Model of dynamic and macroscopic features of a floc blanket
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ABSTRACT

Theory is developed to represent the macroscopic features of a floc blanket held in steady state. Flocs are treated as non-porous entities possessing a fractal structure. A particular feature of the analysis is the recognition of floc strength, floc sizes adjusting to the prevailing rate of energy dissipation within the blanket. Account is taken of the floc size distribution, with expressions derived to describe the blanket settling velocity and mass flux. Analysis of experimental data yielded detail of the blanket floc size scale ($d_vo$), water content and strength. The mass flux was maximised when the floc volume fraction was close to 0.17. It was shown that the upflow velocity ($u$) complied with the dependence $u = S_o (M d_{max}^{-D})$ in which $d_{max}$ is a maximum floc size, $M$ the blanket solids concentration, $D$ the fractal dimension and $S_o$ a strength scaling factor.

Consideration was given to blanket characteristics in non-stationary conditions. The final section of the paper focuses on the attenuation capacity. It was argued that $d_vo$ should be as low as practicable in order to promote the capture of feed flocs by interception, to reduce the water content of the solids waste stream when using hydrolysing coagulants, and may also enhance the mass flux.
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ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>cross-sectional area of blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A'$</td>
<td>packing factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c$</td>
<td>suspended solids concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_e$</td>
<td>efflux suspended solids concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_i$</td>
<td>incoming suspended solids concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td>spherical equivalent diameter of floc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_L$</td>
<td>arithmetic mean value of $d$ across length-size distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{max}$</td>
<td>upper cut-off diameter in floc size distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_o$</td>
<td>reference particle size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_vo$</td>
<td>reference floc size tied to blanket permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{95}$</td>
<td>95th percentile in volume-size distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>mass fractal dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_c$</td>
<td>collision efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{adh}$</td>
<td>adhesion efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f(\Phi_f)$</td>
<td>function tied to blanket permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>gravitational acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>velocity gradient within blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k$</td>
<td>fitting coefficient; Equation (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>fitting coefficient; Equation (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>a quasi-constant defined by Equation (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_0$</td>
<td>blanket thickness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_t$</td>
<td>blanket thickness at time $t = 0$; also used as minimum thickness after solids draw off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_s$</td>
<td>overall suspended solids mass within blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>blanket suspended solids concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_e$</td>
<td>efflux floc number concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n_i$</td>
<td>incoming floc number concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>number concentration of flocs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>fitting coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q$</td>
<td>volumetric flow rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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focusing coefficient associated with \( S_o \)

\( S \)  floc strength

\( S_o \)  strength scale when \( r = 1 \)

\( S'_o \)  general strength scale

\( S_\phi \)  distribution shape factor

\( t_L \)  liquid retention time

\( u \)  upflow velocity

\( U \)  size ratio (= \( d/d_i \))

\( v_{sett} \)  blanket settling velocity

\( V_{floc} \)  overall floc volume within blanket

\( V_s \)  solids volume within \( V_{floc} \)

\( V_w \)  water volume within \( V_{floc} \)

\( \alpha \)  trapping efficiency

\( \beta \)  attenuation coefficient

\( \Delta P \)  pressure drop across blanket

\( \epsilon \)  rate of energy dissipation per unit mass

\( \bar{\epsilon} \)  spatial average value of \( \epsilon (= \nu G^2) \)

\( \lambda_{max} \)  scaling ratio (= \( d_{max}/d_L \))

\( \lambda_{vo} \)  scaling ratio (= \( d_{vo}/d_L \))

\( \mu \)  dynamic viscosity

\( \nu \)  kinematic viscosity (= \( \mu/\rho_w \))

\( \rho_c \)  density difference (= \( \rho_f - \rho_w \))

\( \rho_f \)  floc density

\( \rho_s \)  density of floc solids

\( \rho_w \)  density of water

\( \phi \)  solids volume fraction

\( \Phi_F \)  floc volume fraction

\( < ... > \)  average value within specified volume or set

INTRODUCTION

The character and behaviour of the suspended bed within a floc blanket clarifier (FBC) lies at the heart of the process. The ‘blanket’ is held in place via a balance between the flux of material associated with the upflow and a downward solids flux associated with sedimentation. It consists of an assemblage of flocs whose sizes are relatively large compared with the incoming feed floc. The blanket acts as a filter of the incoming material—capture being controlled by both the rate of collision and the overall trapping efficiency. Material that is not captured, or breaks free from the blanket has direct impact on the load entering the filters.

Echoing developments of Ives (1968), Tambo & Hozumi (1979), Armirtharajah & O’Melia (1990) regarded the blanket as a turbulent reactor, with the efflux concentration of microflocs \( (n_e) \) defined by the relationship:

\[
\frac{n_e}{n_i} = \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha G \Phi_F f_L}{\pi}\right)
\]

In this expression, \( n_i \) refers to the number concentration of the microflocs entering the base of the blanket, \( \alpha \) the trapping efficiency, \( G \) the velocity gradient, \( \Phi_F \) the floc volume fraction, and \( t_L \) the liquid retention time.

As collection progresses, there is an accumulation of solids held within the suspended bed, this manifesting as an increase in the blanket thickness. Periodically, excess solids are bled off. Here the principal concern is with the bed dynamics in steady state conditions subject to the following constraints: (a) the solids mass held within the blanket remains constant, and (b) the blanket interface is sharp and (c) the blanket level is stationary. The latter assumption implies that

\[
u = v_{sett}\]

in which \( u \) is the superficial velocity of loading (= \( Q/A \)), with \( Q \) as the volumetric flow and \( A \), the cross-sectional area. Parameter \( v_{sett} \) refers to the rate of settlement defined by

\[
v_{sett} = v_{o}f(\Phi_F)
\]

where \( v_o \) is a scaling velocity and \( f(\Phi_F) \) a function tied to the permeability of the suspended blanket. There exist many expressions for \( f(\Phi_F) \), tending to be described by an empirical relationship of the form

\[
f(\Phi_F) = (1 - k\Phi_F)^p
\]

in which \( k \) and \( p \) (\( > 0 \)) are fitting coefficients and \( 0 < f(\Phi_F) \leq 1 \).

In the analysis, a necessary task is to define the parameters \( \Phi_F, G \) and \( t_L \), appearing in Equation (1), paying particular attention to the character of the floc. From this base, the principal objective is to gain a better understanding of how floc properties (particularly floc strength) are likely to affect the hydraulic and solids loading that can be sustained by the blanket. Ultimately, the upflow velocity is controlled by Equation (3); this looks deceptively simple,
until one recognises that $\Phi_\text{F}$ and perhaps also $\nu_\text{a}$ are affected by $u$. Some progress was made on this theme in Bache & Gregory (2007). The analysis described in this paper provides a more accurate statement of the $\Phi_\text{F}(u)$ dependence and leads to a different view of how the product $G\Phi_\text{F}L$ is affected by $u$ or $\Phi_\text{F}(u)$.

### THEORY

#### Foundation framework

A blanket of depth $L$ and uniform cross-sectional area ($A$) is assumed to be spatially homogeneous with respect to the solids concentration. The head loss or pressure drop ($\Delta P$) across the blanket associated with the upflow, balances the pressure exerted by the buoyant weight of the floc, such that

$$\Delta P = L\Phi_\text{F} < \rho_\text{F} > g \tag{5}$$

where $<\rho_\text{F}>$ is the average density difference ($\rho_\text{F} - \rho_\text{w}$) within the blanket with $<\rho_\text{F}>$ as the average density of the flocs, $\rho_\text{w}$ the density of water and $g$ the gravitational acceleration. The liquid retention time is defined by

$$t_\text{L} = \frac{(1 - \Phi_\text{F})V}{Q} = \frac{(1 - \Phi_\text{F})L}{u} \tag{6}$$

in which $V$ is the blanket volume. With this information, $G$ is defined by

$$G = \left(\frac{\Delta P}{\mu L}\right)^{1/2} = \left(\frac{u\Phi_\text{F} < \rho_\text{F} >}{(1 - \Phi_\text{F})\mu}\right)^{1/2} \tag{7}$$

The floc volume fraction can either be measured directly as described in Gregory et al. (1996) or deduced from the floc size distribution. An example of a distribution measured within a blanket using an underwater camera (noted in Bache et al. 2000) is shown in Figure 1. Sizes are expressed in the form $d/d_L$ in which $d$ is an equivalent diameter and $d_L$ the arithmetic average value of $d$ across the length-size distribution. Although the rising limb of the distribution is not evident (a symptom of the camera resolution), the distribution is unimodal and can be modelled using the framework described in Bache & Rasool (2006).

Flocs have a fractal structure, implying that their critical properties scale with size. For example, the average solids concentration within an individual floc can be represented by

$$c = \rho_\text{s}A' \left(\frac{d}{d_\text{a}}\right)^{D - 3} \tag{8}$$

in which $\rho_\text{s}$ is the solids density, $A'$ is a packing factor and $d_\text{a}$ a scaling length representative of the diameter of the particles from which the floc is formed. $D$ is the mass fractal dimension in which $1 \leq D \leq 3$. The value $D = 1$ corresponds to particles joined together in a chain form or necklace-type structure whereas $D = 3$ corresponds to a uniform solid continuum in a spherical object. By summing the volume of the flocs across the distribution and recognising that each floc carries mass (such as represented by Equation (8)), Bache & Rasool (2006) showed that the floc volume fraction could be expressed by

$$\Phi_\text{F} = \frac{M}{\rho_\text{s}A' \left(\frac{d_\text{L}}{d_\text{a}}\right)^3 S_\text{b}(D)} \tag{9}$$

in which $M$ is the mass concentration (suspended solids mass per unit volume) and $S_\text{b}(D)$ is a distribution shape factor that combines information about the shape of the volume-size distribution and the mass-size distribution. (NB Equation (9) has been corrected for a typographic error.)
error in the original). When applied to a floc blanket, it should be recognised that \( M \) is expressed by the identity:

\[
M = \frac{m_s}{LA}
\]

(10)

where \( m_s \) refers to the suspended solids mass held within the blanket. The average solids concentration \( \langle c \rangle \) across the total floc volume \( (V_{\text{floc}} = \Phi_F LA) \) is:

\[
\langle c \rangle = \frac{m_s}{V_{\text{floc}}} = \frac{M}{\Phi_F}
\]

(11)

This can be translated to the average density difference (appearing in Equation (5)) using the transformation

\[ c = \frac{\rho_c}{1 - \rho_w/\rho_s} \]

(12)

leading to

\[
\langle c \rangle = \frac{m_s}{LA\Phi_F} \left( 1 - \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_s} \right)
\]

(13)

The next stage is to gain insight into the size ratio \( (d_L/d_o) \). In stirred suspensions, this generally depends on the size of the largest flocs \( (d_{\text{max}}) \) within the distribution, and on the distribution shape. For convenience, one may write

\[
d_{\text{max}} = \lambda_{\text{max}}d_L
\]

(14)

When a distribution has a universal shape, the scaling ratio \( (\lambda_{\text{max}}) \) defined by Equation (14) remains constant in response to the external factors that alter \( d_L \); this applies to any size scale representing characteristic features of the size distribution (see Bache & Rasool 2006). Referring to the distribution shown in Figure 1, \( d_L = 580 \mu m \) and the largest sizes are \( 4,400 \mu m \) (corresponding to \( d_{95} \), the 95th percentile in the volume size distribution). Hence \( \lambda_{\text{max}} \approx 7.6 \) for the distribution shown. The reason that one focuses on the largest flocs is that these are the weakest (and thus most vulnerable to the prevailing hydrodynamic forces). Sonntag & Russel (1987) argued that floc strength \( (S) \) was likely to be of the form

\[
S = S_o \left( \frac{d}{d_o} \right)^{nD-3}
\]

(15)

in which \( S_o \) is a strength scale and \( r \) \((\geq 1)\) is a coefficient reflecting the sensitivity of strength to the floc’s internal solids volume concentration. From a balance of floc strength and available turbulence kinetic energy per unit volume, Bache (2004) showed that

\[
\frac{d_{\text{max}}}{d_o} = \left( \frac{30S_o \nu}{\rho_w d_o^3 G^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3n}}
\]

(16)

where \( \nu \) is the kinematic viscosity and \( \varepsilon \) the local rate of energy dissipation per unit mass.

Equation (16) applies to the viscous domain. To simplify the analysis, it will be assumed that \( r = 1 \) (likely to apply to flocs with a relatively open network of linear structures; see Bache 2004). In this case, \( S_o \) has the particular identity \( S_o \) (see Bache 2004) in which \( S_o \propto A' \).

Again to simplify analysis, it is assumed that \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon_o \), where \( \varepsilon \) refers to the spatial average value of \( \varepsilon \) within the blanket, allowing one to write

\[
\varepsilon = \nu G^2
\]

(17)

With these simplifications, Equation (16) reduces to

\[
\frac{d_{\text{max}}}{d_o} = \left( \frac{30S_o}{\rho_w d_o^3 G^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3n}}
\]

(18)

Combination of Equations (9), (10), (14), (15) and (18) leads to

\[
\Phi_F = \frac{m_s}{LA\rho_o A' \left( \frac{30S_o}{\rho_w d_o^3 G^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{3n}}} \left( \frac{1 - \rho_w}{\rho_s} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} S_o \left( D \right)
\]

(19)

The next step is to discern how the blanket responds to changes in \( u \) as a quasi-independent variable. Increases in \( u \) cause the blanket to expand, thereby causing a reduction in \( \Phi_F \). Making use of Equation (13), Equation (7) becomes

\[
G = \left[ \frac{gm_i u}{\mu A L (1 - \Phi_F)} \left( 1 - \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_s} \right) \right]^{1/2}
\]

(20)

With this definition, Equation (19) can be cast in the form

\[
L \Phi_F = K \left( \frac{1 - \Phi_F}{u} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}}
\]

(21)
with

\[ K = \frac{m_s}{A \rho_s A'} \left( \frac{30S_0 \mu A \rho_s}{g \rho_w d^2 m_s (\rho_s - \rho_w)} \right)^{1/6} 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_{max} D} S_\phi(D) \]  

(22)

\( K \) can be regarded as a constant when the parameters on which it depends (particularly \( m_s \)) remain at fixed values. With knowledge of \( D \), an estimate of \( K \) and the observed variation \( \lambda(u) \), Equation (22) can be solved numerically to yield the \( \Phi_F(u, K) \) dependence. The principal response to \( u \) is described by:

\[ \Phi_F = \frac{1}{1 + u(\Phi_F)^{2/3 - D}/K^{5 - D(3 - D)}} \]  

(23)

in which the product \( L \Phi_F \) is weakly varying, reflecting potential changes in the floc volume as a result of changes in \( G \).

The solution of Equation (21) is necessarily constrained by the condition \( u = v_{set} \) as expressed by Equation (2). This demands knowledge of both \( v_{set} \) and \( f(\Phi_F) \). Ideally, the form of \( v_{set} \) should be determined experimentally with behavioural features cast in terms of Equations (3) and (4) or their equivalent. In the absence of such information, the magnitude of \( v_{set} \) can be estimated using the framework described below.

In viscous flows, it may be shown (e.g. Gmachowski 2002) that the settling velocity of an assemblage of spheres of solids fraction \( \phi \) is expressed by

\[ v_{set} = \frac{\Phi(\rho_s - \rho_w)g}{\mu} k \]  

(24)

where \( k \) is the permeability of the assemblage and \( \mu \) the dynamic viscosity. Probststein 1994, p. 269) cites a Happel model for uniform spheres in which \( k \) is specified by the identity

\[ k = \frac{1 - (3/2)\phi^{2/3} + (3/2)\phi^{5/3} - \phi^2}{18\phi[1 + (2/3)\phi^{5/3}]} d^2 \]  

(25)

Substitution into Equation (24), and making use of Equation (3), leads to the well-known Stokes expression

\[ v_o = \frac{gA'(\rho_s - \rho_w) \lambda_{vo}}{18\mu} \]  

(26)

together with \( f(\phi) \) defined by

\[ f(\phi) = \frac{1 - (3/2)\phi^{1/3} + (3/2)\phi^{5/3} - \phi^2}{1 + (2/3)\phi^{5/3}} \]  

(27)

Equations (26) and (27) can be adapted for use with flocs by adopting the identity \( \phi = \Phi_F \) when flocs are non-porous. Because Equation (24) is a macroscopic model of the assemblage, the density difference must also be a macroscopic parameter with \( <\rho_s> \) defined by Equation (13). With this information, Equation (26) becomes

\[ v_o = \frac{m_s}{\Phi_F A'} \left( 1 - \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_s} \right) \frac{gd^2 v_o}{18\mu} \]  

(28)

in which \( d_{vo} \) is a reference size tied to the permeability of the assemblage. Replacing \( \Phi_F \) using Equation (9) leads to

\[ v_o = \frac{gA'(\rho_s - \rho_w) \lambda_{vo}}{18\mu S_{\phi}(D)} \frac{\lambda_{vo}}{\lambda_{vo} z_{vo} \left( \frac{d_{max}}{d_{vo}} \right)^{D-1}} \]  

(29)

In Equation (29), parameter \( \lambda_{vo} \) is defined by \( d_{vo} = \lambda_{vo} d_L \), this being interpreted in the same way as Equation (14) with respect to \( d_{max} \). Making use of Equation (18), Equation (29) may also be stated as

\[ v_o = \frac{gA'(\rho_s - \rho_w) \lambda_{vo}}{18\mu S_{\phi}(D)} \frac{\lambda_{vo} \left( 30S_0 \right)^{1/2}}{\rho w d_L^2 G^2} \]  

(30)

This shows the explicit dependence of \( v_o \) on the strength scale.

**APPLICATION OF THEORY**

Su et al. (2004) described the behaviour of a blanket formed from a suspension of clay coagulated with PACl. Following coagulation, sediment was collected and carefully transferred to cylindrical column of 5.5 cm diameter, through which clean water was pumped; this allowed a fluidised bed to be established. Figure 2 shows the response of the blanket height to upflow velocity at three doses of PACl. The plots correspond to steady state tests, the trends also displaying effluent turbidity values. From detail of experiments carried out at the optimum dose, it appears the solids mass (\( m_s \)) within the blanket was 3,537 mg. For illustrative purposes,
it is assumed that the clay has the same characteristics as kaolin with $\rho_s = 2,600 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ and $d_o = 3.5 \mu\text{m}$. From studies of flocs of this type, Tambo & Watanabe (1979) found that the size-density relationship (Equation (31)) was sensitive to the ‘ALT ratio’. This describes the ratio of the Al dose (mg l$^{-1}$) to the suspended solids of the suspension (1,600 mg l$^{-1}$ in the study by Su et al. 2004). Thus at the optimum dose (16 mg Al/l), ALT = 16/1600 = 1:100 or 0.01. Data from Tambo & Watanabe (1979) were represented by the fractal dependence

$$
\rho_c = A'(\rho_s - \rho_w)(\frac{d}{d_o})^{D-3}
$$
(arising from the combination of Equations (8) and (12)) which yielded plots of $A'$ and $D$ as a function of the ALT value (in Bache & Gregory (2007) as Figure 3.12); the latter indicates $A' = 5$ and $D = 1.9$ when ALT = 0.01. With this information one can progress with the analysis of the data shown in Figure 2.

**Optimisation procedure**

By adopting trial values of $K$, $\Phi_F(K)$ may be calculated using Equation (21) for each pair of $L$, $u$ values; this allows $f(\Phi_F(K))$ to be deduced using Equation (27). From this one can determine $v_o(K) = u/f(\Phi_F(K))$. In principle, this yields an estimate of $d_{vo}(K)$ using Equation (28). Thereafter optimisation depends on the following logic:

$$
d_{vo} \propto \left[\frac{u\Phi_F L}{f(\Phi_F)}\right]^{1/2}
$$

and

$$
\Phi_F L \propto d_{max}^{3-D}
$$

Linearity between $d_{vo}$ and $d_{max}$ requires that

$$
\frac{u}{f(\Phi_F(K))} \propto [\Phi_F(K)L]^{D-1/(3-D)}
$$

By testing this condition across the set, $K$ can be optimised for each set of $u - L$ pairs; this yielded optimised values of $\Phi_F$, $v_o$ and $d_{vo}$. The outcome of the analysis is summarised in Table 1.

**DISCUSSION**

**Data and model integrity**

Data in Table 1 provides detail of the way in which the parameters respond to changes in $u$. The particular solution rests heavily on the choice of $f(\Phi_F)$. Here, it is not claimed that Equation (27) represents the character of the suspension used. Rather, it permits one to demonstrate the viability of the analysis. At the outcome, it was...
by no means certain whether the framework would lead to an optimised solution. It did. In each set, it is seen that $G$ tends to increase with $u$, with the consequence that the reference size ($d_{vo}$) is reduced. Although there are changes in $v_0$ as a result of changes in size, the principal means by which the balance $u = v_0$ is achieved is by changes in $\Phi_P$, thereby altering $f(\Phi_P)$. Generally it is seen that the changes in $G$, $d_{vo}$ and $v_0$ are relatively small, but are nevertheless vital to the dynamics of the system.

Although the efficacy of the analytical scheme has been demonstrated, it is not clear whether the solution is physically realistic. This can be judged in a number of ways. The least satisfactory (but nevertheless of interest) is the behaviour of the turbidity values marked on the plots in Figure 2. Generally these have similar values within each data set when $u$, $2mh^2$ and increase at larger $u$ values. There are a number of factors that may give rise to the turbidity behaviour. For example, when $G$ increases and floc sizes become reduced, the turbidity might

---

### Table 1

Estimates of optimised parameters associated with trends shown in Figure 2 based on solution of Equation (21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$u$ (m h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$L$ (cm)</th>
<th>$\Phi_P$</th>
<th>$f(\Phi_P)$</th>
<th>$L\Phi_P$ (cm)</th>
<th>$v_0$ (m h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$d_{vo}$ ($\mu$m)</th>
<th>$G$ (s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$t_\ell$ (s)</th>
<th>$G\Phi_P t_\ell$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 ppm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 2.895$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 ppm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 3.443$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20 ppm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K = 5.364$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emanate from unattached debris associated with the rupture process. Closely related, is the possibility that turbidity is generated by surface erosion, shear forces being scaled by $\mu G$. Turbidity values will also increase when small flocs break away from the blanket because their settling velocity is too small. At this condition, the interface becomes diffuse, reflecting non-uniformity in the solids concentration (see Figure 3 in Su et al. (2004) together with photographic evidence in Sung et al. (2005). It is likely that some of the highest values of turbidity shown in Figure 2 may be associated with the approach to the critical state ($u > v_{sett}$) at which hindered settlement breaks down and a blanket cannot exist. If one neglects these higher values, there is a weak correlation between the average turbidity and the average G value for each set as shown in Figure 3.

A second means of judging the outcome of the analysis is to examine the average floc water content associated with each dose. This aspect is summarised in Table 2. The average floc volume is estimated as $A < L \Phi F >$ where $< ... >$ denotes an average across each set shown in Table 1. Within this, the solids volume ($V_s = m_s/\rho_s$) is small. Column 6 shows the relationship between the water amount ($V_w$) and the dose, the ratio being of similar magnitude. This aspect has several messages. Aside from the impact of upflow, the analysis suggests that water content is a major factor affecting the separation of the trends shown in Figure 2. Second, the association between dose and water content is roughly in line with expectation for the following reason. At the pH used in the study (pH 7), the structure of PACl is likely to break down as a result of hydrolysis, leading to the production of a bulk precipitate (see Furrer et al. 1992 concerning the behaviour of Al$_{13}$ (a component of PACl), together with data from Van Benschoten & Edzwald 1990 concerning PACl, which is plotted in Figure 3.0 of Bache & Gregory 2007). The bulk precipitate is water binding—an attribute that is scaled by the amount of precipitate present and dose dependent.

Column 7 shows estimates of $S_o$, these also being dependent on the dose. The largest value of $S_o$ occurs at the highest dose. It is this facet (through its control on floc size) which is ultimately responsible for the capacity of the floc to retain water. The particular values cited are in the range reported in Bache (2004) for Al-Kaolin flocs (0.1–0.5 N m$^{-2}$). The similarity of these values is rather surprising, given the vastly different regimes for estimating their values. It may imply that $d_{vo} \approx d_{max}$ for the suspension under study.

Overall, the analysis appears to lead to deductions which are physically reasonable.

Towards practice

When it comes to practice, there are a host of questions and issues. For example, is there an optimum $u$ value? How does one integrate the concepts described in this paper with the workings of an FBC? Here, some foundation issues are addressed in the context of the data from Su et al. (2004).

Mass flux

On the basis of pilot plant testing, Gregory (1979) suggested that the optimum load might be guided by the maximum solids flux condition within the blanket—this being represented by the product $Mv_{sett}$. Combination of Equations (3), (10) and (28) shows

$$Mv_{sett} = \left( \frac{m_s}{L \Phi F A} \right)^2 \left( 1 - \frac{\rho_s}{\rho_c} \right) \frac{g d_v^2}{18 \mu} \Phi_f(\Phi_F)$$

(35)

Following a series of substitutions and manipulation, this takes the form

$$Mv_{sett} = \left( \frac{\rho A d_v \lambda_{vo}}{S_d(D) \lambda_{max}^2} \right)^2 \frac{g}{18 \mu} \left( \frac{d_{max}}{d_{vo}} \right)^{2D-4} \Phi_f(\Phi_F)$$

(36)

When $f(\Phi_F)$ is defined by Equation (27), the product $\Phi_f(\Phi_F)$ has a maximum at $\Phi_F = 0.172$. Figure 4 shows the mass flux trends associated with the data shown in

**Table 2** Impact of the dose on water content and strength scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Al dose (ppm)</th>
<th>$&lt;L \Phi F&gt;$ (cm)</th>
<th>$V_{nac}$ (ml)</th>
<th>$V_s$ (ml)</th>
<th>$V_w$ (ml)</th>
<th>$V_w/Dose$ (ml/ppm)</th>
<th>$S_o$ (N m$^{-2}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>167.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>394.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—the highest flux values being associated with the 12 ppm set. In the case of this trend, one can see evidence of the approach to a maximum at \(c(\%) < 0.4\). From data in Table 1, it is evident that this condition is associated with the highest upflow at which \(F_F = 0.192\)—this being close to the critical value (0.172) noted above.

In order to gain insight into the factor(s) responsible for this mode of behaviour, a sensitivity analysis was carried out on the basis of both Equations (35) and (36). In the case of Equation (36) (treating \(d_{\text{max}} = d_{\text{vo}}\), the index value \((2D - 4 < 0.2)\) nullifies the direct impact of floc size and \(F_F\) has similar values across the sets. From this, differences in mass flux must be attributed to parameters contained in the term \ [...] 2. In contrast, Equation (35) provides a direct account of the behaviour. Within Equation (35), it is recognised that \(m_s/L_F A\) refers to the average solids concentration within the floc. When flocs have a greater water content, they will tend to be bigger and \(< c >\) will be relatively low, whereas the opposite occurs when flocs have a lower water content. Equation (35) shows that the impact of the \(< c >\) term is offset by the magnitude of \(d_{\text{vo}}\)—the flux being controlled by the behaviour of the product \(< c > d_{\text{vo}}\). In the context of Figure (4), it is the \(< c >\) term which dominates—the largest mass flux occurring in the 12 ppm set, in which the flocs have a lower water content and are smaller (supporting data in Tables 1 and 2).

The upshot of the analysis is that the maximum flux condition is not necessarily favoured by the strongest or largest flocs. In the case of the data shown in Figure 4, the maximum flux condition is favoured by the dose at which the floc volume is lowest.

Blanket floc strength

Gregory (1979) examined the impact of dosing polyelectrolytes for floc strengthening on the blanket solids concentration and on the renovation capacity under conditions in which the raw water quality, coagulant dose and upflow velocity were all held constant. In the case of the latter, it was shown that \(M\) increased according to dose or effectiveness of the polyelectrolyte. It was also found that the renovation capacity approached a limiting value as increasing amounts of polyelectrolyte were added, leading Gregory et al. (1999) to suggest there was little point in applying polyelectrolyte (or increasing the dose) if the blanket floc volume concentration is greater than about 18%.

Focusing on the first of these issues, if \(u\) is constant and one assumes that the blanket level was maintained at a fixed value, it implies that \(v_{\text{vo}}(\Phi_F) = u\) remains constant for the conditions described. Because one would expect floc sizes to increase with the polymer dose (as a result of increased strength), this will manifest as an increase in \(v_{\text{vo}}\), implying that \(f(\Phi_F)\) must decrease in order to maintain \(v_{\text{sett}}\) at the same value; hence \(\Phi_F\) must increase with increasing dose. This can be demonstrated more formally using Equation (30), whereby the condition can be stated as

\[
\frac{g A (\rho_s - \rho_w) d_0^2}{18 \mu_S \delta (D)} \frac{\lambda_{\text{vo}}^2}{\lambda_{\text{max}}^2} \left( \frac{30 S_0}{\rho_w d_c^2 G^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} f(\Phi_F) = \text{constant} \quad (37)
\]

To illustrate the implications of altering the strength scale, it will be assumed that \(D\) remains constant and (for simplicity) potential changes in the distribution shape as a result of strength are ignored. In these circumstances, Equation (37) is steered by the grouping

\[
A \left( \frac{S_0}{G^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} f(\Phi_F) = \text{constant} \quad (38)
\]
When the depth of the blanket and \( u \) are fixed, Equations (10) and (20) combine to show

\[
G \propto \left[ \frac{M}{(1 - \Phi_F)} \right]^{1/2}
\]

Hence Equation (38) can be restated as

\[
A' \left( \frac{S_o(1 - \Phi_F)}{M} \right)^{\frac{p+f}{f}} f(\Phi_F) = \text{constant}
\]

A schematic calculation to illustrate the implications of Equation (40) is based on the data shown in Table 3. Floc data \((S_o, A', D)\) are taken from Bache & Rasool (2006) and refers to aluminium-kaolin flocs. The solids concentration data \((M)\) is taken from Figure 10 of Gregory (1979), the source water being a lowland river. The value \( \Phi_F = 0.18 \) is an assumed value when strengthening agents were present. With this information, and using Equation (27) to estimate \( f(\Phi_F) \), the constant on the right hand side of Equation (40) can be evaluated when a polymer is present. Making use of this value, the magnitude of \( \Phi_F \) \((= 0.05)\) was deduced using the associated data.

The example indicates that \( \Phi_F \) changes in the same sense as \( M \) (as one would anticipate from Equation (9)). Thus, for the particular example, the theoretical explanation appears to be plausible.

One can also examine the association between strength and upflow using Equations (18) in combination with Equation (7), these showing

\[
\frac{uM}{S_o(1 - \Phi_F)} \left( \frac{d_{\text{max}}}{d_o} \right)^{5-D} = \frac{50\mu}{\rho_w d^2 g(1 - \rho_w/\rho_s)}
\]

In essence, the terms on the right hand side of Equation (41) are quasi-constants, whereas those on the left hand side are more variable. If the mass flux is maximised, the term \((1 - \Phi_F)\) can be regarded as quasi-constant (=1 for typical values of \( \Phi_F \) encountered in practice). Ignoring this term shows \( u \propto S_o/M d_{\text{max}}^{5-D} \). This highlights the explicit dependence of \( u \) on \( S_o \). Further, when \( u \) is constant and \( S_o \) is increased by polymer addition (such as described above), one sees that increases in strength must be offset by increases in the product \( M d_{\text{max}}^{5-D} \). At this point in time, it is not feasible to distinguish between the dependences on \( M \) and size. One way or the other, it appears that \( \Phi_F \) will increase as a result of polymer addition—this improving the potential renovation capacity. However, in later analysis it will be shown that the blanket floc size (as well as \( \Phi_F \)) plays a critical role in the trapping capacity—a facet which may be linked to the tailing off of the renovation capacity noted above when the polymer dose is increased as reported above. Experience also shows that, with increasing polymer dose, the floc becomes too sticky—manifesting as an inability to flow out of the sludge hoppers.

**Time-varying conditions**

When one considers the analytical framework in the context of an operating plant, account must be taken of the solids content in the feed flow. As material gets trapped in the blanket, its solids content \((m_s)\) will increase; this manifesting as an increase in the blanket height. This will continue until solids are bled off. Here, it is necessary to examine the likely impact of the added mass on the dynamics as described previously. This can be addressed at two levels, the superficial explanation being more straightforward. The theoretical framework described above is tied to the behaviour of an assemblage of particles whose flow characteristics are described by Equations (24) – (27). Adding particles of similar kind should not alter the dynamics provided \( \phi \) or \( \Phi_F \) remain constant. Readers wishing to probe this question at a deeper level are referred to Probstein (1994, pp. 267–269) in which the dynamics within a ‘Happel cell’ are related to the dynamics of the assemblage. When \( u \) and \( \Phi_F \) remain at fixed values, Equation (21) shows that \( L \propto m_s \); that is, \( M \) (defined by Equation (10)) maintains a fixed value. Thus:

\[
\frac{dL}{dt} = \frac{1}{AM} \frac{dm_s}{dt}
\]

Equation (20) shows that \( G \) remains constant when \( L \propto m_s \), whereas \( t_L \) (defined by Equation (6)) increases as a result of the increase in \( L \). Hence the only parameter within

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Data for inclusion in Equation (40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A )</td>
<td>( D )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No polymer</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polymer</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the product \( G\Phi_\ell d_\ell \), that responds to mass accumulation is the timescale (provided \( M \) and \( \Phi_\ell \) remain constant). With these background factors in place, the following illustrates how the various strands of the analysis can be brought together into a dynamic model.

Mass conservation across a blanket in which there is both an inflow and an outflow is represented by the statement

\[
\frac{dm}{dt} = Qc_i - Qc_e
\]  

(43)

where \( c_i \) and \( c_e \) refer to the incoming solids concentration and the outgoing solids concentration, respectively. Note that \( c_i \) and \( c_e \) are proportional to \( n_i \) and \( n_e \) appearing in Equation (1). Thereafter Equation (43) with the aid of Equations (1), (6) and (10) leads to the expression

\[
\frac{dL}{dt} = \frac{uc_i}{M} [1 - \exp(-\beta t)],
\]  

(44)

with

\[
\beta = \frac{\alpha G\Phi_\ell (1 - \Phi_F)}{\pi u}
\]  

(45)

Making use of the boundary conditions, \( L = L_0 \) at \( t = 0 \) and \( L = L_1 \) at time \( t \), integration of Equation (44) yields

\[
L_1 - L_0 + \frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left( \frac{1 - \beta \exp(-\beta t)}{1 - \beta \exp(-\beta L_0)} \right) = \frac{u c_i t}{M}
\]  

(46)

This can be solved numerically to show the change in blanket level with time. In the particular case of no losses (\( \beta = 0 \)), \( L_1 - L_0 = uc_i t/M \). With knowledge of \( L_1 \), the quality of the outgoing stream is expressed by

\[
c_e(t) = c_i \exp \left[ -\frac{\alpha G\Phi_\ell (1 - \Phi_F)L_1}{\pi u} \right]
\]  

(47)

Aside from the impact of other parameters, a worst case condition exists when the blanket is at its minimum height (say \( L_0 \)) where \( L_0 \) might refer to the state of the blanket after solids withdrawal.

**Trapping behaviour**

At this point it is instructive to examine the impact of \( \alpha \) on clarification. When the feed particles/flocs are larger than a few \( \mu \text{m} \) (eliminating the effects of Brownian motion) and when the density of the incident particles is close to the suspending fluid (eliminating the effects of inertia), trapping by the collector particles/flocs is dominated by interception. Feed particles will tend to follow the streamlines round the collector particles. Collection can only take place if they lie within the ‘collision cross-section’. The boundary of the collision cross-section is determined by the trajectory of the incident particle which passes sufficiently close to the collector to enable attractive van de Waals forces to pull the incident particle towards the surface. This tendency of bond formation/attachment will be offset by the effect of surface shear which acts to break such bonds and a hydrodynamic interaction arising from the displacement of fluid as the incident particle approaches the collecting surface. So collection depends on an appropriate trajectory together with the impact of a variety of forces acting on the incident particle/floc as it approaches the collection surface. In simplified models (e.g. Tambo & Hozumi 1979), these effects are separated into two processes with \( \alpha \) defined by \( E_cE_{adh} \) where \( E_c \) refers to the collision efficiency (based on a limiting trajectory in the absence of surface force fields) and \( E_{adh} \) the adhesion efficiency. In more refined models (e.g. Spielman 1977), the definition of the limiting trajectory includes the effect of the force fields and is more rigorous. However, flocs morphology is such that they differ from the ideal spherical particles considered in theory, so existing theory has only limited value in the task of defining \( \alpha \). The best way of determining its value is via the observed attenuation behaviour, coupled with knowledge of the remaining parameters featured in Equation (47).

**Figure 5** illustrates the relative impact of the terms \( \alpha \) and \( G\Phi_\ell (1 - \Phi_F)L_0 \) on attenuation. Calculations were based on \( G, \Phi_\ell, u \) data shown in Table 2 at a fixed depth (\( L_0 = 0.6 \text{ m} \)). **Figure 5(a)** is based on the fixed value \( \alpha = E_c = 0.004 \) for inclusion in Equation (47); that is, deliberately ignoring the potential impacts of particle size, but displaying some attenuation. At each dose, the overflow water quality deteriorates with increasing \( u \), the dose appearing to have relatively little impact on \( c_e/c_i \) because of the similarity of the \( G\Phi_\ell (1 - \Phi_F)L_0 \) values at the same upflow velocity. In contrast, **Figure 5(b)** shows the potential impact of floc size scale (\( d_{cv} \)) within the blanket when the feed flocs have a
size scale \( (d_p) \) of 40 \( \mu \)m, with \( E_c \) defined by

\[
E_c = \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{d_p}{d_{vo}} \right)^2 \quad (48)
\]

Equation (48) refers to the collection efficiency of neutrally buoyant spherical particles in viscous flow conditions when surface interactions are excluded (e.g. Probststein 1994). A comparison between Figure 5(a) and (b) indicates that the inclusion of particle size impacts transforms the blanket attenuation capacity, best collection being favoured by conditions in which the ratio \( d_p/d_{vo} \) is at its largest (i.e. when \( d_{vo} \) has its smallest values); this occurs at the lowest dose and at the highest values of upflow. However, the response to upflow depicted in Figure 5(b) is unrealistic, because experience shows that the clarified water quality tends to diminish with increasing upflow (see Gregory et al. 1999). The reason is that Equation (48) overstates the collection efficiency. Tambo & Hozumi (1979) attempted to examine the effect of feed floc size on the attenuation capacity. When the feed floc sizes were larger, there was some improvement in the overflow water quality, but the effects were relatively small (possibly because the blanket floc sizes also changed). Although the trends in Figure 5(b) overstate the impact of floc size, they emphasise that losses in the value of \( G\Phi_F (1 - \Phi_F) \) as \( u \) increases (as shown in Figure 5(a)) can be offset by improvements in the trapping efficiency by virtue of reductions in the blanket floc size scale. Here it should be emphasised that parameter \( d_{vo} \) merely reflects a size scale. In practice, collection will be greatly influenced by the spread of floc sizes, particularly the smaller sizes; these occur in greater number concentration (see Figure 1) and also offer a more favourable size ratio for enabling collection.

Regarding the effects of strength on the attenuation performance, the trends in Figure 5 suggest that the flocs with the greatest strength scale (20 ppm set) have the lowest collection capacity. When one considers the effect of polymers to boost strength, these will affect both the feed flocs and the flocs within the blanket, there being ample justification for believing that both would increase in size. If both were to increase in the same proportion, it would make no difference to the trapping efficiency as defined by Equation (48). What matters is the relative size; the collection efficiency improves when the sizes of the feed flocs and collector flocs become more comparable. In addition, one must consider the impact of changing strength on \( \Phi_F \).

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Insofar as one can judge, the framework described appears to accommodate the various strands of experimental evidence that have been presented. This task is made difficult by the lack of supporting information (e.g. \( A', S_o \) and \( D \)) for inclusion in the theory. Where ‘guesstimates’
have been included, they appear to be satisfactory. The assumption of treating flocs as non-porous appears to have been satisfactory in the context of the analysis associated with Figure 2. One outcome of the theory is that it identifies critical parameters that affect the dynamics, which has benefits for experimental design.

The impacts of strength are complex. An immediate impact of increasing strength is to enable the development of larger and/or more compact feed flocs. However in the context of the blanket, the effects of strength are subtle, the outcome depending on the character of the particular floc. Increased strength does not necessarily enhance the mass flux, much depending on the magnitude of $D$. The observations of Gregory (1979) show that greater strength offers the prospect of attaining a greater value of $\Phi_F$, a necessary feature for assuring attenuation. Theory suggests that the magnitude of the upflow goes hand in hand with the strength scale as suggested in Bache & Gregory (2007, Table 3.14).

There appears to be a case for aiming to achieve a blanket with as small a floc size as practicable in order to: promote the capture of feed flocs by interception; reduce the water content of the solids waste stream when using hydrolysing coagulants; and also enhance the mass flux.

There are aspects of the theory that warrant further scrutiny, but generally it provides a framework that can be developed further. Hopefully, the paper will stimulate thinking about the many issues involved.
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