	13
3.3.1 Carbon Dioxide (CO ₂) Emissions	15
3.3.2 Methane (CH ₄) Emissions.....	15
3.3.3 Nitrous Oxide (N ₂ O) Emissions.....	16
3.4 Sources of GHGs	18
3.4.1 GHG Emissions from Unit Operations	18
3.5 Various Treatment Processes.....	19
3.5.1 Activated sludge extended aeration treatment process	23
3.6 Calculation approach	24
3.6.1 Method 01: IPCC approach.....	25
3.6.2 Method 02: RTI International Report.....	33
3.6.3 Method 03: case study-Morocco.....	39

04.	MATERIAL AND METHODS	40
4.1	Description of the Analyzed wastewater treatment plant.....	40
4.2	System Boundaries and Functional Unit.....	41
4.3	Identify GHG contributing processes	44
4.3.1	GHG Emissions	44
4.4	Select a calculation approach.....	47
4.5	Sample Collection and Testing.....	48
4.5.1	Carbon Footprint from direct GHG emission	50
4.5.2	Carbon Footprint from indirect GHG emission	51
4.6	Estimation of GHG Emissions.....	51
	Scope 3: All other indirect emissions not covered in Scope 2.....	51
4.6.1	Scope 1: Method of calculation of all direct GHG emissions.....	52
4.6.2	Scope 2: Method of calculation of indirect emissions	58
05.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	60
5.1	General.....	60
5.2	Results and Discussion	60
5.2.1	Direct GHG Emissions of WSP at Hikkaduwa	60
5.2.2	Indirect GHG Emissions at HSTP	67
5.2.3	Total GHG emissions (carbon footprint) at HSTP	67
5.3	Comparison of GHG emission.....	68
5.3.1	Influent and effluent parameters of a hypothetical process.....	68
5.3.2	Comparison of Direct GHG Emissions.....	68
5.3.3	Indirect GHG Emissions	75
5.3.4	Total GHG emissions (carbon footprint).....	76
06.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	79
6.1	Conclusion	79
6.2	Recommendation	80

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	The Location map of the Study area	7
Figure 2.2	The schematic process flow diagram of WSP at Hikkaduwa	8
Figure 2.3	Schematic Process flow diagram of activated sludge extended aeration treatment process	9
Figure 3.1	Schematic diagram of a typical waste stabilization pond system	11
Figure 3.2	World's Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions	12
Figure 3.3	A conceptual representation of the natural greenhouse effect	13
Figure 3.4	Global greenhouse gas emissions classified by type of gas	14
Figure 3.5	The biological and chemical processes involved in N ₂ O production during nitrification and denitrification	17
Figure 3.6	Human sources of nitrous oxide	17
Figure 3.7	Wastewater treatment systems and discharge pathways	20
Figure 3.8	Production of GHG in anaerobic treatment	21
Figure 3.9	Treatment of waste in a typical facultative pond	22
Figure 3.10	Layout of Activated sludge extended aeration treatment process	23
Figure 4.1	Schematic diagram for the guidelines used for the assessment of carbon footprint	42
Figure 4.2	A system boundary of Hikkaduwa waste stabilization pond	43
Figure 4.3	A system boundary of ASEA treatment process	43
Figure 4.4	Facultative Ponds	43
Figure 4.5	Maturation pond	44
Figure 4.6	Organic degradation repeating cycle at Facultative Pond	46
Figure 4.7	Modelled sources of activated sludge extended aeration treatment process	48
Figure 4.8	Map indicating the sampling locations	49
Figure 5.1	Carbon dioxide emission of functional units	62
Figure 5.2	Methane emission of functional units at HSTP	63
Figure 5.3	Direct GHG emission of functional units at HSTP	65
Figure 5.4	Total direct emission of GHGs equivalent to CO ₂ at HSTP	66
Figure 5.5	Total direct emission of GHGs of functional units at WSP	67
Figure 5.6	Carbon dioxide emission of functional units/plants	70
Figure 5.7	Methane emission of functional units/plants	71
Figure 5.8	Direct GHG emission	73
Figure 5.9	Total direct emission of GHGs equivalent to CO ₂	74
Figure 5.10	Total direct emission of GHGs of functional units at WSP	75
Figure 5.11	Emission of GHG equivalent CO ₂ (carbon footprint)	78

LIST OF TABLES

	Page	
Table 1.1	Gaps and Limitations and key challenges	5
Table 3.1	Global Warming Potentials (100-Year Time Horizon)	13
Table 3.2	Generation and emission of CH ₄ and N ₂ O from Wastewater Treatment Facilities.	20
Table 3.3	Default Maximum CH ₄ Producing Capacity (Bo) for Domestic Wastewater	28
Table 3.4	Default MCF Values and Resultant EFs for Domestic Wastewater	29
Table 3.5	Estimated BOD5 values in domestic wastewater for selected regions and countries	30
Table 3.6	Removal of Organic Component from Wastewater as Sludge	32
Table 3.7	Default Factors for Domestic Wastewater	33
Table 3.8	Default Values for Methane Correction Factor and Biomass Yield	36
Table 3.9	Correction factors for different measurement method	36
Table 4.1	Operational parameters of the system studied	40
Table 4.2	Default Values for Methane Correction Factor and Biomass Yield	54
Table 4.3	Default Emission factors for N ₂ O (EF _{N2O}) values for Domestic wastewater	56
Table 4.4	Combined Margin / Grid Emission Factor (kg-CO ₂ /kWh)	59
Table 5.1	Summary of wastewater quality Parameters	61
Table 5.2	CO ₂ emission rate (Mg CO ₂ /hr) at HSTP	62
Table 5.3	CH ₄ emission rate (Mg CH ₄ /hr) at HSTP	63
Table 5.4	N ₂ O emission rate (Mg N ₂ O /hr) at HSTP	64
Table 5.5	Direct GHG Emission at HSTP	64
Table 5.6	Emission of GHGs equivalent to CO ₂ (tpy CO ₂ eq / year) at HSTP	66
Table 5.7	Total direct emission /carbon footprint at HSTP	66
Table 5.8	CO ₂ emission rate (Mg CO ₂ /hr)	69
Table 5.9	Summary of CO ₂ emission	69
Table 5.10	CH ₄ emission rate (Mg CH ₄ /hr)	70
Table 5.11	Summary of CH ₄ emission	71
Table 5.12	N ₂ O emission rate (Mg N ₂ O /hr)	72
Table 5.13	Direct GHG Emission for functional unit/plant	72
Table 5.14	Emission of GHGs equivalent to CO ₂ (tpy CO ₂ eq / year) for functional units/plants	74
Table 5.15	Total direct emission /carbon footprint at functional unit/ plant	75
Table 5.16	Indirect GHG emission related to the electricity consumption	76
Table 5.17	Total GHG emissions expressed as carbon dioxide equivalent	77

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix - A	Table A.1: Electricity consumption (Power Requirement) for the operation of Activated Sludge Extended Aeration Treatment System
	Table A.2: Summary of wastewater quality by NWSDB
	Table A.3: Summary of wastewater parameters done by Environmental Department Laboratory at University of Moratuwa.
	Table A.4: Summary of wastewater parameters done by NWSDB laboratories

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex 01	Wastewater quality report
----------	---------------------------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AP	Anaerobic Pond
ASEA	Activated Sludge Extended Aeration
BOD	Biological Oxygen Demand
CF	Carbon Footprint
CO ₂ eq	Carbon dioxide equivalent
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
d	day
EF	Emission Factor
FP	Facultative pond 1
FP 2	Facultative Pond 2
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GHGs	Greenhouse gases
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HSTP	Hikkaduwa Sewage Treatment Plant
HRT	Hydraulic Retention Time
hr/hrs	hour/hours
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IWA	International Water Association
LCA	Life Cycle Assessment
MLVSS	Mixed Liquor Volatile Suspended Solids
MCF	Methane Correction Factor
NH ₄	Ammonium
MP	Maturation pond
NWSDB	National Water Supply and Drainage Board
RAS	Return Activated Sludge
RTI	Research Triangle International
SLCCS	Sri Lanka Carbon Crediting Scheme
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
VSS	Volatile Suspended Solids
WHO	World Health Organization
WSP	Waste Stabilization Pond
WWTPs	Wastewater Treatment Plants
yr	Year/yearly

LIST OF NOMENCLATURE

Q_{WW}	:	Wastewater influent flow rate (m^3/hr)
OD	:	Oxygen demand of influent wastewater to the biological treatment unit determined as either BOD_5 or COD ($mg/l = g/m^3$)
EffOD	:	Oxygen demand removal efficiency of the biological treatment unit
CF_{CO_2}	:	Conversion factor for maximum CO_2 generation per unit of oxygen demand
CF_{CH_4}	:	Conversion factor for maximum CH_4 generation per unit of oxygen demand
MCF_{WW}	:	methane correction factor for wastewater treatment unit, indicating the fraction of the influent oxygen demand that is converted anaerobically in the wastewater treatment unit
B_o	:	maximum CH_4 producing capacity, $kg\ CH_4/kg\ BOD$
λ	:	Biomass yield ($g\ C$ converted to biomass/ $g\ C$ consumed in the wastewater treatment process).
Q_s	:	Waste sludge stream flow rate (m^3/hr)
MLVSS _s	:	Mixed liquor volatile suspended solids concentration of the waste sludge stream ($mg/l = g/m^3$)
CF_s	:	Correction factor for the carbon content of the biomass (i.e., MLVSS _s)
CF_C	:	Conversion factor for maximum C consumption per unit of oxygen demand
MCF_s	:	methane correction factor for sludge digester, indicating the fraction of the influent oxygen demand that is converted anaerobically in the digester
B_o	:	maximum CH_4 producing capacity
$N_{2O\text{EFFLUENT,DOM}}$:	N_2O emissions from domestic wastewater effluent in inventory year, $kg\ N_2O/yr$
$N_{\text{EFFLUENT,DOM}}$:	Nitrogen in the effluent discharged to aquatic environments, $kg\ N/yr$.
EF_{EFFLUENT}	:	emission factor for N_2O emissions from wastewater discharged to aquatic system $kg\ N_2O-N/kg\ N$
TN_{DOM}	:	Total nitrogen in domestic wastewater in inventory year, $kg\ N/yr$.
T_i	:	degree of utilization of treatment system
N_{REM}	:	fraction of total wastewater nitrogen removed during wastewater treatment