

Repository Istituzionale dei Prodotti della Ricerca del Politecnico di Bari

Dealing with a cluster of large centralized municipal wastewater treatment plants: A case study

This is a pre-print of the following article

Original Citation:

Dealing with a cluster of large centralized municipal wastewater treatment plants: A case study / De Gisi, Sabino; Pica, Raffaele; Casella, Patrizia; Notarnicola, Michele. - In: PROCESS SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. - ISSN 0957-5820. - STAMPA. - 118:(2018), pp. 268-278. [10.1016/j.psep.2018.07.002]

Availability: This version is available at http://hdl.handle.net/11589/136267 since: 2021-03-31

Published version DOI:10.1016/j.psep.2018.07.002

Publisher:

Terms of use:

(Article begins on next page)

06 May 2024

DEALING WITH A CLUSTER OF LARGE CENTRALIZED MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANTS. A CASE STUDY

3

4 Sabino De Gisi^{1,*}, Raffaele Pica², Patrizia Casella³, Michele Notarnicola¹

- 5
- 6 ¹ Department of Civil, Environmental, Land, Building Engineering and Chemistry (DICATECh), Polytechnic
- 7 University of Bari, Via E. Orabona n.4, 70125 Bari (BA), ITALY
- 8 ² ENEA, Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development,
- 9 ENEA, USER-R4R Lab., Via Martiri di Monte Sole 4, 40129 Bologna (BO), ITALY
- 10 ³ ENEA, Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development.
- 11 Department of Sustainability, P.zza E. Fermi, 80055 Portici (NA), ITALY
- 12

13 ABSTRACT

14

15 The article deals with a cluster of large centralized municipal wastewater treatment plants 16 (LCMWWTPs) assessing the main economic, energy, environmental and management 17 aspects. With reference to the case study of the Regi Lagni system (Southern Italy), 18 composed of five WWTPs for an overall effective population of 2,235,800 inhabitants the 19 study focused first on the multi-disciplinary characterization of the system investigated and 20 then on potential future upgrading options, identifying the best suitable solution. For the 21 scope, several indicators such as running costs, energy consumptions, Greenhouse Gas 22 Emissions (GHG), sludge for landfilling and two scenarios were defined. The first scenario 23 focused on the role of anaerobic digestion while the dewatered sludge was sent to landfill. 24 The second scenario implemented the same operations of the previous one although the 25 construction of a thermal treatment plant for the dewatered sludge was also planned. Results showed how LCMWWTPs could be characterised by low resilience; the upgrading 26 *Address correspondence to:

Sabino De Gisi, Department of Civil, Environmental, Land, Building Engineering and Chemistry (DICATECh), Polytechnic University of Bari, Via E. Orabona n.4, 70125 Bari (BA), ITALY; e-mail: sabino.degisi@poliba.it

of plants to comply with the increasingly stringent legal limits was difficult, especially where works were carried out to ensure continuity of operation. Multi-criteria analysis allowed the cluster system based on anaerobic digestion to be the best solution from an economic, energy and environmental point of view.

31

32 Keywords: Energy consumption, GHG emissions, Regi Lagni, running costs, sludge
 33 management, wastewater engineering

34

35 1. INTRODUCTION

36

Wastewater treatment approaches vary from traditional centralised systems to fully decentralised on-site systems. Centralized systems, usually publicly owned, collect and treat large volumes of wastewater for large communities (Crites and Tchobanoglous, 1998; Massoud *et al.*, 2009). Conversely, decentralised on-site systems treat wastewater from individual homes and buildings (Brown *et al.*, 2009). Between these two extremes, there are other intermediate treatment systems as reported in Libralato *et al.* (2012), and herein described.

44 Centralization consists of a sewer system collecting wastewater that is conveyed to a 45 wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) generally located outside of the limits of the city (Wilderer and Schreff, 2000). Centralization has been the most widely adopted design 46 solution in the previous century and has also been tackled systematically on a scientific 47 48 level (International Water Association (IWA) specialist group on design, operation and costs of large wastewater treatment plants). The Satellite Treatment Plant (STP) facilities 49 50 are integrated with centralised systems for solids processing. The sludge produced by the 51 purification treatment of isolated houses, for example by septic tanks or Imhoff tanks, is

52 transported with tankers to centralized plants equipped with dedicated pre-treatment 53 (Libralato et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2018). The Semi-centralised supply and treatment 54 systems (SESATS) is used for villages and suburbs that cannot always be connected to 55 centralized sewer systems and treatment plants as well as when pumping stations and transfer pipelines are cost-prohibitive (Weber et al., 2007). The arriving wastewater is first 56 57 mechanically pre-treated in a compact plant with integrated fine screen and grit/grease 58 chamber; after intermediate storage, wastewater is treated full-biologically in a compact 59 reactor. In the Great Block system, wastewater from individual buildings (i.e., schools) can 60 be managed with complete recycle systems (Libralato et al., 2012). It represents a highly 61 useful solution for arid and semi-arid areas such as the Mediterranean countries; the 62 recovery of rainwater and the treatment of grey water also for their reuse reduces the demand for drinking water (Lazarova et al., 2003; De Gisi et al., 2016). In the cluster 63 64 systems, typically, 4 to 12 or more houses are grouped to form a cluster system for 65 improved wastewater management (Brown et al., 2009; Libralato et al., 2012). Cluster 66 systems are favourable in areas that are more densely populated or that have poor soil 67 conditions and adverse topography. Finally, in the individual system, the treatment is 68 carried out at home level; different schemes are available such as the NoMix approach 69 where urine and faeces are separated directly at source via an ad hoc WC (McCann, 2010; 70 De Gisi et al., 2014a).

Each system certainly has its own advantages and disadvantages. Several studies have investigated these advantages, criticisms and limitations considering social, economic and environmental issues (Wilderer and Schreff, 2000; Massoud *et al.*, 2009; Libralato *et al.*, 2012; Yung *et al.*, 2018). Although the present world seems to be moving towards decentralised systems, mainly due to significant investments to upgrade facilities at the end of their life cycle, it resulted that none of the approaches could be excluded a priori; generally, the different systems can be integrated with each other on the basis of the
specific required situation (Wilderer and Schreff, 2000; Libralato *et al.*, 2012).

79 The above classification of treatment systems did not take into account that in some 80 territories the concept of centralization was so extended that a cluster of large centralized 81 WWTPs was constructed. In general, the term "cluster" refers to a grouping of 82 interconnected WWTPs; the joint management of sludge, which is also facilitated by the 83 presence of a single water service operator, is an example of relationship between the 84 WWTPs in the cluster. In such a cluster, in order to optimise the system's costs/revenues, 85 the operation of the individual plants was integrated; the flows of one plant (i.e., sludge) 86 were linked to those of another plant.

87 Although the literature on the topic was extensive, there is very little information about a 88 cluster of large centralized WWTPs. However, the study of a cluster of this type can 89 provide useful information on important aspects such as the resiliency of WWTPs, 90 understood as the ability of the plant to comply with substantial changes (i.e., new inlet 91 organic loads, the need to meet more stringent discharge limit values), or whether, at the 92 end of their life cycle, what is the most sustainable upgrading scenario. These issues are particularly relevant in view of the considerable investments that will be made in the next 93 94 few years in renovating the integrated water system (De Gisi et al., 2014b; Dürrenmatt and 95 Wanner, 2014).

Thus, the aim of the paper was to study a cluster of large centralized municipal WWTPs assessing the main economic, energy, environmental and management aspects. With reference to the case study of the Regi Lagni system (Southern Italy), composed of 5 large WWTPs for an overall potentiality of 2,235,800 effective populations equivalent (where, PE corresponds to a five-day biodegradable organic load of 60 g BOD₅/d), the study focused first on the multi-disciplinary characterization of the cluster investigated and then 102 on potential future technological and management upgrading options; in this way it was 103 possible to discuss the best suitable solution from an energy, economic and environmental 104 point of view. Performance evaluation involved the use of various sources; in the case of 105 the estimation of the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions produced by a WWTP, the free-106 available ECAM (Energy Performance and Carbon Emissions Assessment and 107 Monitoring) 2.0 tool was used (http://wacclim.org/ecam-tool/). The assessment of the 108 impact of each plant on the receiving water body, the estimate of costs and energy 109 consumption, of waste produced by the cluster of WWTPs, where not directly supplied by 110 the operator, was carried out on the basis of the indications contained in Teodosiu et al. 111 (2015), De Gisi et al. (2015) and Sabia et al. (2016), respectively.

- 112
- 113 2. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH
- 114

115 2.1 Case study description

116 The Regi Lagni system was an ancient hydraulic reclamation structure, essentially made up 117 of a network of canals dug into the land to drain the waters of an often marshy territory, 118 extending about 100,000 hectares in the productive heart of the provinces of Naples and 119 Caserta (ENEA, 2010a). The canal works, started in Roman times, saw a strong 120 commitment to the hydraulic reorganization during the Spanish Viceregno at the beginning 121 of 1600. The reclamation had put an end to the centuries-old problem of the flooding of the 122 Clanio stream in "Campania Felix" and mitigated malaria in the hinterland. In 1973, the 123 choleric infection that affected the area of Naples justified the beginning of very heavy 124 interventions of urgent hygienic sanitary reorganization of the area. Five large centralised 125 municipal WWTPs were realized, which discharge directly into the main channel of the 126 Regi Lagni system (Fig. 1).

127

Figure 1. The anthropic basin of the Regi Lagni system: (a) Hydrographic sub-basins;
(b) Main river and the 5 large WWTPs.

130

The treatment plants were supposed to "once and for all" clean up the sanitation situation of the drainage water and allow the bathing of the waters north of Naples. The construction of the WWTPs was financed by the Italian Government through the Cassa del Mezzogiorno, as part of the "Progetto Speciale n. 3 per il disinquinamento del Golfo di Napoli" (De Feo *et al.*, 2009).

136 The five WWTPs, having been built in compliance with the rules and design criteria in 137 force in the 1970s, were inadequate to date; the plant structures and equipment have 138 become obsolete and the new environmental regulations have imposed stricter limits. In 139 this respect, Table 1 showed how the PE of today ($PE_{eff} = PE$ effectively served by the 140 WWTP) were different from the project one ($PE_{des} = PE$ related to the project 141 configuration); Acerra, Foce Regi Lagni and Napoli Nord WWTPs were oversized 142 compared to current requirements ($PE_{eff}/PE_{des} \ll 100\%$); on the other hand, the Area Nolana and Area Casertana WWTPs were overloaded by 130.5% and 106.5%, 143 144 respectively.

145

Table 1. The "Regi Lagni" system wastewater treatment plants (re-elaborated Pica *et al.*, 2016).

148

The inlet organic load, expressed as BOD_5 concentration (BOD = Biochemical Oxygen Demand at five days), classified wastewater as medium (around 200 mg/l) and high composition (300 mg/l). Instead, TSS concentrations (TSS = Total Suspended Solids) were in most cases less than 350 mg/l and therefore of low composition. Total nitrogen (TN)
concentrations made it possible to classify wastewater with a medium (around 40 mg/l)
and high (around 85 mg/l) nitrogen composition.

The values of the BOD₅/NH₄-N ratios showed a low ability to remove nitrogen compounds
by conventional denitrification and nitrification processes (Tab. 1).

157 The five WWTPs were designed according to the full-treatment scheme, thus equipped 158 with primary sedimentation, activated sludge-based oxidation and anaerobic digestion. In 159 addition, due to the high overall PE ($PE_{des} = 800,000$), a thermal treatment plant for 160 dewatered sludge was also built at the Area Casertana WWTP.

Data from Pica *et al.* (2016), referring to the 2010 context, showed a different state of quality of the plants and its Unit of Process (UoPs) (Tab. 2), although managed by the same operator. The Area Nolana and Area Casertana WWTPs showed a good quality.

164

165 Table 2. Treatment schemes and status of the unit of process (UoP) (re-elaborated 166 Pica *et al.*, 2016).

167

With the exception of the Area Casertana WWTP, everyone had problems with the sludge line; anaerobic digestion, one of the most delicate processes in the plant, was out of service. Nitrogen removal processes, with the exception of the Area Nolana WWTP, had not been implemented.

The "desolate" situation described above had legal and political implications; in many
cases, some WWTPs had been confiscated by the Competent Authority, precisely because
of frequent violations of environmental protection laws.

175

177 The methodological approach provided first for the evaluation of the performance of the 178 Regi Lagni system (or cluster) in its current configuration and then for the evaluation of 179 the cluster, having hypothesized different technological solutions for WWTPs upgrading. 180 Because of the complexity of the problem, a multi-criteria approach was adopted.

181 By referring to the cluster boundary, the following indicators were identified and 182 quantified (the so called *system-indicators*): (I_{1C}) Energy consumption, (I_{2C}) GHG emissions production, (I_{3C}) Wastes for landfilling, (I_{4C}) Running costs, (I_{5C}) Impact on the 183 184 receiving water body. In detail, I_{1C} measured the consumption of electricity from the 185 national grid for the WWTPs operation. I_{2C} quantified the GHG emissions produced by the 186 treatment processes. I_{3C} considered the total waste produced by the 5 WWTPs, which in 187 turn consisted of screening waste, sand, oil, greases and sludges. I_{4C} quantified the running 188 costs of the plants while I_{5C} measured the overall impact of the 5 WWTPs on the receiving 189 water body. These indicators work on a cluster scale.

However, their quantification included an evaluation at the scale of each WWTP. For example, considering the I_{1C} indicator, its value at cluster scale was calculated as the sum of the energy consumption of each WWTP (I_{1WWTPi}): $I_{1C} = I_{1WWTPi}$ with i = 1, ..., 5. The same approach was followed for the remaining indicators (I_{2C} - I_{4C}). The I_{5C} indicator is detailed subsequently.

Finally, in order to compare the proposed technology upgrading scenarios, a composite
indicator was constructed. The most important elements of the multi-criteria approach are
illustrated below.

198

199 2.2.1 Evaluation database

The data used in the study and shown in tables 1 and 2 were part of a broader study conducted by ENEA in 2010 under the "Regi Lagni project" (ENEA, 2010b). For each 202 plant, there was a detailed report showing the performance in terms of pollutant removal203 and the quality status of the process units; reports were available online (ENEA, 2010a).

Instead, the determination of energy and environmental performance, running costs as well as the quantity of dewatered sludge produced by the plants, where the previous reports were lacking in terms of data (Tab. 3), was done according to the methodologies and databases described below.

208

209 Table 3. Input data availability for the evaluation of the current cluster.

210

211 2.2.1.1 Energy

212 The energy consumption of a municipal WWTP was assessed on the basis of the unit 213 values of the consumption of each UoP. With reference to the data reported in Campanelli 214 et al. (2013) and at 1 m³ of inlet wastewater in the plant, the following values were assumed: 0.07 kWh/m³ for initial pumping (Archimedes screw, centrifugal pumps); 0 215 216 kWh/m³ for the screening (coarse and fine, compaction); 0.02 kWh/m³ for the sand and 217 oils removal (air blower, crane bridge movement, extraction pump and air lift); 0.05 218 kWh/m³ for (pre)denitrification (mixer); 0.38 kWh/m³ for oxidation of the 219 carbon/nitrification fraction (air diffusion system); 0.095 kWh/m³ for recirculation of the 220 mixed liquor (pump); 0.025 kWh/m³ for the return activated sludge recirculation (pump); 221 0.01 kWh/m³ for secondary sedimentation (movement of the bridge crane); 0 kWh/m³ for 222 filtration; 0 kWh/m³ for extraction of primary and secondary sludge (pumps); 0.015 223 kWh/m³ for the aerobic stabilisation of sludge (mixing system); 0.015 kWh/m³ for the 224 mechanical dewatering of the sludge.

The above data showed a zero value for some UoP and therefore the energy consumptionwas negligible.

227 Energy production from anaerobic digestion was assessed, in the absence of site-specific 228 data, according to Metcalf and Eddy (2003), by adopting a specific daily production of 20 229 1/PE/d, corresponding to about 0.075 Nm³ of biogas per 1 m³ of wastewater. This was a 230 "prudential" value, slightly lower than that reported in the literature (Metcalf and Eddy, 231 2003) for an anaerobic digester operating under mesophilic condition (20-40 l/PE/d). With 232 reference to a biogas with a methane content (CH₄) of 60% and an electric motor 233 efficiency of 30% (for the conversion of biogas into electrical energy), a specific electric 234 energy production of 1.6 kWh/Nm³ of biogas was assumed (Campanelli et al., 2013).

The energy requirements of each WWTP therefore took into account both the energyconsumed in the plant and the self-produced energy used for internal uses.

237

238 2.2.1.2 GHG emissions

The evaluation of the GHG emissions produced by the single WWTP involved the use of ECAM 2.0, a tool developed as part of the WaCCliM project (http://wacclim.org/ecamtool/).

242 ECAM considered three types of GHG emissions: direct greenhouse gas emissions; indirect GHG emissions associated with grid electricity consumption; all other indirect 243 244 emissions. Direct emissions included (i) emissions from the maintenance trucks, (ii) CO₂ 245 (carbon dioxide), CH₄ and NO₂ (nitrogen dioxide) emissions from on-site stationary fossil 246 fuel combustion, (iii) CH₄ and (iv) NO₂ from sewers or biological wastewater treatment. 247 The other indirect emissions, instead, included (i) emissions from manufacturing of 248 chemical used, (ii) emissions from the construction materials used, (iii) CH₄ and NO₂ from 249 wastewater discharge without treatment, (iv) CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O from sludge transport off-250 site and (v) NO₂ from effluent discharge in receiving waters. Other emissions, such as end-251 user emissions or CO₂ produced by microbial rupture of organic matter in activated sludge

reactors (considered to be a source of biogenic nature, although the literature is controversial on this point), were not included in ECAM (ECAM 2.0 manual, 2017).

254 The environmental assessment was carried out on an annual basis. With reference to the Italian situation, the values of "Emission factor for grid electricity", "Annual protein 255 256 consumption per capita" and "BOD₅ per person per day" were assumed of 0.410898038 257 kgCO₂/kWh, 40.88 kg/person/year e 60 g/person/day, respectively (provided by default by 258 the tool, that allows only the country to be selected). The IPPC 5th AR (2014/2013) CCF 259 was selected as "Global Warming Potential (GWP) source". The GWP values relative to CO_2 for a 100-year time horizon were: $CO_2 = 1$ CO_2 equivalents; $CH_4 = 34$ CO_2 260 261 equivalents; $N_2O = 298 CO_2$ equivalents.

ECAM also allowed to define the typology (i.e., activated sludge) and the functioning (well-managed, minor poorly aerated zones, some aerated zones, not well managed) of the biological treatment implemented in the plant as well as the sludge disposal method (composting, incineration, land application, landfilling and stockpiling). In this specific case, the landfill was the final destination of the sludge, which, once mechanically dewatered, was transported by means of transport to landfills for special waste.

Furthermore, evaluation with ECAM takes place at two stages, indicated *Tier A* and *Tier B*. 268 269 The first (Tier A) allowed a preliminary evaluation of WWTP performance in terms of 270 GHG emissions and energy consumed; as an input, several parameters were to be 271 provided, as following reported: PE, energy consumed from the grid, volume of fuel 272 consumed, volume of treated wastewater, volume of discharged wastewater to water body, 273 running costs, energy costs, average Total Nitrogen (TN) at discharge, if you are producing biogas and/or if you are valorising biogas, the main treatment type (i.e., activated sludge, 274 275 trickling filter, etc.) as well as the sludge disposal method (composting, incineration, 276 landfilling, etc.). Instead, the Tier B offered a detailed assessment. In addition to the

277 previous parameters, as the data input it was necessary to add the influent and effluent 278 BOD load, the BOD removed as sludge, the BOD mass removed, if used, the type of fuel 279 engines (i.e., methane) as well as the volume of fuel consumed. Furthermore, many other 280 requests composed the so-called "advanced assessment" modules.

281 In this study, the GHG emissions were estimated with the *Tier B*.

282

283 2.2.1.3 Running costs

284 The running costs considered in the study related to the cost of (i) electricity, (ii) operating personnel and (iii) technical/managerial ones, (iv) reagents (sodium hypochlorite or 285 286 peracetic acid for disinfection, ferric chloride or polyelectrolyte for sludge conditioning), 287 disposing of (v) screening by-products (European Waste Code – EWC 19 08 01), (vi) oils 288 and greases (EWC code 19 08 09), (vii) sands (EWC code 19 08 02), (viii) sludge (EWC 289 code 19 08 05) and (ix) for maintenance. The unit cost of operating and technical 290 personnel was 3.78 and 1.65 \notin /PE, in line with the literature related to large facilities (PE > 291 200,000) (De Feo et al., 2012) as well as the values provided directly by the operator. 292 For reagents, values of 0.35 and 0.24 €/PE were assumed respectively for disinfectant and

chemical used for sludge conditioning. The unit cost for the disposal of screening byproducts and sand was $138 \notin/t$; the cost for the disposal of oils and greases and for sludge was 100 and 200 \notin/t , respectively. The unit cost of electricity, both consumed and produced, was assumed to be $0.12 \notin/kWh$.

The current cost, calculated as the sum of the above items (De Gisi *et al.*, 2015), was then increased by 10% to take account of general expenses and VAT (value-added tax).

299

300 2.2.1.4 Wastes for landfilling

301 The calculation of the wastes for landfilling required the prior identification of the system

boundary which, in the case of a single WWTP, coincided with the physical boundary of the plant. In the absence of site-specific data, sludge production was estimated (primary and secondary) using the methodology reported in Sabia *et al.* (2016). The sludge from the plant was then sent to landfill via trucks. Taking into account that the sludge produced in the Regi Lagni system has long been sent to Apulia Region (De Feo *et al.*, 2017), a distance of 300 km was assumed between the centre of gravity of the basin and the landfill.

309 2.2.1.5 Environmental impact on water body

The environmental impact of the WWTPs cluster was calculated considering the environmental impact assessment methodology reported in Teodosiu *et al.* (2015). In particular, considering the single WWTP, the environmental impact (EI) on the water body was estimated with the following relation:

314

$$EI = \frac{C_{det} \cdot q_{det}}{C_{max} \cdot q_{max}} \cdot IU$$
⁽¹⁾

315

where q_{det} was the average wastewater flow discharged by the pollution source (measured value), m³/s; q_{max} was maximum contracted wastewater flow, according to the environmental permit, m³/s; C_{det} was the average pollutant concentration (as given by a specific water quality indicator) in the effluent, mg/L; C_{max} was the maximum allowed concentration (MAC) for wastewater discharging into natural receivers, mg/L; IU importance unit (dimensionless).

Based on the available data, three common water quality indicators were used: BOD_5 , TSS and TN. The maximum allowed concentrations, MAC, referred to the discharge limits imposed by Italian Law (D.Lgs 152/2006): $BOD_5 = 25$ mg/l; TSS = 35 mg/l; TN = 15 325 mg/l.

326 The importance units (IU), that in accordance to Teodosiu et al. (2015) was introduced in 327 the method as an expression of the impact of the polluter upon the state of the receiving 328 water body, was evaluated on the basis of the data available at the time of the assessment 329 (year 2010). In this regard, the Campania regional environmental protection agency 330 (ARPAC) classified all the sections of the Regi Lagni river as belonging to the fifth class 331 of the chemical status (ARPA, 2010). According to the Water Framework Directive (EC, 332 2000), the fifth class had a "bad" meaning and as consequence, the river waters were 333 highly contaminated. Based on Teodosiu et al. (2015), a value of 1 was given for waters 334 with a bad chemical water quality class. This assignment covered all the 5 WWTPs of the 335 Regi Lagni system. Finally, the environmental impact of the WWTPs cluster, represented 336 with I_{5C} indicator, was calculated as the average value of the impact produced by each 337 WWTPs.

338

339 2.2.2 Scenarios for future upgrading's

As explained later, following the assessment of the *status quo* of the Regi Lagni system,
various technological solutions for the enhancement of the 5 WWTPs were considered. For
this purpose, two alternative scenarios (clusters) were identified (Tab. 4).

343

344 Table 4. Scenario analysis of upgrading project actions.

345

The first scenario concerned the Regi Lagni system in its current configuration (Cluster A). The second scenario (Cluster B) provided for the recovery of all treatment units for each WWTP, considering both the water and sludge lines. The scenario therefore focused on the role of anaerobic sludge digestion; the dewatered sludge, after being stored on a common 350 platform, was sent to landfill.

351 Instead, the third scenario (Cluster C) implemented the same operations as in the scenario 352 B. Differently, the construction of a centralized thermal treatment plant for the dewatered 353 sludge was also planned; the sludge output from the five WWTPs was thus sent to the 354 thermal treatment plant located (virtually) in the Area Casertana WWTP. As can be seen 355 from Table 2, a sludge incineration plant, although not functioning, was already realized at 356 the Area Casertana site. In addition, for the third scenario, in order to calculate the GHG 357 emissions due to transport, a standard distance of 5 km was assumed between each WWTP 358 and the virtual thermal treatment plant. The consumption of fuel (methane gas) for 359 incineration was estimated at 0.58 Nm³ per kg of dry sludge (Mininni et al., 2004), having 360 assumed a dry content in the sludge of 30%.

Scenarios B and C involved the restoration of anaerobic digestion, which represents the most advantageous solution for high loaded WWTP equipped with primary sedimentation (generally, it is adopted for capacities greater than 50,000 PE). The adoption of a thermal process for scenario C was linked to the need to minimize the sludge to be disposed of in landfills, thus containing disposal costs as well as recovering energy from the combustion of sludge. These solutions were in line with literature (Panepinto *et al.*, 2016).

367

368 2.2.3 Multi-criteria analysis methodology

The two scenarios described above constituted the 2 alternatives in the context of the multi-criteria problem (De Gisi *et al.*, 2017, 2014b), whose goal was to identify the best solution.

372 The multi-criteria analysis provided for the definition of 5 indicators as previously reported 373 $(I_{1C}-I_{5C})$.

374 The preference index, indicated with PI and defined as the parameter that aggregates the

information of the evaluation criteria (or indicators), was the result of the following
relation (Sabia *et al.*, 2016):

377

$$PI_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \overline{x}_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} x_{ij} \cdot w_{j}$$
(2)

378

Where, x_{ij} is the performance of the alternative i-th (i.e., each cluster) with respect to the jth evaluation criterion (I_{1C} - I_{5C}). Instead, the normalized value was calculated with the following relations:

382

$$\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} = \mathbf{x}_{ij} / \mathbf{Max}(\mathbf{x}_j) \tag{3}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{ij} = \mathrm{Min}(\mathbf{x}_j) / \mathbf{x}_{ij} \tag{4}$$

383

Where, the selection of the relation depends on the nature of the criterion, if it was to maximize or minimize in respect to the general goal (to select the best scenario). In the specific case, all criteria were to be minimized.

387 The method described above allowed to evaluate the single cluster in respect of the five 388 criteria described above and, further, to identify the best suitable cluster, representing by 389 the scenario with the highest value of PI.

In order to verify the goodness of the obtained solution, three different weighing vectors were considered, corresponding to three different decision makers: environmentalist, water service operator/manager, balanced. The environmental decision-maker (Env) was the one who attached the greatest importance to pro-environmental criteria; the following condition was defined: Impact on the water body (I_{5C}) = GHG emissions (I_{2C}) > Wastes for landfilling (I_{3C}) = Energy balance (I_{1C}) > Running costs (I_{4C}). On the other hand, the decision-maker in the water service (Ser) was the one who attached the greatest importance to the pro-management criteria; the following condition was therefore defined: Running costs (I_{4C}) = Impact on water body (I_{5C}) > Wastes for landfilling (I_{3C}) = Energy balance (I_{1C}) > GHG emissions (I_{2C}). Finally, the balanced decision-maker (Bal) was what he considered the 5 indicators to be equally important.

- 401 The application of the SAW-PCT (Simple Additive Weighting Paired Comparison 402 technique) method reported in De Gisi *et al.* (2014b) made it possible to determine, with 403 reference to criteria I_{1C} , I_{2C} , I_{3C} , I_{4C} and I_{C5} , respectively, the following weights: $V_{Env} =$ 404 (0.167; 0.167; 0.067; 0.300; 0.300); $V_{Ser} = (0.167; 0.167; 0.300; 0.067; 0.300); V_{Bal} =$ 405 (0.200; 0.200; 0.200; 0.200; 0.200).
- 406
- 407 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**
- 408
- 409 3.1 *Cluster performance in current configuration*

410 Assessing the performance of the cluster in its current configuration initially included a411 detailed assessment of the performance of each WWTP.

412 Results in terms of BOD₅, TSS and TN removal showed diverging values (Tab. 5); a total 413 of 4 out of 5 plants did not comply with the discharge limit values (25 mg/l) for BOD₅. As 414 well as, with reference to the TN, the output values were on average higher than the set 415 limit (15 mg/l). In addition, Napoli Nord and Area Casertana WWTPs also showed 416 overruns in TSS, highlighting difficulties in the solid/liquid separation of secondary 417 sedimentation. Only the Area Nolana WWTP showed excellent performance with 418 reference to all the considered parameters.

419 The results in terms of performance were essentially in line with the technological level

420 and operating status of the UoPs of the WWTPs (Tab. 2).

421

Table 5. Main pollutants removal efficiency and comparison with the Italian legal
limits (re-elaborated Pica *et al.*, 2016) ^(a).

424

The good performance of Area Nolana WWTP was the result of the upgrading actions carried out in the past years and reported in detail in Pica *et al.* (2012). The other plants, although operated by the same operator, were not subject to an adjustment.

428 The experience described in Pica et al. (2012) in Area Nolana WWTP allowed to explain 429 the difficulties encountered during the upgrading of the plant; adaptation made necessary 430 to tackle an increase in the inlet organic load (BOD_5) or to comply with the new stringent 431 limits for nitrogen compounds. The adaptation had to be carried out in such a way as to 432 avoid interruption of the treatment service. The procedure implemented by ENEA (Italian 433 National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development) 434 and here briefly described, had initially provided for storage of the inlet wastewater 435 (approximately 3000 m³/h) for a sufficient time to perform the work of interconnection of 436 the new biological line with the existing operating lines. Subsequently, the new 437 denitrification, nitrification/oxidation unit was realized and an additional secondary 438 sedimentation unit was activated. The most arduous part of the work involved the 439 construction of connecting pipes between the secondary sedimentation tank and the 440 existing splitter (location of the sludge recirculation pumps) without interruption of 441 operation. The large tubing (700mm diameter) had required the construction of a special 442 metal carpentry that had allowed the tubing coming from secondary sedimentation to reach the central part of the existing splitter; in this way, the hydraulic load of the side wells of 443 444 the aerated mixture was discharged into the metal carpentry. Pica et al. (2012) also pointed 445 out how the implemented procedure resulted in only about 0.65% increase in the total cost

of the revamping project. The above procedure was successfully applied to Area Nolana
WWTP only, although it could also be extended to the other WWTPs of the Regi Lagni
system.

The experience described above, in addition to showing why Area Nolana worked, had highlighted how large centralized WWTPs could show a limited resilience; the upgrading of the plant, only for adaptation to the increasing inlet organic load, could be difficult to implement in the hypothesis of ensuring the continuity of service operation.

The subsequent analyses (costs, energy, etc.) confirmed the results of the treatment yields,although other interesting aspects were highlighted.

455

Table 6. Running costs, energy consumption, GHG emissions and waste produced by the Regi Lagni WWTPs system on annual basis.

458

The analysis of running costs, for example, made it possible to identify the unusual behaviour of Foce Regi Lagni WWTP (Tab. 6). The per capita value of 21.8 \notin /PE/y was symptomatic: the plant had a higher value when PE increased, thus not respecting the laws of economy of scale (Lubello and Breschi, 2000). Nevertheless, running costs were substantially in line with the literature related to large WWTPs, where Kampet (2000) referred to a per capita cost in the range of 20-30 \notin /PE/y for plants with a potential > 100,000 PE.

The study of the individual cost items (Fig. 2a-f) showed that for Foce Regi Lagni and Napoli Nord WWTPs, the largest item concerned the disposal of sludge, with a percentage value of 51 and 44%, respectively. These values were wide-ranging the 34% reported in Campanelli *et al.* (2013). However, for the other plants, the main items were the cost of reagents (25% for Acerra WWTP and 27% for Area Nolana) and of the operational staff 471 (28% for Area Casertana WWTP); there was basically a good balance between costs. The
472 operational staff of Area Casertana WWTP was in line with 27% reported in Campanelli *et*473 *al.* (2013).

474

Figure 2. (a-f) Costs; (g-l) Energy consumption per Unit of Process (UoP); (m-r) GHG
emissions. In the figure, (a, g, m) = Napoli Nord WWTP; (b-h-n) = Acerra WWTP;
(c-i-o) = Area Nolana WWTP; (d-j-p) = Foce Regi Lagni WWTP; (e-k-q) = Area
Casertana WWTP.

479

The energy consumption analysis showed values in line with the economy of scale (Tab. 6), with variable values in the range 12.3-58.1 kWh/PE/y. The specific consumption of Foce Regi Lagni and Area Casertana WWTPs were lower compared to those reported in literature; in this respect, the Federal Environmental Agency (2007) reported 32 kWh/PE/y for PE > 100,000, while Thöle (2008) and Haberken *et al.* (2008) showed a range of 20-42 kWh/PE/y and 25-80 kWh/PE/y, respectively. Acerra and Area Nolana WWTPs were in line with the aforementioned literature.

The items that mostly contributed to total energy consumption were oxidation (57-76%), initial lifting (11-14%) and lifting of the return activated sludge (4-5%) (Fig. 2g-l). The Area Nolana WWTP was the only one with an energy consumption related to nitrogen removal processes, in line with the technological status shown in Table 2. In addition, it (Area Nolana) showed a much lower percentage of energy consumption (57%) due to the oxidation of the carbon fraction compared to other plants; moreover, this percentage was in line with Menendez *et al.* (2010), which reported a value of 60%.

The assessment of GHG emissions focused on other interesting aspects. Firstly, the lowTable 6 values of GHG were broadly linked to biological treatment; the latter was

496 incomplete (i.e., not-well managed) and consequently the GHG was lower than in the case 497 of complete treatment (Yoshida et al., 2014). The detailed analysis showed that the 498 malfunctioning plants (i.e., Foce Regi Lagni and Napoli Nord WWTPs) were characterised 499 by high percentages of GHG emissions due to CH₄ and NO₂ from untreated wastewater. 500 Instead, with reference to the most performing plants (i.e., Area Nolana WWTP), the 501 higher GHG emissions were due to the production of energy to be used in the water line 502 (71-78%), to indirect GHG emissions (10-14%) and to GHG emissions for the 503 management of sludge (8-10%).

504 Finally, the study of the per capita production of wastes destined for disposal also revealed 505 the anomalous behaviour of Foce Regi Lagni WWTP (Tab. 6); the per capita value (54 506 kg/PE/y) was far greater than that of the other plants (23 kg/PE/y). Most probably, this was 507 due to the treatment cycle implemented, based exclusively on gravity thickening and 508 mechanical dewatering, the latter not perfectly efficient. With regard to the Napoli Nord WWTP, the sludge production was substantially in line with De Feo et al. (2012); 509 510 assuming a specific production of 50 kg/PE/y, there was a per capita sludge production of 511 51 kg/PE/y.

The above results made it possible to quantify the I_{1C} - I_{5C} indicators, thus extending the evaluation on a cluster scale. Results showed current cost values (I_{1C}), energy consumption (I_{2C}), GHG emissions (I_{3C}) and landfill waste production (I_{4C}) of 18.8 \notin /PE, 24.7 kWh/PE, 113.5 kgCO_{2,eq}/PE and 33.1 kg/PE, respectively (See cluster A, Fig. 3).

516

517 Figure 3. (a) Running costs, (b) energy consumption, (c) GHG emissions, (d) wastes 518 for landfilling and (e) environmental impact on the water body for the clusters under 519 investigation. Cluster A = Scenario composed by the 5 WWTPs that implement the 520 current technologies (status quo); Cluster B = Scenario subject to structural and

521	technological upgrading with sludge management by anaerobic digestion; Cluster C =
522	As in the case of the scenario B, but with a sludge-fired centralized thermal plant,
523	which treats the dewatered sludge of all 5 WWTPs.
524	
525	As far as waste is concerned, it was found to be composed of screening waste, sands, oils
526	& greases and dewatered sludge. Stored in suitable areas, they were destined for landfill
527	disposal, jointly managed by the unique operator (Fig. 4).
528	
529	Figure 4. Mass balance of waste generated by each WWTP and by the Regi Lagni
530	system as a whole in the current configuration (Cluster A).
531	
532	In terms of impact on the receiving water body, the I_{5C} indicator, calculated as the average
533	value of impacts on the water body of each WWTP, showed a value of 0.839. Such a high
534	value was largely attributable to the low treatment yields of the main polluting parameters
535	such as BOD ₅ , TSS and TN, as shown previously. In particular, among all the plants,
536	Napoli Nord WWTP contributed mostly (Fig. 5).
537	
538	Figure 5. Impact on the receiving water body of the 5 WWTPs and of the cluster.
539	
540	The analysis of the cluster in its initial configuration was subsequently used to compare the
541	goodness of the WWTPs upgrading hypotheses, as herein described.
542	
543	3.2 Cluster performance in future configurations following plant upgrading
544	Two alternative scenarios were considered. The first would have provided for the recovery
545	of all UoPs and the putting into operation of anaerobic digestion, for all facilities of the

546 system. The second, in addition to the contents of the previous scenario, would also have 547 provided for the construction of a centralized thermal treatment plant for the treatment of 548 the dewatered sludge produced by the Regi Lagni WWTPs, thereby minimising the 549 transport of sludge to landfill. In this respect, previous Figure 3 showed the simulation 550 results for both scenarios.

It was possible to observe how all the indicators, with the exception of GHG emissions (I_{3C}) , showed an increase with respect to the *status quo*; bringing the plants to comply with the legal limits, there was inevitably an increase in running costs, energy consumption and wastes for landfilling.

555 The multi-criteria evaluation, whose theoretical bases are given in section 2.2.3, allowed to 556 identify the best scenario, that was the one based on the upgrading of plants by the 557 operation of anaerobic digestion of sludge (Fig. 6a).

558

559 Figure 6. Preference Index score for the identification of the best management 560 scenario (cluster) varying decision-makers: Considering (a) the GHG emissions 561 estimated with ECAM 2.0, (b) a further reduction in GHG emissions of 50%.

562

The scenario in question was the best from a multi-criteria point of view, despite the presence of a thermal treatment plant that could have allowed to minimize the sludge to be sent to landfill. The result thus obtained was validated by varying the weights to be attributed to the criteria, and considering, therefore, three different types of decision-maker (De Gisi *et al.*, 2014a).

The multi-criteria evaluation carried out by imposing a reduction of the GHG emissions of 569 50% in cluster C showed greater competitiveness of the thermal-based scenario. In 570 particular, the "so cleaner" cluster C was the best solution for both the environmental and 571 the water service operator decision-maker. Such a higher preference index was linked to a 572 50% reduction in GHG emissions as well as a reduction in running costs, estimated at 573 around 30%; the latter was the result of lower consumption of methane as additional fuel. 574 In this respect, Mininni et al. (2004) showed how the replacement of the traditional 575 incineration, based on the fluidised bed technology (which is the one implemented in 576 ECAM 2.0), with one able to integrate evaporation and fluidised bed technology (the so 577 called integrated fluidised bed technology) allowed to obtain a drastic reduction of fuel 578 consumption and as a consequence, also the GHG emissions linked to this aspect would be 579 reduced.

580

581 4. CONCLUSIONS

582

583 The analysis of the Regi Lagni case study, that is to say of the system of large plants built 584 in the 70's and according to a vision that favoured large centralized WWTPs, showed a 585 limited resilience of the plants with respect to the plant adaptations; such adaptations were 586 necessary for various reasons as dealing with increases in the inlet organic load or the 587 compliance with new discharge limit values, as in the case of nitrogen compounds. From 588 the five considered plants, only Area Nolana WWTP, which was previously adapted to 589 meet the increase in its influential organic load, demonstrated any problems in complying 590 with the legal limit values. However, the lack of resilience, required the use of special 591 engineering solutions; the concept was to adapt the plant without interrupting operation.

The case study also highlighted the importance of adopting suitable approaches for adapting the WWTPs cluster; a multi-criteria approach, able to take into account the economic, energy, GHG emissions, waste production as well as the impact on the receiving water body, was a very reliable tool. In this specific case, the cluster based on the re-functioning of anaerobic digestion for all the plants represented the best solution from a multi-criteria point of view, positioning it more successfully than in the case of the scenario based on the construction of a centralised sludge thermal treatment plant. Although the results obtained cannot be extended to the case of other WWTPs clusters around the world, they can be used as a reference in all similar situations, characterized by the presence of a cluster of large WWTPs interconnected (i.e., in sludge management), a

single water service operator as well as the need to adapt the plants since they havereached the end of their life cycle.

604

605 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

606

The authors express their gratitude to Giuseppe Iannone for the valuable support he has shown during the processing of the results. In addition, the authors thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments, which have strengthened the article.

610

611 **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

612

613 None

614

615 **REFERENCES**

616

617 ARPAC, 2010. Classification of the water bodies of the Campania Region (Southern Italy)

618 in quality classes in accordance with the Water Framework Directive for 2010 (Available

619 on line at this link: <u>http://www.arpacampania.it/riepilogo-acque-superficiali</u>; Accessed on

620 7 June 2018).

621

Brown, V., Jakson, D.W., Khalifé, M., 2010. 2009 Melbourne metropolitan sewerage
strategy: a portfolio of decentralised and on-site concept designs. *Water Sci. Technol.*624 62(3), 510-517.

625

626 Campanelli, M., Foladori, P., Vaccari, M., 2013. Electrical consumption and energy
627 efficiency in waste water treatment. Maggioli Editore, pp. 386 (in Italian).

628

629 Crites, R.W., Tchobanoglous, G., 1998. Small and Decentralized Wastewater Management
630 Systems. MacGraw-Hill, New York, USA.

631

De Feo, G., De Gisi, S., Ferrara, C., Notarnicola, M., 2017. Comparison between the waste
management of two Southern Italy Regions: Lessons learnt and future perspectives. In
Proceedings Sardinia 2017/Sixteenth International Waste Management and Landfill
Symposium/ 2 - 6 October 2017 S. Margherita di Pula, Cagliari, Italy.

636

637 De Feo G., De Gisi S., Galasso M., 2012. Wastewater. Design and management of
638 treatment and disposal facilities, Dario Flaccovio Editore Srl, Palermo, Italy, pp. 1244 (in
639 Italian).

640

641 De Feo, G., De Gisi, S., Ferrante, A., Galasso, M., De Rosa, R., Giuliani, A.,
642 Guadagnuolo, S., Pucci, L., 2009. The first year of operation of the Nocera Superiore
643 waste-water treatment plant. *IA Ingegneria Ambientale* 37(6), 310-317 (in Italian).

644

645 De Gisi, S., Molino, A., Notarnicola, M., 2017. Enhancing the recovery of gypsum in

- 646 limestone-based wet flue gas desulfurization with high energy ball milling process: A
 647 feasibility study. *Process Saf. Environ.* 109, 117-129.
- 648
- 649 De Gisi, S., Casella, P., Notarnicola, M., Farina, R., 2016. Grey water in buildings: a mini-
- 650 review of guidelines, technologies and case studies. *Civ. Eng. Environ. Syst.* 33(1), 35-54.
- 651
- De Gisi, S., Sabia, G., Casella, P., Farina, R., 2015. An integrated approach for monitoring
 efficiency and investments of activated sludge-based wastewater treatment plants at large
 spatial scale. *Sci. Total Environ.* 523, 201-218.
- 655
- De Gisi, S., Petta, L., Wendland, C., 2014a. History and technology of Terra Preta
 Sanitation, *Sustainability* 6(3), 1328-1345.
- 658
- De Gisi, S., Petta, L., Farina, R., De Feo, G., 2014b. Development and application of a
 planning support tool in the municipal wastewater sector: The case study of Italy. *Land Use Policy* 41, 260-273.
- 662
- Dürrenmatt, D.J., Wanner, O., 2014. A mathematical model to predict the effect of heat
 recovery on the wastewater temperature in sewers. Water Res. 48, 548-558.
- 665
- EC, 2000. Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23
 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy.
 Official J Eur Union, L327/1.
- 669
- 670 ECAM 2.0 Manual Draft V1 August 2017. Energy Performance and Carbon Emissions

671 Assessment and Monitoring Tool Methodology (Available at this link:
672 http://wacclim.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/ECAM-V2-Methodology_Aug2017.pdf;
673 Accessed on 7 June 2018).

674

ENEA, Capacità prestazionali dei depuratori afferenti al sistema idrico dei Regi Lagni,
2010a (Available at this link: http://www.bologna.enea.it/ambtd/regilagni/Regi_Lagni_up-to-date_2010/) (Accessed on 3 March 2018) (in Italian).

678

679 ENEA, Progetto Regi Lagni, 2010b (Available at this link:
680 http://eboals.bologna.enea.it/ambtd/regi-lagni/homepage-rl.html) (Accessed on 3 March
681 2018) (in Italian).

682

D.Lgs. 152/2006. Decreto Legislativo 3 aprile 2006, n. 152. "Norme in materia
ambientale", Gazzetta Ufficiale n. 88 del 14 aprile 2006 – Supplemento Ordinario n. 96 (in
Italian).

686

Federal Environmental Agency (Umweltbundesamt), 2007. Electricity consumption ofWWTP's at German.

689

Haberkern, B., Maier, W., Schneider, U., 2008. Steigerung der Energieeffizienz auf
kommunalen Kläranlagen (Enhancing the energy efficiency of municipal wastewater
treatment plants) Dessau-Roβlau (Germany): Umweltbundesamt.

693

694 International Water Association (IWA) specialist group on design, operation and costs of 695 large wastewater treatment plants (Available at this link: http://www.iwa-

696 network.org/groups/design-operation-and-costs-of-large-wastewater-treatment-plants/)
697 (Accessed on 3 March 2018).

698

Jung, Y.T., Narayanan, N.C., Cheng, Y.-L., 2018. Cost comparison of centralized and
decentralized wastewater management systems using optimization model. *J. Environ. Manage.* 213, 90-97.

702

Kampet, T. (2000), The cost planning for building, operating and maintaining wastewater
treatment plants. Presentation in the frame of the Tacis Project: "Water environmental
monitoring and management in the Kaliningrad Oblast". MVV/Innotec. (Available at this
link: https://cgi.tu-harburg.de/~awwweb/wbt/emwater/documents/lesson_c2.pdf)
(Accessed on 3 March 2018).

708

Lazarova, V., Hills, S., Birks, R., 2003. Using recycled water for non-potable, urban uses:
a review with particular reference to toilet flushing. *Water Sci. Technol.* 3, 69-77.

711

Lee, E.J., Criddle, C.S., Geza, M., Cath, T.Y., Freyberg, D.L., 2018. Decision support
toolkit for integrated analysis and design of reclaimed water infrastructure. *Water Res.* 134,
234-252.

715

Libralato, G., Volpi Ghirardini, A., Avezzù, F., 2012. To centralise or to decentralise: An
overview of the most recent trends in wastewater treatment management. *J. Environ. Manage.* 94, 61-68.

719

720 Lubello, C., Breschi, T., 2000. Benchmarking of water services: wastewater treatment

721 plants. Edizioni Sudgest, Roma, Italy (in Italian).

722

Massoud, M.A., Tarhini, A., Nasr, J.A., 2009. Decentralized approaches to wastewater
treatment and management: applicability in developing countries. *J. Environ. Manage.* 90,
652-659.

726

McCann, B., June 2010. Exploiting wastewater potential through nutrient recovery
research. *Water* 21, 39-41.

729

Menendez, M., 2010. How we use energy at wastewater plants...and how we can use less.Conference of the North Carolina Section of the American Water Works Association,

732733

Charlotte, NC.

Metcalf & Eddy, 2003. Wastewater engineering. Treatment and Reuse (4th ed.), McGraw
Hill, New York.

736

- Mininni, G., Braguglia, C.M., Passino, R., Tomei M.C., 2004. A comprehensive strategy
 for sludge management. In the proceedings of the National Conference Ecomondo 2004, 36 November, Rimini, Italy (in Italian).
- 740
- 741 Panepinto, D., Fiore, S., Genon, G., Acri, M., 2016. Thermal valorization of sewer sludge:
- 742 Perspectives for large wastewater treatment plants. J. Clean. Prod. 137, 1323-1329.

- Pica, R., Giuliano, A., Sabia, G., Busi, S., De Gisi, S., 2016. The remediation of the Regi
- 745 Lagni system in Campania. Problems in the operation of wastewater treatment networks in

746 critical contexts. In proceedings of the National Conference Ecomondo 2016, 8-11747 November, Rimini, Italy.

749	Pica, R., Pasanisi, F., Tebano, C., Salluzzo, A., Cesaro, G., 2012. Regi Lagni: Revamping
750	of the Wastewater Treatment Plant "Area Nolana" Without Service Interruption. Energia,
751	Ambiente e Innovazione 4-5, 115-122 (Available at this link:
752	http://www.enea.it/it/seguici/pubblicazioni/EAI/anno-2012/n4-5-luglio-ottobre-parte-
753	I/regi-lagni-revamping-of-the-wastewater-treatment-plant-201carea-nolana201d-without-
754	service-interruption) (Accessed on 3 March 2018).
755	
756	Sabia, G., De Gisi, S., Farina, R., 2016. Implementing a composite indicator approach for
757	prioritizing activated sludge-based wastewater treatment plants at large spatial scale. Ecol.
758	Indic. 71, 1-18.
759	
760	Teodosiu, C., Robu, B., Cojocariu, C., Barjoveanu, G., 2015. Environmental impact and
761	risk quantification based on selected water quality indicators. Nat. Hazards 75 (1), 89-105.
762	
763	Thöle, D., 2008. Ways to identify possibilities of energy saving at wastewater treatment
764	plants. Water and Energy Workshop, IWA World Water Congress 2008, Vienna, 9
765	September 2008.
766	
767	WaCCliM project, Waste and Wastewater Companies for Climate Mitigation (Available at
768	this link: http://wacclim.org/ecam-tool/) (Accessed on 3 March 2018).
769	
770	Weber, B., Cornel, P., Wagner, M., 2007. Semi-centralised supply and treatment systems

for (fast growing) urban areas. *Water Sci. Technol.* 55(1-2), 349-56.

- 773 Wilderer, P.A., Schreff, D., 2000. Decentralised and centralised wastewater management:
- a challenge for developers. *Water Sci. Technol.* 41, 1-8.
- 775
- 776 Yoshida, H., Mønster, J., Scheutz, C., 2014. Plant-integrated measurement of greenhouse
- gas emissions from a municipal wastewater treatment plant. *Water Res.* 61, 108-118.



(a) (b) **Figure 1.** The anthropic basin of the Regi Lagni system: (a) Hydrographic sub-basins; (b) Main river and the 5 large WWTPs.



Acerra WWTP; (c-i-o) = Area Nolana WWTP; (d-j-p) = Foce Regi Lagni WWTP; (e-k-q) = Area Casertana WWTP.



Figure 3. (a) Running costs, (b) energy consumption, (c) GHG emissions, (d) wastes for landfilling and (e) environmental impact on the water body for the clusters under investigation. Cluster A = Scenario composed by the 5 WWTPs that implement the current technologies (*status quo*); Cluster B = Scenario subject to structural and technological upgrading with sludge management by anaerobic digestion; Cluster C = As in the case of the scenario B, but with a sludge-fired centralized thermal plant, which treats the dewatered sludge of all 5 WWTPs.



Figure 4. Mass balance of waste generated by each WWTP and by the Regi Lagni system as a whole in the current configuration (Cluster A).



Figure 5. Impact on the receiving water body of the 5 WWTPs and of the cluster.



Figure 6. Preference Index score for the identification of the best management scenario (cluster) varying decision-makers: Considering (a) the GHG emissions estimated with ECAM 2.0, (b) a further reduction in GHG emissions of 50%.

Parameter	Unit	WWTPs						
		Napoli	Acerra	Area	Foce Regi	Area		
		Nord		Nolana	Lagni	Casertana		
PE _{des} ^(a)	-	886,000	828,000	311,000	632,000	800,000		
$\text{PE}_{\text{eff}}^{(b)}$	-	227,400	252,400	406,000	500,000	850,000		
$PE_{eff}/PE_{des}^{(c)}$	%	25.7	30.5	130.5	79.1	106.3		
Average flow	m ³ /d	64,602.7	48,986.3	84,164.4	105,369.8	150,575.3		
rate ^(d)								
BOD ₅	g/m ³	211.2	309.1	289.4	284.7	338.7		
TSS	g/m ³	458	175	204	117	184		
Total Nitrogen	g/m ³	45.7	82.4	67.5	75.9	73.4		
BOD ₅ /NH ₄ -N	adim	4.62	3.75	4.28	3.75	4.61		
Propensity to	-	medium	poor	medium	poor	medium		
removal nitrogen(e)								

Table 1. The "Regi Lagni" system wastewater treatment plants (re-elaborated Pica et al., 2016).

^(a): $PE_{des} = population$ equivalent related to the project configuration; ^(b): $PE_{eff} = population$ equivalent effectively served by the WWTP; where PE = corresponds to a five-day biodegradable organic load of 60 g BOD₅/d; ^(c): Plant load percentage; ^(d): Flow rates were measured; ^(e): The ratio expresses the capacity to remove nitrogen by means of a biological process (i.e., activated sludge, as in our case). According to De Feo *et al.* (2012), based on the value of the BOD₅/N-NH₄ ration, the following classes can be used: < 4 (poor), 4-6 (medium), 6-8 (good), > 8 (excellent).

Unit of process	WWTPs ^(a)							
•	Napoli	Acerra	Area	Foce Regi	Area			
	Nord		Nolana	Lagni	Casertana			
Water line								
Initial pumping	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🕲)			
Screening	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)			
Sand removal	(yes; 🙁)	(yes; 🙁)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)			
Oils removal	(yes; 😕	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😐	(yes; 😕)			
Primary sedimentation	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🕲)			
Pre-denitrification	(no)	(no)	(yes; 🙂)	(no)	(no)			
Oxidation	(yes; 😑)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)			
Secondary sedimentation	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)			
Filtration	(no)	(no)	(yes; 🙂)	(no)	(no)			
Disinfection	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)			
Sludge line								
Pre-thickening	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)			
Aerobic stabilization	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)			
Anaerobic Digestion (AD)	(yes; 🙁)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 🙂)			
Post-thickening	(yes; 😕)	(no)	(yes; 🙂)	(no)	(yes; 🙂)			
Sludge chemical conditioning	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 🙂)			
Mechanical dewatering	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)	(yes; 😐)	(yes; 🙂)			
Thermal drying/incineration	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(yes; 😕)			
Engine energy production from	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 😕)	(yes; 😐)			
biogas								

Table 2. Treatment schemes and status of the unit of process (UoP) (re-elaborated Pica *et al.*, 2016).

^(a): In the round brackets: yes = the unit of process is available, no = otherwise; UoP status: O = works well; O = not well managed; O = does not work.

Input data	Unit	WWTPs ^(a,b)					
		Napoli	Acerra	Area	Foce Regi	Area	
_		Nord		Nolana	Lagni	Casertana	
Electricity consumption	kWh/m ³	(yes; 0.56)	(no)	(yes; 0.48)	(yes; 0.16)	(yes; 0.22)	
Dewatered sludge	kg/m ³	(yes; 0.56)	(yes; 0.32)	(yes; 0.16)	(no)	(yes; 0.30)	
production							
Sand production	kg/m ³	(yes; ~0)	(yes; ~0)	(yes; 0.125)	(yes; 0.04)	(yes; 0.015)	
Biogas production	m ³ /d	(yes; ~0)	(yes; ~0)	(yes; ~0)	(yes; ~0)	(yes; 838.7)	
Persons employed	Person	(yes; 68)	(yes; 47)	(yes; 48)	(yes; 69)	(yes; 84)	
Running costs	€/m ³	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	(no)	

Table 3. Input data availability for the evaluation of the current cluster.

(a): In the round brackets: yes = yes, the data is provided by the WWTP operator; no = otherwise, the data was estimated; (b): The number in brackets is the value of the data provided by the WWTP operator.

N.	Scenario/Cluster	Concerned	Characteristics of the interventions			
		WWTPs	Water line	Sludge line		
А	Current configuration. Anaerobic digestion not working.	-	-	-		
В	Upgrading based on Anaerobic Digestion.	Acerra, Foce Regi Lagni, Napoli Nord, Area Nolana.	Recovering of all UoPs; Pre- denitrification; Oxidation/nitrification well managed.	Recovering of all UoPs; Anaerobic digestion well managed; Mechanical dewatering well managed; Energy recovery from biogas.		
C	As in the case of the previous scenario, but with a thermal treatment plant.	Acerra, Foce Regi Lagni, Napoli Nord, Area Nolana, Area Casertana.	As in the previous scenario.	As in the previous scenario; Realization of a centralized waste-to-energy plant for the incineration of sledges produced by the Regi Lagni system WWTPs.		

Table 4. Scenario analysis of upgrading project actions.

Parameter	Unit	LVs ^(b)	WWTPs ^(c)				
			Napoli	Acerra	Area	Foce Regi	Area
			Nord		Nolana	Lagni	Casertana
BOD ₅	g/m ³	25	(33.8; 😕)	(34.0; 😕)	(20.2; 🙂)	(45.6; 😕)	(50.8; 😕)
TSS	g/m ³	35	(87.0; 🙁)	(21.0; 🙂)	(24.5; 🙂)	(32.7; 🙂)	(40.4; 😕)
TN ^(d)	g/m ³	15	(38.4)	(15.6)	(13.5)	(60.7)	(38.2)
%BOD ₅	%	≥ 80	(84.0; 🙂)	(89.0; 🙂)	(93.0; 🙂)	(84.0; 🙂)	(85.0; 🙂)
% TSS	%	≥ 90	(81.0; 🙁)	(88.0; 🙂)	(88.0; 🙁)	(72.0; 🙁)	(78.0; 😕)
%TN ^(d)	%	70-80	(16.0)	(81.0)	(80.0)	(20.0)	(47.9)

Table 5. Main pollutants removal efficiency and comparison with the Italian legal limits (reelaborated Pica *et al.*, 2016) ^(a).

(a): Average values considering the year of observation; (b): Limits refer to plants with capacity > 100,000 PE; (c): In the round brackets: the value: (a) = compliance with the discharge limit value of the D.Lgs 152/2006; (b) = not in compliance; (d): the WWTPs under investigation discharge into a non-sensitive area; therefore, they are not subject to the nitrogen limit value.

Table 6. Running costs, energy consumption, GHG emissions and waste produced by each WWTP of the Regi Lagni WWTPs system on annual basis.

N.	WWTP	PE _{eff} ^(a)	Running costs		Energy consumption		GHG emissions		Wastes for landfilling ^(b)	
			[€]	[€/PE]	[kWh]	[kWh/PE]	[t _{CO2eq}]	[kg _{CO2eq} /PE]	[t]	[kg/PE]
1	Napoli Nord	227,400	6,622,869.9	29.1	13,204,800.0	58.1	29,358.0	129.1	13,454.9	59.0
2	Acerra	252,400	4,641,822.1	18.4	8,940,000.0	35.4	32,585.0	129.1	5,999.2	24.0
3	Area Nolana	406,000	7,136,448.2	17.6	14,745,600.0	36.3	39,901.0	98.3	9,201.8	23.0
4	Foce Regi Lagni	500,000	10,887,889.3	21.8	6,153,600.0	12.3	64,550.0	129.1	27,088.4	54.0
5	Area Casertana	850,000	12,730,086.8	15.0	12,091,200.0 ^(c)	14.2	87,455.0	102.9	18,247.4	21.0

^(a): Population equivalent that effectively loads the plant; ^(b): Wastes (solid and liquid) produced in the plant and destined for landfilling; ^(c): It refers to the net value as the difference between the energy needs of the plant and the energy produced in the plant through the anaerobic digestion of sludge.