

# Uncertainty in Wastewater Treatment Design and Operation

*Addressing Current Practices and Future Directions*

---



*Scientific and Technical Report Series No. 21*

# Uncertainty in Wastewater Treatment Design and Operation

*Addressing Current Practices and Future Directions*

---

Edited by

Evangelia Belia, Lorenzo Benedetti, Bruce Johnson,  
Sudhir Murthy, Marc Neumann, Peter Vanrolleghem and  
Stefan Weijers



**Published by**

**IWA Publishing**  
**Unit 104–105, Export Building**  
**1 Clove Crescent**  
**London E14 2BA, UK**

Telephone: +44 (0)20 7654 5500

Fax: +44 (0)20 7654 5555

Email: [publications@iwap.co.uk](mailto:publications@iwap.co.uk)

Web: [www.iwapublishing.com](http://www.iwapublishing.com)

First published 2021

© 2021 IWA Publishing

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act (1998), no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the publisher, or, in the case of photographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licenses issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in the UK, or in accordance with the terms of licenses issued by the appropriate reproduction rights organization outside the UK. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the terms stated here should be sent to IWA Publishing at the address printed above.

The publisher makes no representation, express or implied, with regard to the accuracy of the information contained in this book and cannot accept any legal responsibility or liability for errors or omissions that may be made.

**Disclaimer**

The information provided and the opinions given in this publication are not necessarily those of IWA and should not be acted upon without independent consideration and professional advice. IWA and the Editors and Authors will not accept responsibility for any loss or damage suffered by any person acting or refraining from acting upon any material contained in this publication.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 9781780401027 (Paperback)

ISBN: 9781780401034 (eBook)

ISBN: 9781789062601 (ePUB)

This eBook was made Open Access in October 2022

© 2022 The Editors.

This is an Open Access eBook distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits copying and redistribution for non-commercial purposes with no derivatives, provided the original work is properly cited (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). This does not affect the rights licensed or assigned from any third party in this book.



# Contents

---

<b>List of Contributors</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>Preface</b> .....	<b>xv</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>xvii</b>
<b>Introduction to the Scientific and Technical Report</b> .....	<b>xix</b>

## **Chapter 1**

<b>Key concepts of the STR</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Risk .....	1
1.3 Uncertainty .....	2
1.3.1 Classification of uncertainty .....	2
1.3.2 Separating variability and uncertainty .....	4
1.3.3 Sources of variability and uncertainty .....	4
1.3.4 Uncertainty analysis approaches .....	6
1.4 Incorporating Variability and Uncertainty Analysis in Models .....	7
1.4.1 Variability and uncertainty in model steps .....	7
1.4.2 Sources of variability and uncertainty in models .....	9
1.4.3 Evaluation methods .....	12
1.5 Summary .....	13
References .....	13

## **Chapter 2**

<b>Uncertainty in wastewater treatment – current practice</b> .....	<b>15</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	15
2.2 General Approaches for Addressing Uncertainty in Wastewater Treatment .....	15

2.2.1	Design guidelines	15
2.2.2	Statistical methodologies	20
2.2.3	Scenario analysis	20
2.2.4	Mathematical modelling	20
2.3	Addressing Specific Sources of Uncertainty and Variability in Current Design Practice	21
2.3.1	Addressing sources of variability and uncertainty in flow and load determination	21
2.3.2	Addressing sources of uncertainty in unit process design	23
2.3.3	Addressing uncertainty via effluent permit selection	25
2.3.4	Summary of uncertainty analysis methods in current practice	26
2.4	Implications of Current Practice on Degrees of Freedom in Engineering Decisions	29
2.5	Summary	29
	References	30

### Chapter 3

#### ***Incorporating uncertainty analysis into model-based decision making – opportunities and challenges***

		<b>33</b>
3.1	Introduction	33
3.2	Incorporation of Safety in Current Model-Assisted Design	33
3.3	Opportunities of Explicitly Considering Uncertainty and Variability	34
3.4	Scope and Limitations of Models	34
3.4.1	Evolution of wastewater treatment modelling	34
3.4.2	Desirability criteria for models	35
3.4.3	Example of wastewater treatment plant model limitations	35
3.5	What Don't We Know about Dealing with Uncertainty?	36
3.5.1	How conservative are we with the safety factor approach?	36
3.5.2	How to move from guidelines with the safety factor approach to probabilistic model-assisted design?	36
3.5.3	Determination of prior uncertainty ranges	37
3.5.4	Parameter (uncertainty) estimation in systems with poor identifiability	37
3.5.5	How to adequately deal with biokinetic model structure uncertainty?	38
3.5.6	Full-fledged probabilistic model-based design	38
3.6	How Can We Currently Account for Variability and Uncertainty?	38
3.6.1	Accounting for variability	38
3.6.2	Accounting for uncertainty	40
3.6.3	Sensitivity analysis	42
3.7	Opportunities of Combining Models with Uncertainty – Example	43
3.8	Summary	44
	References	44

**Chapter 4*****Available methods for uncertainty analysis in model-based projects – critical review*** .....**47**

4.1	Introduction	47
4.2	Methods and Literature Review Results Summary	48
4.3	Assessment of Input and Parameter Uncertainty	49
4.3.1	Input uncertainty (measurement errors)	49
4.3.2	Parameter uncertainty	53
4.4	Assessment of Model Structure Uncertainty	55
4.4.1	Macroscopic vs. microscopic mixing scales	55
4.4.2	Unquantified model structure uncertainty	56
4.4.3	Mathematical methods for quantification of model structure uncertainty	57
4.5	Propagation of Uncertainty for Model-Based Decisions	58
4.5.1	Review of uncertainty propagation methods	58
4.5.2	Discussion	63
4.6	Summary	64
4.6.1	Input and parameter uncertainty assessment	64
4.6.2	Model structure uncertainty assessment	65
4.6.3	Propagation of uncertainty in model-based decision making	65
	References	66

**Chapter 5*****The DOUT uncertainty analysis methodology – combining models, statistics and design guidelines*** .....**71**

5.1	Introduction	71
5.2	The Inclusion of Uncertainty Analysis in a Model-Based Project	71
5.2.1	General tasks	71
5.2.2	Linking process modelling steps and uncertainty methodology tasks	72
5.3	Bridging Design Guidelines and Steady-State Design with Dynamic Stochastic Modelling	73
5.3.1	Define project objectives	74
5.3.2	Select configurations to be evaluated	74
5.3.3	Identify sources of variability and uncertainty to be evaluated	77
5.3.4	Prioritise and reduce sources of uncertainty	82
5.3.5	Describe sources of variability and uncertainty explicitly	82
5.3.6	Model set-up and model structure uncertainty	83
5.3.7	Propagation of uncertainty and variability using Monte Carlo simulation	83
5.3.8	Synthesise evaluation metrics (output analysis)	88
5.3.9	Communicate results	90
5.4	Summary	91
	References	91

**Chapter 6*****Case studies*** .....**95**

6.1	Introduction	95
-----	--------------	----

6.2	Steady-State Uncertainty Analysis Example: Operation of the Durham WRRF	95
6.2.1	Project objectives	95
6.2.2	Conventional design approach using safety factors	96
6.2.3	Probabilistic design approach	97
6.2.4	Results and discussion	99
6.3	Dynamic Uncertainty Analysis Example: Design Upgrade for the Eindhoven WRRF	101
6.3.1	Project objectives	101
6.3.2	Generation and screening of steady-state pre-designs	102
6.3.3	Variability and uncertainty propagation	104
6.3.4	Quantification of probability of non-compliance (PONC)	105
6.3.5	Total cost estimates	108
6.4	Summary	108
	References	108

## Chapter 7

	<b>The bigger picture</b>	<b>111</b>
7.1	Introduction	111
7.2	Engineering Project Phases	112
7.2.1	Overview	112
7.2.2	Regulatory phase	115
7.2.3	Planning phase	115
7.2.4	Preliminary (conceptual) design	115
7.2.5	Detailed design, construction, and start-up	116
7.2.6	Operations	117
7.3	Stakeholders	118
7.3.1	Overview	118
7.3.2	Regulators	118
7.3.3	Utilities – owners and operators	118
7.3.4	Engineers	120
7.3.5	Public	120
7.4	Contract Delivery Methods	120
7.4.1	Overview	120
7.4.2	Examples of delivery methods	120
7.4.3	Stakeholder involvement as a function of contract type	121
7.5	Summary	122
	References	122

## Chapter 8

	<b>Perspectives</b>	<b>123</b>
8.1	Introduction	123
8.2	Socioeconomics and Applied Mathematics	124
8.2.1	Socioeconomics	124
8.2.2	Applied mathematics and statistics	124



8.3	Accounting for Uncertainty in Projects	125
8.3.1	Regulatory phase	125
8.3.2	Planning phase	125
8.3.3	Preliminary design	125
8.3.4	Detailed design	126
8.3.5	Operation	126
8.4	Alternative Ways of Handling Uncertainty	127
8.5	Outlook	127
	References	128

## Appendix A

	<b><i>Terms and definitions – application and discussion</i></b>	<b>129</b>
A.1	Introduction	129
A.2	Modelling	130
A.3	Statistics	133
A.4	Uncertainty	135
A.5	Discussion of Terms Often Confounded with Uncertainty	136
A.5.1	Precision and variability	136
A.5.2	Accuracy and uncertainty	136
A.5.3	Error and residual	137
A.5.4	Trueness and bias	137
A.5.5	Note on true values	138
A.5.6	Note on repetitions	139
A.5.7	Bias, variability and uncertainty: a graphical example	139
A.5.8	Link between measurement, modelling and prediction	140
A.5.9	Qualitative model performance criteria	140
A.5.10	Reliability and redundancy	141
A.5.11	Robustness and resiliency	142
	References	143

## Appendix B

	<b><i>Methods for uncertainty analysis</i></b>	<b>145</b>
B.1	Uncertainty Frameworks	145
B.1.1	Frequentist	145
B.1.2	Bayesian	145
B.2	Monte Carlo Simulation	146
B.2.1	Random sampling and LHS	147
B.2.2	Introducing correlations between parameters	148
	References	149

## Appendix C

	<b><i>Existing methods for uncertainty analysis in WWT model-based projects – Complete literature search results</i></b>	<b>151</b>
C.1	Introduction	151
C.2	Assessment of Input and Parameter Uncertainty	152

C.3	Assessment of Model Structure Uncertainty .....	153
C.4	Propagation of Uncertainty for Model-based Decisions .....	156
C.5	Uncertainty in Wastewater Treatment Plant Operational Control Data and Methods of Addressing in Online Control .....	162
C.6	Uncertainty in the Fate of Pollutants in the Environment and Resulting in Regulatory (WWTP Effluent Standards) Issues .....	167
C.7	Updated Literature 2011–2019 .....	171

**Appendix D**

***Application of uncertainty analysis methods – knowledge from other fields*** .....

		<b>175</b>
D.1	Introduction .....	175
D.2	Review of Uncertainty Analysis Methods in Chemical Engineering .....	175
	D.2.1 Comparison of chemical engineering with wastewater treatment .....	175
	D.2.2 Uncertainty methods used in chemical engineering .....	177
	D.2.3 Applicability to WWT .....	185
D.3	Review of Uncertainty Analysis Methods in Hydrogeological (Groundwater) Engineering .....	185
	D.3.1 Comparison of hydrogeological engineering with WWT .....	185
	D.3.2 Uncertainty methods used in hydrogeological engineering .....	187
	D.3.3 Applicability to wastewater treatment .....	189
References	.....	190

**Appendix E**

***Current practices in different countries*** .....

		<b>195</b>
E.2	Current Practice in North America .....	195
	E.2.1 Planning phase .....	195
	E.2.2 Design–bid–build contracts .....	195
	E.2.3 Design–build contracts .....	197
	E.2.4 Design–build–operate contracts .....	198
E.3	Current Practice in Other Countries .....	199
	E.3.1 Questionnaire .....	199
	E.3.2 United Kingdom .....	200
	E.3.3 The Netherlands .....	201
	E.3.4 Switzerland .....	202
	E.3.5 Czech Republic .....	203
	E.3.6 South Korea .....	204
	E.3.7 South America .....	205
References	.....	206

<b><i>Index</i></b> .....	<b>207</b>
---------------------------	------------

# List of Contributors

---

## TASK GROUP MEMBERS

Evangelia Belia, Primodal Inc., US&Canada  
Lorenzo Benedetti, Waterways d.o.o., Croatia  
Bruce Johnson, Jacobs, USA  
Sudhir Murthy, NEWhub Corp., USA  
Marc Neumann, Basque Centre for Climate Change, Spain  
Peter Vanrolleghem, Université Laval, Canada  
Stefan Weijers, Waterschap De Dommel, Netherlands

## STR CHAPTER EVOLUTION AND CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

The STR materials originally consisted of white papers with contributions from a number of authors as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Original STR white papers.

---

<b>Task A0</b>	Document how uncertainty and risk are currently handled in the wastewater treatment practice by consultants, utilities and regulators. Brian Karmasin, Henryk Melcer, Jeffrey McCormick, Ana Pena-Tijerina, Davide Bixio, Jose Jimenez
<b>Task A1</b>	Propose a set of terms and definitions relating to uncertainty. Kris Villez, Dave Kinnear, Sylvie Gillot
<b>Task A2</b>	Propose a comprehensive list of the sources of uncertainty for typical project planning horizons. Marie Burbano, Charles Bott, JB Neethling, Maureen O'Shaughnessy, Leiv Rieger, Youri Amerlinck, Benedek Plosz
<b>Task A3</b>	Document and evaluate existing methods for assessing and evaluating uncertainty in wastewater treatment. George Sprouse, Gurkan Sin, Jeffrey McCormick, Oliver Schraa
<b>Task A4</b>	Identify gaps and inefficiencies in current knowledge and practice related to uncertainty. Andrew Shaw, Thomas Hug, Jeffrey McCormick, Youri Amerlinck, Xavier Flores-Alsina, Jeffrey Weiss

**Task A5** Incorporate knowledge from other fields and institutions on applications of uncertainty evaluation methodologies.

Oliver Schraa, Kris Villez, Spencer Snowling, Benedek Plosz

**Task A6** Finalise report.

Evangelia Belia, Marc Neumann, Lorenzo Benedetti, Bruce Johnson, Sudhir Murthy, Stefan Weijers, Peter Vanrolleghem

The final version of the STR, following four sets of reviews, is shown in Table 2. In the process of stream lining the material, the content of several of the white papers was re-organised and distributed in different chapters.

**Table 2.** Final version of STR chapters.

<b>Chapter 1</b>	Key Concepts Marc Neumann and Evangelia Belia
<b>Chapter 2</b>	Current Practice Brian Karmasin, Henryk Melcer, Jeffrey McCormick, Ana Pena-Tijerina, Davide Bixio, Jose Jimenez, Bruce Johnson
<b>Chapter 3</b>	Benefits Marc Neumann, Andrew Shaw, Thomas Hug, Jeffrey McCormick, Yuri Amerlinck, Xavier Flores-Alsina
<b>Chapter 4</b>	Evaluation of Existing Methods George Sprouse, Gurkan Sin, Jeffrey McCormick, Oliver Schraa
<b>Chapter 5</b>	DOU Framework Evangelia Belia, Marie Burbano, Charles Bott, JB Neethling, Maureen O'Shaughnessy, Leiv Rieger, Yuri Amerlinck, Benedek Plosz, Peter Vanrolleghem
<b>Chapter 6</b>	Case Studies Evangelia Belia, Bruce Johnson, Peter Vanrolleghem
<b>Chapter 7</b>	Bigger Picture Evangelia Belia, Lorenzo Benedetti, Bruce Johnson, Sudhir Murthy, Marc Neumann, Peter Vanrolleghem, Stefan Weijers
<b>Chapter 8</b>	Future of Uncertainty Analysis Marc Neumann, Andrew Shaw, Thomas Hug, Jeffrey McCormick, Yuri Amerlinck, Xavier Flores-Alsina, Jeffrey Weiss
<b>Appendix A</b>	Terminology and Definitions Kris Villez, Dave Kinnear, Sylvie Gillot
<b>Appendix B</b>	Theory of Methods Oliver Schraa, Kris Villez, Spencer Snowling, Benedek Plosz
<b>Appendix C</b>	Literature Search Results George Sprouse, Gurkan Sin, Jeffrey McCormick, Oliver Schraa, Lorenzo Benedetti
<b>Appendix D</b>	Methods from Other Fields Oliver Schraa, Kris Villez, Spencer Snowling, Benedek Plosz
<b>Appendix E</b>	Current Practice Worldwide Evangelia Belia, John Copp, Bruce Johnson, Marc Neumann, Libor Novák, Daniel Nolasco, Dae Sung Lee, Stefan Weijers

**CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS****Evangelia Belia***Primodal Inc., US&Canada***Lorenzo Benedetti***Waterways d.o.o., Croatia***Bruce Johnson***Jacobs, USA***Sudhir Murthy***NEWhub Corp, USA***Marc Neumann***Basque Centre for Climate Change (BC3)  
Ikerbasque – Basque Foundation for Science, Spain***Peter Vanrolleghem***modelEAU-Université Laval, Canada***Stefan Weijers***Waterschap De Dommel, Netherlands***Youri Amerlinck***Aquafin NV, Belgium***Davide Bixio***European Commission, Belgium***Charles Bott***Hampton Roads Sanitation District, USA***Marie Burbano***Brown and Caldwell, USA***Xavier Flores-Alsina***Technical University of Denmark, Denmark***Sylvie Gillot***INRAE, France***Thomas Hug***Hunziker Betatech AG, Switzerland***Jose Jimenez***Brown and Caldwell, USA***Brian Karmasin***CDM Smith, USA***David Kinnear***Kinnear Process Solutions LLC, USA***Jeffrey McCormick***Carollo Engineers, USA***Henryk Melcer***Brown and Caldwell, USA***JB Neethling***HDR, USA***Daniel Nolasco***NOLASCO y Asociados S.A., Argentina***Libor Novák***aqua4you s.r.o., Czech Republic***Maureen O'Shaughnessy***Prince William County Service Authority, USA***Anna Pena-Tijerina***Plummer Associates Inc., USA***Leiv Rieger***inCTRL Solutions Inc., Canada***Oliver Schraa***inCTRL Solutions Inc., Canada***Andrew Shaw***Black & Veatch, USA***Gurkan Sin***Technical University of Denmark, Denmark***Spencer Snowling***Hydromantis Inc., Canada***George Sprouse***MCES, USA***Benedek Plosz***University of Bath, UK***Kris Villez***Oak Ridge National Laboratory, USA***Jeff Weiss***Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County  
(retired), USA*



# Preface

---

## **ABOUT THE IWA DESIGN AND OPERATIONAL UNCERTAINTY TASK GROUP**

The International Water Association (IWA) Design and Operations Uncertainty Task Group (DOUG) was formed to develop methodologies that enable the explicit evaluation of variability and uncertainty in model-based design of water resource recovery facilities (WRRF), and model-based analysis of plant operations.

An overview of uncertainty in the treatment plant modelling context was discussed at a workshop (in Mont-Sainte-Anne, Canada) during the 1st IWA/WEF (Water Environment Federation) Wastewater Treatment Modelling seminar (WWTmod2008). This workshop identified knowledge gaps and the requirements for the development of the needed methodologies. Following the workshop, the Task Group established the following set of objectives and set-up several working groups to advance these goals:

- Document how uncertainty and risk are currently handled in wastewater treatment practice by consultants, utilities and regulators.
- Propose a set of terms and definitions relating to uncertainty to be used by wastewater professionals.
- Propose a comprehensive list of the sources of uncertainty for typical project phases and contract delivery mechanisms.
- Document and evaluate existing methods for assessing and evaluating uncertainty in wastewater treatment.
- Identify gaps and inefficiencies in current knowledge and practice related to uncertainty.
- Incorporate uncertainty evaluation methodology knowledge from other fields.
- Present examples of methods already available that can be used to deal with uncertainty and variability.

The working groups were composed of professionals from consulting, utilities, software companies and academia. From its inception the intention was one of *co-production*, further facilitated through a large number of workshops and working meetings held during national and international conferences. The findings obtained through this process form the cornerstone of this Scientific and Technical Report (STR).

## MISSION STATEMENT

The goal of the Task Group was to develop methods for integrating uncertainty analysis into wastewater treatment process simulators in order to facilitate a shift from deterministic (one answer) to probabilistic analysis (likelihood of outcome) of treatment plant design and operation. Such a transition will lead to better management and quantification of the risks/benefits of a specific design or operational strategy. This in turn will provide utilities with more effective, efficient facilities and increase the socio-economic benefits of resource recovery.

In pursuit of these objectives, this STR reviews the state of the art in dealing with uncertainty and variability in wastewater engineering, as well as novel methods and approaches recently developed in academia. The STR examines the feasibility of these novel methods for use in the wastewater sector.

## SCOPE

The work presented in the STR, focuses on the entire wastewater treatment plant from influent to effluent. Links to the urban catchment (upstream of the wastewater treatment plant) are also discussed because uncertainties associated with expected developments in the catchment have impacts at the planning stage of plant design. Links to the receiving water body (downstream of the wastewater treatment plant) are also discussed as uncertainties in effluent standards imposed by regulators impact plant design and operation.

Much of the work presented in this STR focuses on biological treatment in the liquid stream as this is one of the principal drivers for initiating this paradigm change in design methodology. However, it is important to note that the methodologies presented are model-independent and applicable to any unit process (e.g., primary settling tank, anaerobic digester, etc.), including external factors, or even within an all-encompassing plant-wide modelling approach.

The Task Group hopes that the concepts and methods presented in this STR will contribute to a more systematic and transparent way of managing uncertainty in WRRF design and operations, which in turn will lead to more cost-effective solutions.

**Evangelia Belia, Canada**  
**Lorenzo Benedetti, Croatia**  
**Bruce Johnson, USA**  
**Sudhir Murthy, USA**  
**Marc Neumann, Spain**  
**Peter Vanrolleghem, Canada**  
**Stefan Weijers, Netherlands**



# Acknowledgements

---

The Design and Operations Uncertainty Task Group (DOUT) was sponsored by the International Water Association (IWA). We would especially like to thank Michael Dunn, former managing director at IWA Publishing and Paul Reiter, former IWA executive director, as well as Mark Hammond and Niall Cunniffe for guiding us through the publishing effort.

The Task Group was also supported by the Water Environment Federation (WEF) and we would like to thank them for their support.

The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and Primodal Inc., funded a Collaborative Research and Development grant which supported the development of the STR.

The following organisations provided financial support through the sponsoring of projects:

- Waterschap de Dommel, The Netherlands
- Water Research Foundation, Virginia, USA
- Hampton Roads Sanitation District, Virginia, USA

The doctoral research of Mansour Talebizadeh, co-supervised by Cristina Martín, substantially contributed to the STR.

A special thanks goes to the group of professionals that reviewed our initial draft, for their guidance and comments: Eduardo Ayesa, Damian Dominguez, Krist Gernaey, Joe Husband, Paul Lessard, Doug Lumley, Henrik Melcer, Art Umble and Zhiguo Yuan.

We would also like to thank the DOUT workshop contributors for providing additional insights from the wider water resources field:

Charles Bott	Libor Novak
David Clark	Luk Peeters
Tony Flameling	Antonio Manuel Moreno Ródenas
Tony Jakeman	Simon Tait
Mark van Loosdrecht	Franz Tscheikner-Gratl
Holger Maier	Christian Urich

Ludiwine Clouzot acted as our special editor and helped to form the current version of the STR.

We would like to thank the reviewers of the final version of the STR: John B. Copp, Jeffrey Weiss and Erik U. Lindblom. Their edits and suggestions were invaluable and helped us improve the quality of the STR.

Finally, we would like to extend special recognition to the people that inspired us to embark on this journey:

**Bruce Beck**  
**Willi Gujer**  
**Paul Harremoës**  
**Peter Reichert**  
**Stefano Saltelli**

# Introduction to the Scientific and Technical Report

---

## MOTIVATION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Over the past 30 years, mathematical models (usually included in simulators) have been displacing the use of heuristic-based ('rules-of-thumb') guidelines for designing water resources recovery facilities (WRRF). Models unify our knowledge about the treatment processes into a single package that is capable of generating comprehensive portraits of how a design will perform. In addition to their value in WRRF design, these models are increasingly being used to evaluate the effect of proposed modifications to plant operations and control, aimed at improving plant performance. Key reasons for the transition to model-aided design and operations include:

- Models allow for more realistic representation of the complexities introduced by hydraulic regime, reactor configuration and variation in operating modes.
- Models can simulate plant performance under dynamic conditions.
- Models enable the designer to analyse and isolate the impact that individual unit operations have on the performance of the treatment train as a whole.
- Models facilitate the examination of effluent quality sensitivity to specific design assumptions.
- Models allow the designer to efficiently screen alternative designs for those that best meet specific environmental goals such as energy efficiency or minimization of greenhouse emissions.
- Models streamline performance comparison of alternative plant designs by facilitating direct comparisons.
- Models can simulate effluent quality response to transient conditions such as wet weather induced influent loadings and operating strategy.
- Models address the growing consensus amongst wastewater professionals that the quality of performance prediction is a critical component of design and operation.
- Wastewater simulation software is a knowledge capture/communication tool that is constantly being updated to simulate new treatment technologies as they gain acceptance and to improve the simulation of existing processes as their behaviour becomes better understood.

A goal of any treatment plant design project is to provide a facility that can be operated reliably to meet specific treatment objectives at minimal cost. Many alternative designs with varying cost structures,

performance and risk profiles might be considered to meet the defined objectives. The designer is tasked with the responsibility of finding an acceptable balance between cost, risk and benefit.

Identifying this balance is hampered by the lack of available protocols for explicit risk and benefit assessment. Traditional design methodologies are based upon guidelines and heuristics that have survived the test of time. However, in their application, the complexities of the treatment process are simplified. For example, the variability in plant flow and influent wastewater load is typically addressed through the use of peaking factors. Uncertainty in the coefficients that determine process efficiency is accounted for through the application of safety factors. Judicious choice of these factors provides for a margin of safety that is supposed to ensure adequate performance.

Process model-based design, in addition to the benefits listed earlier, allows the design engineer to incorporate much more information into the design process and in turn to support a more informative assessment of risk and benefits. The reality though is that under current practice, when engineers are interested in evaluating the robustness of a design, they will often overlay a safety factor approach onto the simulation results to accomplish this. In the absence of a prescribed procedure, each engineer will do this in a way that reflects his/her own experiences and prejudices, resulting in some level of arbitrariness.

***This need not be.*** The power and sophistication of existing treatment plant simulators, combined with the wider availability of real-time data and advancements in statistical and data analysis methods, creates opportunities for quantifying treatment plant performance under a wide range of operating conditions. With properly defined protocols, performance profiles can be generated that enable formulation of probabilistic statements (likelihood) regarding various types of failure. Risk/benefit/cost analyses of multiple design alternatives to support identification of the optimal design can be generated. This can be done with a high level of transparency so that each stakeholder can be better informed of the trade-offs they are asked to accept. This is the long-term goal whose exploration is being initiated with this Scientific and Technical Report (STR).

***The primary focus of the STR is to develop a comprehensive, workable, and well documented framework for addressing uncertainty and integrating it into WRRF design and operations optimizations. This includes defining what is meant by uncertainty, identifying where uncertainty arises in a project, how uncertainty fits into predicting the long-term performance of a design, how uncertainty influences the attitudes and thus the decision-making process of various stakeholders, methods that are currently available for addressing uncertainty, and methods that are needed but have yet to be developed.***

This STR is envisioned as a reference for utilities, regulators and consultants dealing with uncertainty, opportunity and risk in wastewater treatment. The technical details covered in the STR are fleshed out within a comprehensive and holistic framework. This holistic view extends the discussion beyond those uncertainties directly associated with the application of treatment plant models into other areas that influence the final design. This is done in recognition that the chosen design is shaped by inputs from many different stakeholders, and in acknowledgement that uncertainty arises at many stages of project development and execution. These non-model associated uncertainties are important components of the overall uncertainty that influence project risk.

To clarify this last point, consider that the stakeholders in a project might include the public in general, interest or advocacy groups, facility owners, facility operators, facility users, regulators, planners, engineers, designers and contractors. Each comes to the table with different concepts of project objectives and different perceptions and appetites for risk. To illustrate the need for a holistic approach and the complexities of risk in infrastructure projects, consider the example in [Box 0.1](#).

### BOX 0.1 UNCERTAINTY – THE BIGGER PICTURE

An engineer is designing a facility that must meet a defined set of effluent limit guidelines. She may receive certain prescriptive criteria for the design from others. She can apply one of the available treatment plant simulators that will enable her to determine the critical aspects of the configuration and sizing of the treatment tanks. She works up a design and then by doing some sensitivity analysis, determines an envelope of conditions under which the design is expected to meet treatment objectives. In doing the sensitivity analysis, she might incorporate some knowledge she has pertaining to statistical uncertainty in some of the model parameters. She might then do some statistical analysis to determine the probability that conditions outside her envelope will be experienced. Based on the findings, she might develop various iterations on the design until she finds a suitable risk profile. The magnitude of that risk is a function of the variability in the key constituents in the wastewater and the uncertainty of various stoichiometric and kinetic parameters in the simulation software being used.


Now the engineer might have received information for the design basis from a planner. The planner may have focused on current and future land use to make forecasts of flows to the plant. He may have decided that the facility should be designed to handle the flows expected 40 years into the future, at which time he expects the catchment to reach maximum flow. To reach this conclusion, the planner may be applying models that are specific to his discipline. He also faces a different set of uncertainties which also contribute to the risk of the project. Whatever the planner determines may simply end up as a specification to which the design engineer must respond, but without any explanation of the attached risks and uncertainties. As a result, embedded into the design are risks unknown to the engineer.

The regulator is charged with setting effluent limitations. In setting limitations, he is guided by the beneficial uses designated for the receiving stream, the water quality objectives necessary to protect those uses and the waste load allocations that follow from those objectives. The regulatory authority might have its own set of models to consult when considering this problem. And these models come with their own unique sources of uncertainty. Then there is the possibility that in the future, the public demands a change in the beneficial uses, or perhaps a future ecological study determines that the assimilative capacity of the receiving is less than originally thought. This might result in a reduction of a waste load allocation with a concomitant lowering of the effluent limitations. How does one consider this regulator risk?

Finally, there are risks that arise out of the contract delivery methods (e.g., has the owner bid the design and construction phases separately or as a package?). Contract delivery methods allocate project risks in different ways and this will have different impacts at various stages of project development.

## STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This STR is divided into four sections as shown in [Figure 0.1](#) below. Section I, ‘System understanding’, opens with a general discussion of risk, variability and uncertainty, and identifies how they may influence decisions made at various stages of a project (Chapter 1). This section continues with an assessment of how uncertainty is currently handled in practice (Chapter 2). Reading through Chapter 2 – Current practice, the reader should become aware of the fact that the selection of safety factors and conservative design flow and load values are the most prevalent methods used by engineers currently to account for uncertainty and variability. The section concludes with the benefits of incorporating



**Figure 0.1** The content flow of the STR.

uncertainty analysis in plant design through the use of simulators (Chapter 3). After reading Chapter 3 the reader will have learned about the major sources of uncertainty and variability, how they can be classified in a modelling framework, how practical it is to separate variability from uncertainty and the design parameters that are not amenable to this separation.

Supporting Section I are Appendices A and E. Appendix A includes additional terms and definitions relevant to uncertainty. Appendix E includes examples of engineering practices across selected parts of the world.

Section II, ‘Tested and transferable methods’, focuses on ‘available methods that allow professionals to manage and evaluate *quantifiable* uncertainty in explicit ways. It introduces the reader to concepts and methods which are found in the literature and assesses their feasibility for widespread use in wastewater engineering (Chapter 4). A comprehensive up-to-date literature list has been included in Appendix C. Methods developed in other fields and an assessment of their potential for transfer to the wastewater sector can be found in Appendix D.

Section III, ‘DOUT framework’, presents a proposed methodology for combining models, statistics and design guidelines for plant design (Chapter 5). The methodology is applied to the case studies presented in Chapter 6. Chapters 5 and 6 focus on two types of uncertainties: quantifiable and scenario uncertainties. Details on the theory behind the methods described as well as further reading materials, can be found in Appendix B.

The final section, ‘Broader view and way forward’, presents a broader view of the factors influencing engineering decisions (Chapter 7). Chapter 7 discusses the relevance of the contractual environment, the role of the stakeholders and the type of project, and how these play a far greater role in shaping the final outcome of an infrastructure project than is widely acknowledged. Chapter 8 examines possible future ways of dealing with uncertainty and exposes existing challenges, as well as methods available that can already be used by the profession to deal with issues of variability and uncertainty.