

APPENDIX-A

Table A1. Sewage properties and characteristics used in the current model

Sewage flow characteristics		
S.No	Parameters	Values
1	City Population Equivalent	1.3E+06
2	Sewage produced/ Person	150 L
3	Suspended solids/ Person	0.06 kg
4	BOD in influent / Person	0.05 kg
5	BOD removed in primary clarifier	30%
6	Target Effluent	20 mg/ L
7	F/M (Food / Microbial)	0.7
8	MLSS (Mixed Liquor Suspended Solids)	4000 mg/ L
9	MLVSS/MLSS (MLVS-Mixed Liquor Volatile Suspended Solids)	0.8
10	Sewage inlet temperature	10 °C

Table A2. Clarifier-settling tanks, aeration and thickening system parameters

Upstream Process Parameters					
	CAPEX ^a , \$	Power Demand ^b kWh/m ³	Solid Removal Efficiency %, η	Polymer Demand	Source
Primary and Secondary Clarifier Systems (Tank, Pumps, Rakes)	6.02 E+06	35.67	60	NA	[1, 2]
Aeration tank and Blowers	5.42 E+06	0.0459	NA	NA	[2, 3, 4] and estimation.
Belt Thickener	2.92 E+06	0.3	85	0.003 kg /kg dry solids	[5, 6]

^a Adapted based on scale up factors from available literature.

^b Adapted and calculated based on empirical correlations and available literature.

Table A3. Aeration Energy requirement validation

Aeration Basin Power Requirements				
		[4]	Model (Empirical based, safety factor-1.25)	INPUTS
Q	M ³ /d	100	100	
SS	g/m ³	1800	1800	
BOD	g/m ³ d	660-770	700	
F/M		0.3-0.46	0.4	
K, (BOD removal rate)	g/m ³ hr	NA	0.001	
SOTE	η	4%	4%	
O ₂ /BOD	Kg/kgd	1	1	
Volume of Reactor	m ³ /unit	7900	7762	OUTPUTS
Air supplied	m ³ /hr	244800	298029	
HRT	Hours	6.2-4.8	6.01	
Centrifugal Blower Power	kW	5294	5472	
Power	Kwhr/Kg O ₂ dissolved	1.5	1.84	

Anaerobic Digester Process Parameters					
	CAPEX ^a , \$	Power Demand ^b , kWh/m ³ .day	VS destruction Efficiency %, η	Methane production, ml/ kg VS	Source
Anaerobic Digester	90	0.12	0.5	450	[7,8,9]

Table A4. Anaerobic Digester process parameters

^a Concrete cost/ m³ .

^b mixing energy requirement.

Table A5. Anaerobic digestion system products and compositions

	Sludge Type	VS Destruction /day	Product	Composition	Parameters
1	Mixed Sludge	2.5%	CH ₄ -450 ml/ kg VS	CH ₄ -60%, CO ₂ -40%	20-Days, 6.5 pH and 35 °C
2	Primary Sludge	4%	VFAs- 600 mg/L.day	Acetic acid -40%, propionic acid -25%, butyric acid -20% and Valeric acid - 15%	5-days, 10 pH and 25 °C
	Waste activated sludge	3.5%	VFAs- 300 mg/L.day		10-days, 10 pH and 25 °C

Table A6. Product recovery system parameters

Product Recovery and Intensification				
Separation Technology	CAPEX ^a , \$	Power Demand ^b	Separation Efficiency %, η	Source
CED/BPED	3.2 E+06 ^c	3 kWh/kg	90	[10]
Membrane Filtration (MF/UF)	377.52 \$/ m ³ .d	0.1 kW/3.78 m ³	90 ^d	[11,12,13]
Super Critical-(SCO ₂) Extraction	2E+06 / 400 L Batch	0.8 kWh/kg	60	[14,15]

^a Adapted based on scale up factors from available literature.

^b Adapted, calculated based on empirical correlations and available literatures.

^c Membrane cost -1774 \$/m², 2 yearly replaced, Peripheral and Stack cost – 3 x Membrane cost.

^d Turbidity removal.

CHP and Boiler System					
	CAPEX ^a , \$	Power Demand ^b	Energy Efficiency %, η	Methane Leak	Source
CHP	1340 / kW	3 ^c %	85	2%	[16-18]
Water Scrubbing	1.65E+06/ 1000 m ³ /hr	0.25 kWhr/ Nm ³	90 ^d	2%	[19, 20]
Boiler & accessories	542 / kW	NA	85	NA	[21]

Table A7. CHP and Boiler system parameters

^a Adapted based on scale up factors from available literature.

^b Adapted and calculated based on empirical correlations and available literatures.

^c Parasitic power demand.

^d Water scrubbing energy efficiency at 98% methane purity.

Table A8. Pyrolysis product composition and energy content

Pyrolysis Product composition at 550 °C				
	Oil	Gas	Char	Source
Composition %	25	42	30	Estimate
Energy (MJ/kg)	32-43	7-23	9.56-14.2	Estimate

Table A9. Pyrolysis system parameters

Pyrolysis System				
	CAPEX ^a , \$	Power Demand	Energy Efficiency %, η	Source
Pyrolysis	53 \$/kg	6.5 MJ/ Kg ^b	85	Estimate

^a Adapted based on scale up factors from available literature.

^b Heat Energy demand.

De-Watering System					
	CAPEX ^a ,	Power Demand	Solid Removal Efficiency %, η	Polymer/Chemical Demand	Source
Centrifuge	132 \$/kg	3.2 kW/m ³ s	90	0.01 kg / kg of dry solids	Estimate
Dryer	287 \$/kg	2.15*10 ⁶ J/ Kg ^b	90	NA	[22, 23]

Table A10. Dewatering system parameters

^a Adapted based on scale up factors from available literature.

^b Heat Energy demand.

References for Appendix:

1. K.J. Swanson, Clarifier Improvements Facility Plan, Mankato, 2013.
2. W. Eckenfelder, Biological Treatment of Wastewater, Advances in Hydro science, 1966, Volume 3, Pages 153-190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-021803-5.50010-4>.
3. N.K. Shamas and L.K. Wang, Pure oxygen activated sludge process, Handbook of Environmental Engineering, 2009, 8, 283–314.
4. J.K. Nelson and J.L. Puntenney, Performance Comparison of the Air and High-Purity-Oxygen Activated Sludge Systems, J. Water Pollut. Control Fed, 1983, 55, 336–340.
5. PURE, Good practices in sludge management, Finland, 2012.
6. Technical Memo-8, Sludge Thickening Systems Evaluation, Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District Solids Handling Facilities Plan, Madison Metropolitan, 2009.
7. F. Bonk, J.R. Bastidas-Oyanedel and J.E. Schmidt, Converting the organic fraction of solid waste from the city of Abu Dhabi to valuable products via dark fermentation – Economic and energy assessment, Waste Manag, 2015, 40, 82–91. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.03.008>
8. H. Carrere, C. Dumas, A. Battimelli, D. Batstone, J.P. Delgenès, J.P. Steyer and I. Ferrer, I, Pretreatment methods to improve sludge anaerobic degradability: A review, Journal of hazardous materials, 2010, 183, 1-3, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2010.06.129>
9. L. Metcalf, H.P. Eddy, and G. Tchobanoglous, Wastewater engineering : treatment and reuse. Fourth edition / revised by George Tchobanoglous, Franklin L. Burton, H. David Stensel. Boston : McGraw-Hill, 2003.
10. Y. Wang, N. Zhang, C. Huang and T. Xu, Production of monoprotic, diprotic, and triprotic organic acids by using electrodialysis with bipolar membranes: Effect of cell configurations, Fuel Energy Abstr, 2011, 385, 226–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.memsci.2011.09.044>.
11. B. Yirmibesoglu, Physical processes for particle matter removal from wastewater effluents: A comparative study, Master's Thesis, Tampere University of Technology, 2016.
12. B. Movahed, Introduction and applications of low pressure membranes (MF/UF). AMTA Technology Transfer Workshop, Knoxville, Tennessee – May 4-6, 2010.
13. J.R. Braker, 10 MGD UF water treatment plant after 5+ years of operation. AMTA Technology Transfer Workshop, Knoxville, Tennessee – May 4-6, 2010.
14. M.Henczka and M Djas, Reactive extraction of acetic acid and propionic acid using supercritical carbon dioxide, J. Supercrit. Fluids, 2016, 110, 154–160. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.supflu.2015.11.018>
15. J. Rocha-Urbe, J. Iván Novelo-Pérez and C. Araceli Ruiz-Mercado, Cost estimation for CO₂ supercritical extraction systems and manufacturing cost for habanero chili. J. Supercrit. Fluids, 2014, 93, 38–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.supflu.2014.03.014>.
16. Clarke-Energy, Jenbacher gas engines, 2015. <https://www.clarke-energy.com/gas-engines/>

17. M. Lantz, The economic performance of combined heat and power from biogas produced from manure in Sweden – A comparison of different CHP technologies. *Appl. Energy*, 2012, 98, 502–511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2012.04.015>
18. P. Lako, Combined Heat and Power, 2010. https://iea-etsap.org/E-TechDS/PDF/E04-CHP-GS-gct_ADfinal.pdf
19. J.H. Marina, Cost evaluation and life cycle assessment of biogas upgrading technologies for an anaerobic digestion case study in the United States, Master's Thesis – *Industrial Ecology*, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 2017.
20. Q. Sun, H. Li, J. Yan, L. Liu, Z. Yu and X.Yu, Selection of appropriate biogas upgrading technology-a review of biogas cleaning, upgrading and utilisation, *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 2015, 51, 521–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.06.029>.
21. E. Agbor, A. Oyedun, X. Zhang and A. Kumar, Integrated techno-economic and environmental assessments of sixty scenarios for co-firing biomass with coal and natural gas, *Appl. Energy*, 2016, 169, 433–449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.02.018>.
22. S. Klein, Belt Dryer, Germany, 2016. <https://www.tratamentodeagua.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/secadores-esteira-centrisys-2.pdf>
23. P.V. Diana, Construction and operation of a Sewage sludge thermal drying process at low temperature using the clinker kiln gases in Cemex Alicante cement factory, 2013.