

Environmental Science Water Research & Technology

Characterization, fate and transport of floc aggregates in full-scale flocculation tanks

Journal:	Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology
Manuscript ID	EW-ART-11-2015-000259.R1
Article Type:	Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Dec-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Gagnon, Graham; Dalhousie University, Civil and Resource Engineering Vadasarukkai, Yamuna; Dalhousie University, Civil and Resource Engineering

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts Page 1 of 25

5

1 Characterization, fate and transport of floc aggregates in full-scale flocculation tanks

- 2 Yamuna S. Vadasarukkai*and Graham A. Gagnon*[§]
- ^{*} Department of Civil and Resource Engineering, Dalhousie University, Canada
- 4 [§]Corresponding Author: Dr. G.A. Gagnon, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, B3J 1Z1,
 - e-mail: graham.gagnon@dal.ca, Tel: 902.494.3268, Fax 902.494.3108

6 1. Abstract

7 Floc size distribution is of high operational importance as it governs the transport and 8 removal of contaminants from drinking water. The complex nature of turbulent flow in treatment 9 plants has limited the research to quantify the dynamics of flocculation. This paper describes the 10 use of a submersible digital in-line holographic microscopy (DIHM) technique for the 11 measurement of the spatial distribution of floc sizes in a direct filtration treatment facility. The 12 DIHM tool was positioned at thirteen different locations in a flocculation tank and holograms were recorded for at least 10 minutes at each location. The acquisition of morphological details 13 14 of flocs (e.g., floc counts, size distributions and floc velocities relative to the fluid motion) from 15 the reconstructed DIHM images is discussed. The results of the spatial distribution of floc sizes 16 indicated that the volume equivalent floc diameter measured in the flocculation tank was mostly 17 of large-sized aggregates greater than 100 µm, which can have adverse impacts on the 18 performance of a direct filtration process. The relative motion of flocs calculated from the DIHM 19 analysis ranged from 0.002 to 0.008 m/s. Results showed that the investigated DIHM technique 20 could be used as an operational tool to evaluate flocculation performance in terms of floc sizes, 21 which is otherwise difficult to characterize in most treatment plants. The information acquired 22 from this tool is important to understand the fate and transport of flocs during flocculation for 23 process optimization that can lead to minimize chemical and energy usage in treatment plants.

24 **2.** Water impact

The ability to obtain details on floc morphology from in-line measurements will significantly advance our understanding of the fate and transport of flocs with their associated contaminants in treatment plants. In this study floc counts, floc size distributions, and floc velocities are characterized relative to hydrodynamics in a hydraulic flocculation tank. The results demonstrated that large, irregular shaped floc aggregates were formed in flocculation due to limited supply of active mixing in the tank. Accumulation of large flocs on filters has an 31 economical impact on the plant performance. In a broader context, the ability to understand floc

32 formation in real-time has potential to assist in other environmental applications (e.g.,

33 wastewater treatment, algal detection).

34 **3. Introduction**

35 Coagulation is an important treatment process for the removal of mineral and organic particles in water supplies that are typically stable in water.¹ Inorganic metal salts added in 36 37 coagulation causes a change to the surface chemistry of constituent particles in source water mainly by charge neutralization or enmeshment of particles within metal hydroxide precipitates.² 38 39 Flocculation that follows coagulation is the gentle mixing phase used to achieve contact between unstable particles in suspension, promoting their aggregation.³ Particles grow in flocculation 40 41 often leading to aggregates of highly porous, loosely connected, irregular shaped structures, described as flocs.^{3, 4} High molecular weight polymers are at times added as a flocculant aid to 42 43 increase floc strength and size by adsorption and interparticle bridging mechanisms.⁵

44

45 Flocs represent a complex matrix of microbial communities, colloids and suspended materials, and organic and inorganic constituents.⁶ The size and strength of the developed flocs 46 47 determines the efficiency of solids removal processes. Preferred floc characteristics differ 48 depending on the solids removal processes used-for instance, relatively small, dense and low-49 volume flocs are recommended for direct filtration (i.e., no sedimentation step) in order to enhance the effective use of the media depth.⁸ In contrast, large and dense aggregates with high 50 resistance to breakage are preferred for sedimentation.⁹ Although the porosity of aggregates 51 52 often increases with floc size, which affects their settling rates, their volume, and dewatering characteristics of the sludge.¹⁰ Therefore a compromise between sedimentation efficiency and 53 54 sludge filtration characteristics has to be achieved in industrial practice.

55

Flocculation is a dynamically active process which is directly influenced by its hydrodynamic conditions.^{9, 11} The flow conditions are driven by localized fluid turbulence that depends on both the geometry of the flocculation tank and the impeller speed and type.¹² Flocs are transported between zones of varying levels of energy dissipation in a turbulent flow; this results in a continuous process of aggregation and breakage of flocs.¹¹ Hopkins and Ducoste¹³ 61 showed that the average floc size varied spatially in a flocculation reactor at low mixing speeds

62 with larger flocs sizes and growth rates in the bulk region and a larger variance in the impeller

- 63 discharge region. A simulation study by Samaras et al.¹⁴ showed no large flocs in the region
- 64 close to the impeller and floc growth in regions of high residence time. Data on spatial variations
- 65 in floc size distribution is an important parameter to understand the transport and removal of
- 66 particles in flocculation, sedimentation and filtration of suspensions.¹⁵
- 67

68 Measuring floc physical characteristics (e.g. size and morphology) can be achieved by using a number of different techniques such as optical microscopy¹⁶, automated image analysis 69 system¹⁷, coulter counters¹⁸, laser diffraction techniques¹⁹, and photometric dispersion 70 analyzer²⁰. Most of these techniques (including microscopy, imaging analysis, and laser 71 72 diffraction) require withdrawal of floc samples through pipetting or pumping and/or dilution of 73 floc samples prior to the measurement. Such sampling procedures can disrupt the floc structure, causing floc breakage.²¹ In-line methods are advantageous for floc analysis as it eliminates 74 75 sample collection and/ preparation issues. Only few studies have used in-line techniques (e.g., Oliveira et al.²², Chakraborti et al.²³)- for instance, Chakraborti et al.²³ used a non-intrusive 76 photographic technique coupled with a digital image processing system to characterize alum floc 77 aggregates formed in a jar test. But all these aforementioned techniques are limited to laboratory 78 79 workbench only.

80

81 Holographic microscopy is a technique that can be used for the characterization of marine 82 particulates and tracking particle motion, such as the swimming behaviour of microscopic organisms²⁴, and spatial distribution of micrometer and sub-micrometer particles in dense liquid 83 suspensions.²⁵ In the current study, a submersible digital in-line holographic microscopy (DIHM) 84 85 was used for the non-destructive, direct measurement of floc characteristics (e.g., floc counts, 86 sizes, relative floc velocities) in a three-stage hydraulic flocculation tank at the J.D. Kline Water 87 Supply Plant in Halifax, Canada. The flow characteristics of the flocculation tank were 88 previously modelled using computational fluid dynamics (CFD), as described by Vadasarukkai et al.¹². In the previous study, the predicted average velocity gradient (i.e., the G- values) ranged 89 from 2 to 40 s⁻¹ at various inflow conditions in the flocculation tank, which was significantly 90 below the recommended design criteria of 20 to 75 s^{-1.8} 91

92

The purpose of the current study was to obtain in-line measurements of floc size distributions and floc velocities relative to the prevailing turbulent flow in hydraulic flocculation tanks. The potential implications of identified floc characters on filter performance are also discussed. It was hypothesized that the use of DIHM tool will improve the understanding of flocs transport in flocculation as it is capable of counting particles, conducting image analysis and tracking particle motion. The present study is its first application to the authors' knowledge in the drinking water industry.

100 4. Materials and methods

101 **Overview of the study site:**

102 The study was carried out at the J.D. Kline Water Supply Plant in Halifax, Canada. The 103 design capacity of the plant is about 220 ML/d, with an average daily intake of 95 ML/d. Raw 104 water is pumped into the direct filtration facility through a 1.2 m (48") inlet pipe, and flows 105 under gravity into the subsequent treatment processes. As seen in Fig. 1, the treatment process 106 consists of three rapid mix tanks in series, four parallel units of a three-stage tapered hydraulic 107 flocculation tanks, eight direct dual-media filtration units in parallel, and chlorination. Calcium 108 hydroxide (lime) is added for pH adjustment in the first of three premix tanks. Water then passes 109 to the second premix tank, where additional mixing takes place, and then to the final premix tank 110 where carbon dioxide is used to adjust to the coagulation pH of 5.5–6 and an average alum dose of 8 mg/L of aluminum sulfate is added for coagulation.²⁶ 111

112

113 Flow distributes the water after coagulation into four identical hydraulic flocculation 114 tanks. Each flocculation tank contains three rows of two parallel sets of chambers (i.e., total six). 115 The inlet pipe is located primarily below grade at the site, which divides the incoming water into 116 the first set of chambers (Fig. 1). The length, width, and depth of each flocculation chamber are 117 5.0 m, 5.0 m, and 8.3 m, respectively. Two tapered vertical shafts are provided for the water to transfer between the three rows of flocculation chambers. Each shaft has a capacity of 11.95 m³ 118 119 and 18.68 m³ respectively. The water enters at an inclined angle into the first chamber due to the 120 inlet design. After mixing in the first chamber it flows over a weir, then through a vertical shaft, 121 and enters the next cell from the bottom. The design of an up-and-down flow arrangement in the

subsequent second and third flocculation chambers provides the tapered G-value for mixing
purposes.¹² After the flocculation process, the water is distributed to filter units through a floc
water conduit.

125 **DIHM set-up and acquisition of images:**

126 Fig. 2 shows the main components of the submersible digital in-line holographic 127 microscopy (4deep Inwater Imaging, Halifax, Canada). It consists of a laser source that directs 128 the light (λ = 365 nm) through a 500 nm pinhole. A spherical wave emanates through the pinhole, 129 which acts as the point source. As seen in the schematic in Fig. 2, it has two pressure chambers, 130 one of which houses the laser and the other has a CCD camera (JAI PULNIX Inc., Sunnyvale, 131 CA) connected to a computer source and a power supply. A 3 mm sampling space was provided 132 between the two chambers to allow free circulation of water (medium) between them. The 133 sampling space can be adjusted up to an 8 mm range depending on floc sizes to measure. Interference between the reference wave with a known phase distribution and light scattered 134 from various size range of floc aggregates in the water was recorded as holograms.²⁵ The records 135 136 of interference patterns contain spatial information about flocs within the imaged volume. 137

138 The present study was conducted on one parallel set of chambers of a hydraulic 139 flocculation tank. The flow characteristics predicted in the previous CFD study¹² were used to select different sampling locations to position the submersible microscope in the tank. According 140 141 to the model, three distinct regions were identified in the tank – namely, short circuiting, 142 recirculation and stagnant (non-mixing) zones as shown in Fig. 3. The short circuiting path was 143 created by a jet velocity of flow near the inlet which caused some portion of the incoming flow 144 to rapidly exit into the second flocculation chamber. An intense recirculation region was formed at the interior of the first flocculation chamber, where 10.4% of simulated particles were shown 145 trapped in that region for a longer residence time from the particle tracking analysis.¹² Stagnant 146 (or non-mixing) zones depicted in Fig. 3 represented those regions in the second and third 147 148 flocculation chambers where the flow path of particles never visited.

149

As illustrated in Fig. 4, the DIHM tool was positioned at thirteen different sampling
locations in the flocculation tank to acquire a true representation of the spatial distribution of floc
sizes in a turbulent flow. Specifically, eleven locations in section X-X in the first chamber and

two locations in section Y-Y in the last chamber were chosen. These locations were selected based on the three regions identified from the flow characteristics described previously. For instance, 1B and 2B were the locations that represented the short circuiting path near the inlet in the first tank; locations 4M and 4B at the center denoted the recirculation region. No sampling location was selected for the second flocculation chamber as the fluid velocity was low in the stagnant zones (Fig. 3). Only two locations, 6T and 6B, were selected for the last (third) flocculation chamber, where location 6T was situated near the peripheral outflow.

160

At each selected location, the DIHM was placed perpendicular to the fluid motion to allow free circulation of water through the sampling space. The instrument was held firmly using a rope, and the holograms were recorded continuously for 10 minutes at 15 fps by the CCD camera as illustrated in Fig. 5. Data was transmitted from the camera to the computer via an underwater cable. All the recorded holograms were stored as bitwise digital images in the computer for further analysis.

167 Image processing- hologram reconstruction and measuring the floc aggregates:

168 Stored holograms were reconstructed numerically to obtain images of floc aggregates 169 within the imaged volume. Software (Holosuite, 4deep Inwater Imaging) was used to reconstruct 170 each batch of holograms acquired at a sampling location. An example of reconstruction step is 171 illustrated in Fig. 6. Here, two consecutive holograms were paired to remove the background 172 noise. This combined file, called the difference hologram, was then reconstructed with the 173 Kirchhoff-Helmholtz transform²⁷ to obtain images at a particular depth plane in the sample 174 volume.

175

176 The morphological details of flocs, including floc counts and size distribution, were 177 processed from the reconstructed DIHM images. The pixel value of the image was enhanced 178 using the threshold tool to detect the floc aggregates from the background noise. Typically, the 179 pixel value varied between 0 and 255, where 0 was considered as black and 255 signified the 180 white color. Those images with pixel values greater than the adjustable threshold value were 181 recognized as "floc aggregates"; the rest of the image was inferred as background pixels, as 182 suggested by Wu et al., 2010. The threshold value of the original image was adjusted between 183 110 and 120% by manually examining it for at least 5-10 reconstructed images. The dilation and 184 erosion factors were used to enhance the identified flocs. It was seen that a 10- 12 of dilation and

185 1-3 of erosion were the best suitable values for measuring flocs. The entire sequence of

- 186 reconstructed DIHM images was then automatically counted, based on the parameter values that
- 187 were manually adjusted for the first image.
- 188

189 Eq. (1) was used to measure the equivalent circular diameter, d (μ m), from the projected 190 area (A in μ m²) of a floc detected using the DIHM analysis. The volume and mass distribution of 191 flocs is important for the control of floc sizes in solid-liquid separation process. Thus, floc size 192 distribution was expressed as the volume fraction of floc diameter in each bin using Eq. (2).

193
$$\mathbf{d} = \sqrt{\frac{4\mathbf{A}}{\pi}} \tag{1}$$

194
$$dV_i = \frac{\left(\frac{\pi d_i^3}{6}\right)^* \left(\frac{dN_i}{N}\right)}{V}$$
(2)

195 Here, dV_i is the volume fraction of flocs in the ith class interval, the term $\left(\frac{\pi d_i^3}{6}\right)$ is the

average volume of flocs in the ith class interval by assuming flocs are spherical, the term $\left(\frac{dN_i}{N}\right)$ is the frequency of occurrence for the ith class interval with dN_i number of flocs. V is the total

is the frequency of occurrence for the ith class interval with dN_i number of flocs, V is the total
floc volume.

199 Floc velocity measurements:

Floc velocity was calculated by overlaying two subsequent holograms. Overlaying the reconstructed holograms highlighted only the floc motion relative to the fluid (water) velocity, while the rest of the stationary features were deducted during this process. The distance travelled was manually measured (Fig. 7). The relative magnitude of velocity of a floc was calculated as the ratio of distance travelled and the time between frames. Nearly, 30-50 flocs were tracked to obtain a statistically significant velocity magnitude profile. It was challenging to track flocs, and to calculate their velocities at locations that had minimum fluid velocity (e.g., stagnant zones).

207 **5. Results of full-scale data**

208 Floc size distribution:

209 The floc size distribution was evaluated for the thirteen locations in the flocculation tank. 210 Fig. 8 illustrates the volume-based floc equivalent diameter measured at one such sampling 211 location (1B in the first flocculation chamber). The value of the median equivalent diameter was 188 µm at this location, with a 90th percentile of 300 µm. Similar information about the floc size 212 distribution was acquired from the data collected at the remaining locations (1M to 6B). Box and 213 214 whisker plots were used to demonstrate spatial variations in the equivalent floc diameter as 215 shown in Fig. 9 (A) and (B). In Fig. 9 (A), the data in the section X-X was arranged into four 216 groups (A, B, C and D) with reference to the flow trajectory. Most distributions were positively 217 skewed, with the median equivalent floc diameter varying from 175 to 225 µm at these locations. A log-normal distribution (α =0.01) was a suitable fit for the size distribution of floc aggregates, 218 the finding which is in agreement with earlier studies.¹⁸ Although five sampling locations (i.e., 219 220 1B, 2M, 5B, 5M, and 5T) did not fit any of the models tested, including Weibull, log-normal, 221 exponential, and gamma distributions.

222

223 Levene's test (α =0.05; N >16) was used to assess the variation in floc size distribution 224 within each group; it showed no significant difference in floc aggregate sizes formed in the 225 section X-X, except for locations in Group B (i.e., 2T, 2M and 2B). The spatial distribution of 226 floc size was related to the local velocity of the fluid phase, and the turbulent energy dissipation, as described in previous studies.^{14, 28, 29} A detailed description of the predicted velocity 227 distribution for the sections X-X and Y-Y is illustrated in Fig. A (1) in the supplementary 228 229 information. Initially, flocs followed the trajectory of the main inlet flow stream, which was the 230 main source of mixing intensity for flocs to interact in the hydraulic flocculation tank. The actual 231 floc growth was observed more towards the upper middle and top portions of the tank. A few 232 floc aggregates of larger than 550 μ m in diameter, identified as outliers in Fig. 9 (A), were 233 prominent in Group A (i.e., 1T, 1M and 1B) and Groups B (i.e., 2T, 2M and 2T). 3M and 4M, 234 situated at the interior of the flocculation tank, had a narrow distribution of floc aggregates with 235 median values between 175 and 200 μ m. In these recirculation zones, lower velocities (0 to 236 0.015 m/s) were observed, causing fewer particle interaction(s) and limiting floc size.

237

Page 9 of 25

In the last flocculation chamber, a broader distribution of floc sizes ranging from 100 to 750 μ m was observed, as shown in Fig. 9 (B). This resulted in a heterogeneous floc suspension near the peripheral outflow, with 95% percent of the volume fraction of floc sizes less than or equal to 674 μ m.

242 Measurements of relative velocity of floc aggregates:

243 The relative motion of individual floc aggregate with respect to the fluid motion was 244 tracked using the recorded holograms. As shown in Fig. 10, median values of the relative 245 velocity of flocs varied significantly from 0.003 to 0.009 m/s at each location. A jet inflow 246 velocity of approximately 0.1-0.16 m/s near the entrance caused flocs at 1B, 2B and 5B locations 247 to experience a relative floc velocity of up to 0.016 m/s, following the trajectory of the fluid 248 motion. The sampling locations 5B, 5M and 5T in Group D had a clear trend of decreasing 249 values of median floc velocities from 0.007 to 0.004 m/s along the depth. This suggested the 250 upward flow of water to the rest of the tank appeared to reduce the floc velocity at the middle 251 and top locations. But, this trend was not consistent in the sampling locations of Group A and B, 252 which were situated in a high velocity profile location with the local velocity magnitude ranging 253 between 0.03 and 0.08 m/s. These locations (1T, 1M, 1B, 2T, 2M and 2B) had median floc 254 velocities ranging between 0.006 and 0.008 m/s. The low fluid velocity profile of less than 0.015 255 m/s in the recirculation regions (3M and 4M) had the interquartile relative floc velocities ranging 256 from 0.005 to 0.006 m/s.

257

258 The relative motion of flocs calculated from the DIHM analysis was in reasonable 259 agreement with the fluid flow. At large, the predicted fluid velocities (0.02 to 0.055 m/s) from 260 the CFD analysis were approximately an order of magnitude larger than the DIHM calculated 261 particle velocity (0.002 to 0.008 m/s). The variation in the average relative velocity of flocs to 262 the fluid motion is attributable to two possible reasons- (i) the actual plant flow was 86.72 ML/d 263 at the time of floc analysis, which was less than the modelled flow rate of 90 MLD (ii) floc velocities were tracked for a wide range of flocs sizes from 20 to over 500 µm measured in the 264 flocculation chamber. Saffman and Turner³⁰ found that small agglomerates (<15 µm) in water 265 266 treatment plants follow the fluid motion completely. The larger floc sizes predominantly found in 267 the flocculation tank exhibited inertia with respect to turbulent flow fluctuations leading to a motion of particles different from that of the fluid, as suggested in Abrahamson's³¹ work. 268

269 6. Practical implications

270 The DIHM analysis demonstrated a relatively quiescent condition in the flocculation process, which was in agreement with the earlier CFD findings.¹² Flocs formed in the hydraulic 271 flocculation tank received a limited supply of active mixing in the chambers, aside from the inlet 272 273 and small openings in weir columns between the chambers. Median floc sizes of 200-225 μ m were formed in the regions that had the local velocity range of 0.035 to 0.07 m/s. Flocs that were 274 275 entrained in the recirculation region in locations 3M and 4M of high residence time¹² had a 276 narrow distribution of floc aggregates. These regions are recognized to contribute less to floc 277 sizes in the peripheral outflow and are thus less connected to the solid-liquid separation processes (e.g., sedimentation, filtration).¹⁴ Approximately 25% of volume fractions of floc sizes 278 279 measured near the outflow in the present study was larger than 500 µm. As a consequence, bulky 280 and irregular shaped floc aggregates represented the overall floc morphology in the hydraulic 281 flocculation tank.

282

In direct filtration, as the entire solid-liquid separation takes place in the filter itself, the 283 floc size is an important operational parameter.³² Filter beds in direct filtration processes are 284 designed with a large floc holding capacity⁸ that can retain a considerable volume of floc sizes 285 larger than the effective filter pore size. Alternatively, fine flocs sizes of the order of 1 µm are 286 not readily captured by typical filter grains.³³ Their small sizes are more likely to bypass the 287 288 filters along with the treated effluent, which can pose potential risks to the drinking water 289 quality. The volume equivalent floc diameter measured in the flocculation tank was larger than 290 the optimum sizes recommended in the literature. For instance, the simulation results of Ngo et al.³² indicated that a mean floc diameter of 62 µm was the optimal size for direct filtration. 291 Similar results by Pivokonsky et al.⁹ demonstrated that small, highly compact and regular 292 293 aggregates of most probable diameter of 50 um displayed the best filterability. In the present 294 case, over 98% of the particle count near the peripheral outflow was tied to flocs larger than 100 295 μm.

296

The open structure of large floc aggregates can have adverse impacts on the performance of a direct filtration process. Such floc structures are susceptible to breakage during

299 transportation through the floc tunnel to the filtration unit, potentially leading to filter

300 performance issues such as turbidity breakthrough. Jarvis et al.¹⁹ showed consistent decrease in

301 floc sizes in three different floc suspensions when exposed to increased rotational speeds, with

302 little re-growth potential after the breakage. Large floc sizes can also reduce the effective filter

303 run times in a direct filtration plants. Pivokonsky et al.⁹ showed that a high proportion of large

304 (i.e., 155-1330 μm) floc aggregates formed during coagulation/flocculation processes caused a
 305 high pressure drop in deep-bed filtration and thereby, significantly shortened filter run time.

306 7. Conclusions

307 This study demonstrated the applicability of the submersible digital in-line holographic 308 microscopy (DIHM) technique for the measurement of the spatial distribution of floc sizes in 309 full-scale flocculation tanks. The spatial distribution of floc sizes indicated that the volume 310 equivalent floc diameter measured in the flocculation tank was mostly large-sized aggregates of 311 greater than 100 μ m, which was larger than the optimum floc size (~50 μ m) recommended for direct filtration by other studies (e.g., Pivokonsky et al.⁹). In direct filtration, large flocs can 312 313 quickly cover the top surface of the filter media, reducing the effective use of the entire media 314 depth. Practical issues of operating at such conditions in a direct filtration facility are rapid 315 clogging of filters, resulting in excessive backwashing due to a high rate of head loss 316 development.

317

318 The performance of a hydraulic flocculation tanks was evaluated using in-line 319 measurements of floc size distributions, which is otherwise difficult to characterize in treatment 320 plant with respect to the prevailing turbulent flow. The motion of individual floc aggregate tracked in the DIHM showed relative velocities ranging from 0.002 to 0.008 m/s. At large, the 321 322 velocity magnitude of fluid motion (0.02 to 0.055 m/s) from the CFD predictions was 323 approximately an order of magnitude larger than the DIHM calculated particle velocity. 324 Regularly acquiring critical information on the type of flocs formed in flocculation can assist 325 water utilities to take corrective actions (e.g., adjust coagulant dosage, pH, mixing) to improve 326 filter performance. The information from this study is important for understanding the fate and 327 transport of flocs during the flocculation process for process optimization that can lead to 328 minimize chemical and energy usage in treatment plants. The ability of DIHM to measure 329 particles sizes and to compute the relative particle velocities is likely to contribute to the

advancement of new technologies for the water and wastewater industry in other environmental

331 applications (e.g., algal, microbial detections).

332 8. Acknowledgements

333 The authors acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Resource Council

of Canada (NSERC) and 4deep Inwater Imaging through an NSERC Engage Grant, as well the

- financial support of both NSERC and Halifax Water through the NSERC/Halifax Water
- 336 Industrial Research Chair program. The authors also acknowledge the technical and in-kind
- 337 support of Dr. Manfred H. Jericho, Stefan Jericho and John Samson from the department of
- 338 Physics at Dalhousie University during the initial design and implementation phase of the study.

339 The authors also thank the J.D. Kline water supply plant authority, Nova Scotia, Canada for

- 340 providing access to conduct sample collections in the hydraulic flocculation tanks.
- 341

9. Bibliographic references & notes

342 1. J. K. Edzwald, Water Science and Technology, 1993, 27, 21-35. 343 344 2. J. M. Duan and J. Gregory, Advances in Colloid and Interface Science, 2003, 100, 475-345 502. 346 347 3. J. Bridgeman, B. Jefferson and S. Parsons, *Chemical Engineering Research & Design*, 348 2008, 86, 941-950. 349 350 S. H. Kim, B. H. Moon and H. I. Lee, Microchemical Journal, 2001, 68, 197-203. 4. 351 352 5. R. D. Letterman, A. Amirtharajah and C. R. O'Melia, Coagulation and flocculation., American Water Works Association, McGraw Hill, New York, 5th edn., 1999. 353 354 355 6. I. G. Droppo, G. G. Leppard, D. T. Flannigan and S. N. Liss, Water Air and Soil 356 Pollution, 1997, 99, 43-53. 357 358 7. AWWA, Operational control of coagulation and filtration processes, American Water Works Association, Denver, CO, 2nd edn., 2000. 359 360 361 8. AWWA and ASCE, Mixing, coagulation, and flocculation., McGraw Hill, American Water Works Association and American Society of Civil Engineering, New York, 362 5th edn., 2012. 363 364 M. Pivokonsky, P. Bubakova, L. Pivokonska and P. Hnatukova, Environmental 365 9. 366 Technology, 2011, 32, 1355-1366.

367		
368	10.	B. Gorczyca and J. Ganczarczyk, Water Quality Research Journal of Canada, 1999, 34,
369		653-666.
370		
371	11.	A. J. Manning and K. R. Dyer, <i>Marine Geology</i> , 1999, 160 , 147-170.
372		
373	12.	Y. S. Vadasarukkai, G. A. Gagnon, D. R. Campbell and S. C. Clark, Journal American
374		Water Works Association, 2011, 103, 66-80.
375		
376	13	D C Hopkins and J J Ducoste Journal of Colloid and Interface Science 2003 264
377		184-194
378		
379	14	K Samaras A Zouboulis T Karapantsios and M Kostoglou <i>Chemical Engineering</i>
380	1	Journal 2010 162 208-216
381		<i>bournal</i> , 2010, 102 , 200 210.
382	15	M C Kayanaugh and I O Leckie Particulates in water: characterization fate effects
383	15.	and removal American Chemical Society Washington D.C. 1980
384		una removai., American chemical Society, Washington D.C., 1960.
385	16	B. Gorezvea and I. Ganezarezvek, Environmental Technology 1996, 17, 1361-1369
386	10.	D. Gorezyea and J. Ganezarezyk, Environmental Technology, 1990, 17, 1901-1909.
387	17	B. Corection and P. Klasson, Water Quality Research Journal of Canada 2008 13 230
200	17.	D. Obrezyca and T. Klassen, whier Quality Research Journal of Canada, 2008, 43, 259-
280		247.
200	19	D. H. Li and I. Conorarathe Pasagraph Journal of the Water Pollution Control
201	10.	Endergation 1001 62 806 814
202		reaeration, 1991, 03 , 800-814.
202	10	D. Lawig D. Lofferson and S. Dersons, Water Science and Technology 2004 50 62 70
204	19.	r. Jarvis, B. Jenerson and S. Parsons, water science and rechnology, 2004, 50, 05-70.
205	20	M. A. Vultagion and I. Crogory, International Journal of Minaual Duccessing 2004 73
206	20.	M. A. Tukselell and J. Olegoly, International Journal of Mineral Processing, 2004, 73,
207		251-259.
200	21	P. I. Cibbs and I. N. Kamwan Emvironmental Science & Technology 1002 1(110 121
298 200	21.	R. J. Globs and L. N. Konwal, <i>Environmental Science & Technology</i> , 1982, 10, 119-121.
399	22	A. L. de Oliveire D. Marane, D. A. C. de Silve M. De Julie and D. D. Marumi
400	22.	A. L. de Olivella, P. Molello, P. A. G. da Sliva, M. De Julio and K. B. Moluzzi,
401		Desalination and water Treatment, 2015, 1-12.
402	22	
403	23.	K. K. Chakraborti, J. F. Atkinson and J. E. Van Benschoten, <i>Environmental Science &</i>
404		<i>Technology</i> , 2000, 34 , 3969-3976.
405	24	
406	24.	J. Garcia-Sucerquia, W. B. Xu, S. K. Jericho, P. Klages, M. H. Jericho and H. J. Kreuzer,
40/		Applied Optics, 2006, 45 , 836-850.
408	25	
409	25.	J. Sneng, E. Maikiel and J. Katz, Applied Optics, 2006, 45, 3893-3901.
410	26	
411	20.	A. K. Stoddart and G. A. Gagnon, <i>Journal American Water Works Association</i> , 2015,
412		10/, E038-E04/.

413		
414	27.	K. Nakamura, H. J. Kreuzer and A. Wierzbicki, Quantum Control and Measurement,
415		1993, 271-276.
416		
417	28.	D. L. Marchisio, R. D. Vigil and R. O. Fox, <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> , 2003, 58 ,
418		3337-3351.
419		
420	29.	O. P. Prat and J. J. Ducoste, <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> , 2006, 61 , 75-86.
421		
422	30.	P. G. Saffman and J. S. Turner, <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> , 1956, 1, 16-30.
423		
424	31.	J. Abrahamson, <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> , 1975, 30 , 1371-1379.
425		
426	32.	H. H. Ngo, S. Vigneswaran and H. B. Dharmappa, <i>Environmental Technology</i> , 1995, 16,
427		55-63.
428	22	
429	33.	J. Gregory, Filtration & Separation, 1998, 35, 367-371.
430		



Fig. 1 Schematic overview of the treatment processes of a direct filtration system at the J.D. Kline Water Supply Plant (Halifax, Canada) (adapted from Vadasarukkai et al.⁹). Note: Not to scale



Fig. 2 A schematic diagram of a submersible digital inline holographic microscope (DIHM). Two pressure chambers-A & B, a 365 nm laser light source, imaged volume, camera sensor, and computer source are shown. Note: Not to scale





G_{floc1}, G_{floc2}, G_{floc3}- the average velocity gradient in the first, second and third flocculation chambers, respectively.

^{*} The average G-value was 21.7, 7 and 4.6 s⁻¹ in the first, second and third flocculation chambers at a plant flow of 90 MLD was computed from the numerical analysis (Vadasarukkai et al.⁹).



Fig. 4 Thirteen sampling locations selected in one parallel set of a flocculation tank for the digital inline holographic microscope (DIHM) analysis- (A) top view of the entire tank (B) sectional view X-X of chamber-1 and B) sectional view Y-Y of chamber-3.

Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology



Fig. 5 Illustration of holograms recorded at (A) 1B, (B) 1M and (C) 1T locations using the DIHM technique. Note: Scale: 100 nm

Environmental Science: Water Research & Technology



Fig. 6 Example of reconstruction step- a difference hologram reconstructed after subtracting the background noise from consecutive hologram pairs at locations 1B, 1M and 1T. (Scale: 100 nm) Note: Flocs appear as dark spots on the lighter background, the background was changed to a lighter color for better visibility.



Fig. 7 Illustration of the relative floc velocity measurement- (A-B) trajectories of a floc aggregate captured using two successive reconstructed holograms (C) superimposing of the two reconstructed holograms to obtain the path travelled by a floc aggregate (D) measurement of the distance travelled. (Scale: 100 nm)

Note: Flocs appear as dark spots on the lighter background, the background was changed to a lighter color for better visibility.



Fig. 8 Illustration of the floc size distribution (by volume) with a total floc count of 830 flocs was calculated at the location, 1B, in the flocculation chamber-1.



----Cumulative frequency (%)





Fig. 9 Box and whisker plots of the spatial distribution of the volume-based floc equivalent diameter measured at different floc monitoring stations- (A) represents floc sizes formed in chamber-1 and (B) represents floc distribution in chamber-3.



Fig. 10 Box and whisker plots of the relative velocities of flocs with respect to the fluid motion calculated at the sampling locations in the flocculation chamber-1.