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ABSTRACT

Low Pressure Reverse Osmosis Membrane (LPROM) has been introduced to water and wastewater industries in the past few years due to the high cost of operational and maintenance of conventional high-pressure RO membrane system. LPROM may remove more than 90% of heavy metals depending on the operating conditions of the system. LPROM with operating pressure less than 100 psi is commercially available to make treatment system more affordable and cost effective. Therefore, the aim of this study was to produce high-quality drinking water using LPROM system by removing heavy metals and other contaminants. The main objective of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of LPROM for rejection of heavy metals, under different operating parameters (i.e. pressure, feed concentrations and pH). A commercially available LPROM (ES20) system manufactured by Nitto Denko Company was used in this study. The experimental design was carried out using Response Surface Methodology (RSM). Two types of wastewater containing heavy metals (i.e. synthetic polluted water containing copper and magnesium from copper chloride and magnesium sulphate solutions, and raw water from ex-mining pool from Tasik Biru, Sarawak) were studied. The experimental study for copper showed that higher operating pressure increased permeate flux and higher feed concentration and pH values increased the percentage of removal. However, the two-way interaction parameter (i.e. pressure vs. pH, pressure vs. feed concentration and pH vs. feed concentration) showed insignificant effects in determining permeate flux and copper removal. For magnesium, all parameters and all two-way interaction were significant in determining the percentage of magnesium removal. The higher the operating pressure resulted in a higher permeate flux and percentage of magnesium removal. A higher the value of pH has caused a lower permeate flux. However, it will increase the percentage of magnesium removal. Besides, the higher the feed concentration of magnesium was also resulted the higher percentage of magnesium removal. The optimum range of operating pressure for both copper and magnesium removal was between 90 to 120 psi and at pH between 5.5 and 7.5. The optimum statistical model for these processes based on the experimental conditions of this study indicates that operating pressure was the most significant parameter in determining the permeate flux. However, the statistical analysis of heavy metals removal was statistically insignificant and showed that the range of parameters in the study appears to be less significant to develop a sensitive and comprehensive model. This was due to the transport or separation mechanism between micropollutants and membrane surface, effect of chemical characteristics as well as effect of metal complexation. As a conclusion, operating conditions such as operating pressure and pH must be taken into account when designing the LPROM system for an optimum process in order to achieve a better heavy metals removal with higher permeate flux.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of the micropollutants contamination in ex-mining pools and previous studies conducted on membrane technology, especially using Low Pressure Reverse Osmosis Membrane (LPROM) to remove micropollutants for drinking water production. The objectives and background of the study are also stated in this chapter. The scope of work are defined and the importance of this study are presented. Lastly, this chapter also presents the structure of the thesis.

1.1 Background of the Study

Direct contamination of surface waters with micropollutants from mining, smelting and industrial manufacturing is a long-standing phenomenon. In Malaysia, water samples from ex-mining pools have been reported containing various micropollutants, especially heavy metals (Yusof et al., 1996; Morgensen et al., 2001).
Heavy metals are conservative pollutants and some of them are harmful to health. Some of these compounds may suppress the immune system, leading to increased susceptibility to disease while some may be carcinogenic. For example, some heavy metals such as copper, mercury and arsenic, for which the proposed guideline values for drinking water quality are quite low (in the range of µg/L to a few mg/L) owing to their carcinogenic effects or other risk factors to public health (Crespo et al., 2004).

Generally, these types of micropollutants contained in polluted raw water can cause problems in water treatment plants. They can inhibit the biological treatment processes and reduce the treatment efficiency of the treatment plants (Buckley et al., 2001). Thus, various technologies have been applied to remove micropollutants in water and wastewater, such as coagulation, filtration, lime softening, activated carbon and membrane technology. Although many of them have proved to be technically feasible, other factors such as cost, operational requirements and aesthetic considerations have not been favourable in some cases.

Membrane technology is considered as one of the most effective processes for water and wastewater treatment. It is a compact system, economically feasible and has high rejection level of pollutants (Oh et al., 2000). Membrane technology has been given special focus in water treatment processes because of its capability in removing physical and chemical matters at a higher-degree of purification. It is commonly divided into microfiltration, ultrafiltration and reverse osmosis (RO), which utilizes pressure differentials (Oh, 2001). Nowadays, RO is one of the effective technologies to remove almost all pollutants, especially those with low concentrations. RO technology is also used today in large water treatment plants. It produces good quality of potable water from brackish and seawater resources, reclaim contaminated water sources and reduce water salinity for industrial applications. In addition, the application spectrum of RO membrane elements covers household units to produce higher quality of drinking water (Wilf, 1998).
However, the use of RO system has been limited due to high operational cost to keep the pressure at high level and maintain its components. RO requires high pressure system and need extensive pre-treatment. Over the history of wastewater treatment and reclamation by RO, developments in membrane technology have resulted in a variety of advancements. These advancements included enhancements in salt rejection capabilities, chemical stability and perhaps most importantly, pressure requirements (Filteau and Moss, 1997). Hence, in the past few years, low pressure reverse osmosis membrane (LPROM) has been introduced to water and wastewater industries (Ujang and Anderson, 2000; Filteau and Moss, 1997; Hofman et al., 1997; Ozaki et al., 2001).

LPROM is not a new concept in membrane technology. Its inception could be traced back to the 1960s (Ujang and Anderson, 2000). At that time, LPROM system was not an attractive system because of low flux and non-reliable membrane materials. For the past 15 years, many improvements were made to the membrane and different models were introduced into the market. One of the goals of many studies carried out recently was to reduce the operating costs of RO, by lowering the required operating pressure of the system. In the mid-1990s, membrane manufacturers began marketing high-rejection-high-flux LPROM (Nemeth, 1998). Recently, LPROM with operating pressure less than 100 psi is available commercially to make the system more affordable and cost effective.

Most studies carried out so far on LPROM have been focused on bench-scale feasibility approach using various pollutants. The applications of LPROM for micropollutants removal, particularly the investigation of operating parameters effect (i.e. pressure, feed pH and feed concentration) on separation of metal chelates, study on transport phenomena based on electrostatic, steric hindrance and filtration effect of LPROM as well as the effect of metal complexation, have not been studied extensively up to date.
1.2 Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study was to produce high-quality drinking water, using LPROM system to remove micropollutants from feed water. This can be achieved by the following specific objectives:-

i. To evaluate the effectiveness of LPROM for rejection of micropollutants, using synthetic wastewater, i.e. magnesium and copper under different operating parameters, such as pressure, feed concentrations and pH.

ii. To analyze and optimize the pressure range and other associated operating parameters for rejection of micropollutants using response surface methodology.

iii. To investigate the feasibility of micropollutant removal from an actual ex-mining pool water, Tasik Biru, Sarawak and to study the effect of metal complexation.

iv. To develop a statistical model for the removal efficiency using LPROM.
1.3 Scope of the Study

This study focused on the performance of LPROM, which was evaluated by response parameters, i.e. permeate flux and the percentage of micropollutant removal. This study was conducted on an experimental rig and the analytical studies include physical and chemical procedures, particularly to evaluate the performance and effectiveness of LPROM system.

The experimental design was carried out using response surface methodology (RSM). RSM is a statistical and mathematical technique which is useful for developing, improving and optimizing processes. All experiments were investigated under different operating parameters, i.e. pressure, pH and feed concentration.

Two types of wastewater containing micropollutants were studied i.e. synthetic polluted water containing micropollutants i.e. copper (Cu) and magnesium (Mg) from copper chloride and magnesium sulphate solutions, and raw water from an ex-tin mining pool from Tasik Biru, Sarawak.
1.4 Importance of the Study

Various technologies have been applied to remove pollutants in raw water, such as ion exchange, activated carbon and membrane separation (Oh et al., 2000). Due to high costs of operation and maintenance of conventional high-pressure RO membrane system, LPROM has been introduced to the water and wastewater industries in the past few years (Ujang and Anderson, 1996; Filteau and Moss, 1997; Hofman et al., 1997; Ozaki et al., 2001). The importance of this study are as follows:-

i. Water and wastewater treatment using LPROM can remove more than 90% of micropollutants depending on the operating parameters of the system. In order to achieve the optimum value of removal and flux rate, this study will be useful to determine the best operating conditions for LPROM system.

ii. This study will provide insight on the transport phenomenon of solutes through the LPROM charged membrane, which can affect the overall performance of LPROM systems.

iii. This study will provide a statistical model which acts as the basic reference in identifying the effectiveness of LPROM system in treating water and wastewater.
1.5 The Organization of the Thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters. Chapter I gives an overview of micropollutants contamination in ex-mining pools and studies conducted on membrane technology, especially LPROM. An overview of the theoretical background of studies conducted on membrane technology, especially LPROM, and theory of membrane transport are presented in Chapter II. Chapter III presents the methodology used in this study including on the design of experiments. Factorial design analysis and response surface methods (RSM) were described in this chapter.

Chapter IV presents the results of the experimental studies that have been described in Chapter III. Findings are combined and discussed holistically in this chapter. The last chapter, Chapter V, stated the conclusions of this study. Recommendations for future studies are also outlined in this chapter.