Table 7.1.4.1 Risk Evaluation of Heavy Metal Intrusion

| Service Arcas | Industry Categorics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TotaiWeightingPoint | Total <br> Toxic <br> Factory <br> Number | Total <br> Factory <br> Number | Average <br> Weight <br> Point to <br> One <br> Factory | Toxic Factory Ratio to All Factores | Industrial <br> Wastewater Ratio to Total Sewage | Toxicity <br> Point at <br> Present | Toxicity Index at Present | Potential Growth Index of Industrial Sector | Total Toxicity Index | Risk Ranking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dycing: |  | Machinery |  | Electroplating |  | Conmetial <br> Tooth <br> Paste |  | Battery |  | Printing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relative Rating by Industries | 3 |  | 3 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) (B) |  | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (A) | (B) | (C) $=\Sigma$ <br> (B) | $(D)=\Sigma$ <br> (A) | (E) | $\begin{gathered} \langle\mathrm{F})= \\ (\mathrm{C}) /(\mathrm{D}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{G})= \\ (\mathrm{D}) /(\mathrm{E}) \\ \times 100 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{H}) \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline(\mathrm{I})= \\ (\mathrm{F}) \times(\mathrm{G}) \\ \times(\mathrm{K}) / 100 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (J)= \\ & 10 / 26 \\ & x(1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | (K) | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{L})= \\ (\mathrm{J}) \times(\mathrm{K}) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Si Phraya | 0 | 0 | 99 | 297 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 337 | 115 | 1.040 | 2.9 | 11.1 | 48 | 15.6 | 9.7 | 2 | 19.4 | 8 |
| Ratanakosin | 0 | 0 | 68 | 204 | 44 | 220 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 11 | 7 | 21 | 457 | 131 | 1,173 | 3.5 | 11.2 | 30 | 11.7 | 7.3 | 3 | 21.9 | 6 |
| Din Daeng | 2 | 6 | 524 | 1572 | 12 | 60 | 7 | 7 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 129 | 1818 | 632 | 5.827 | 2.9 | 10.8 | 16 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 3 | 9.4 | 15 |
| Xannawa | 2 | 6 | 307 | 921 | 30 | 150 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 21 | 151 | 453 | 1567 | 527 | 5.305 | 3.0 | 9.9 | 31 | 9.2 | 5.7 | 3 | 17.2 | 9 |
| Nong Khaem | 1 | 3 | 204 | 612 | 30 | 150 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 14 | 81 | 243 | 1029 | 337 | 3,347 | 3.1 | 10.1 | 25 | 7.7 | 4.8 | 9 | 43.2 | 2 |
| Ratburana | 5 | 15 | 75 | 225 | 15 | 75 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 36 | 108 | 432 | 140 | 1.884 | 3.1 | 7.4 | 20 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 10 | 28.7 | 3 |
| Chatuchak | 1 | 3 | 148 | 444 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 17 | 17 | 2 | 6 | 493 | 175 | 902 | 2.8 | 19.4 | 6 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 3 | 6.1 | 16 |
| Thonburi South | 9 | 27 | 298 | 894 | 33 | 165 | 11 | 11 | 18 | 18 | 154 | 462 | 1577 | 523 | 5,726. | 3.0 | 9.1 | 29 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 4 | 20.0 | 7 |
| Thonburi Central | 4 | 12 | 165 | 495 | 7 | 35 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 11 | 20 | 60 | 615 | 209 | 1,927 | 2.9 | 10.8 | 23 | 7.3 | 4.6 | 3 | 13.8 | 10 |
| Thonburi North | 0 | 0 | 95 | 285 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 14 | 42 | 346 | 120 | 857 | 2.9 | 14.0 | 15 | 6.1 | 3.8 | 3 | 11.4 | 13 |
| Khlong Toey West | 1 | 3 | 154 | 462 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 22 | 66 | 557 | 199 | 2,032 | 2.8 | 9.8 | 27 | 7.4 | 4.6 | 6 | 27.8 | 4 |
| Khiong Toey East | 1 | 3 | 236 | 708 | 9 | 45 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 51 | 153 | 931 | 319 | 2,207 | 2.9 | 14.5 | 22 | 9.3 | 5.8 | 10 | 58.0 | 1 |
| Bang Sue | 0 | 0 | 85 | 255 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 13 | 4 | 12 | 298 | 208 | 1.207 | 2.8 | 8.9 | 13 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 5 | 10.0 | 14 |
| Huay Kwuang | 1 | 3 | 105 | 315 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 27 | 356 | 126 | 681 | 2.8 | 18.5 | 16 | 8.4 | 5.2 | 5 | 26.1 | 5 |
| Wang Thong Lang | 4 | 12 | 187 | 561 | 11 | 55 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 22 | 66 | 709 | 239 | 1.512 | 3.0 | 15.3 | 8 | 3.8 | 2.3 | 5 | 12.7 | 12 |
| Bung Kum | 0 | 0 | 127 | 381 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 12 | 413 | 147 | 778 | 2.8 | 18.9 | 8 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 5 | 13.3 | 11 |

3) (H): Industrial wastewater amount to totai wastewater amount derived from PCD Master Plan for the existing and ongoing projects and from Tabie 6.1.3.1 for proposed schemes. 4) (K): Estimated based on Land Use Plan for the target year of 2017.
Source: JICA Study Team

Table 7.2.4.3 Standards of Heavy Metal Contents for Agicultural Use Sludge in Developed Countics (1/2)
(1) Sewage Sludge Regulation in E.C

|  | Max.content of sludge ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ ) | Max allowable content in agricultural $\begin{gathered} \text { soil } \\ \text { pH } 6.7(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}) \end{gathered}$ | Max. loading $\text { ( } 10 \text { ycars, } \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yr} \text { ) }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cu | 20-40 | 1-3 | 0.15 |
| Cr | not specilied | 100-150 | not speciticd |
| Cu | 1,000-1,750 | 50-140 | 12 |
| Hg | 16.25 | 1-1.5 | 0.1 |
| Pb | 750-1,200 | 50-300 | 15 |
| Ni | $300-400$ | 30-75 | 3 |
| 7 n | 2.500-4,000 | 150.300 | 30 |

(2) Maximum Content and Loading of Heavy Metats in U.K. (1989)

|  | Max. allowable content ( $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ dyy soil) |  |  |  | Max. loading ( 10 years $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha} / \mathrm{yn}$.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\underset{5.0-5.5}{\mathrm{pH}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{pH} \\ 5.5-6.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{pH} \\ 6.0-7.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{pH} \\ >7.0 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 2 nn | 200 | 250 | 300 | 450 | 15 |
| Cu | 80 | 100 | 135 | 200 | 7.5 |
| Ni | 50 | 60 | 75 | 130 | 3 |
|  | $\mathrm{pH}>5.0$ |  |  |  |  |
| cd | 3300 |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| Pb |  |  |  |  | 0.15 |
| Hg | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 400 \text { (tentative) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | 0.1 |
| Cr |  |  |  |  | 15 (emative) |
| Mo | 4 |  |  |  | 0.2 |
| Se | 3 |  |  |  | 0.15 |
| As | 50500 |  |  |  | 0.7 |
| F |  |  |  |  | 20 |

## (3) Maximum Heavy Mctal Contents for Agricultural Use of Sludge

(Units: $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}$ )

| Country | Year of <br> Establishment | Cd | Cu | C | Ni | Pb | Zn | Hg |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| France | 1988 | 20 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 200 | 800 | 3,000 | 10 |
| Spain | 1990 | 20 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 300 | 750 | 2,500 | 16 |
|  | 1990 | 1.2 | 1,000 | 100 | 45 | 120 | 4,000 | 1.2 |
| Denmark | 1995 | 0.8 | 1,000 | 100 | 30 | 120 | 4,000 | 0.8 |
|  | 1995 | 1.5 | 600 | 300 | 100 | 100 | 1,500 | 1.0 |
| Finland | 1995 | 4 | 1,000 | 125 | 80 | 100 | 1,500 | 5 |
| Noway | 1995 | 2 | 600 | 100 | 50 | 100 | 800 | 2.5 |

Table 7.2.4.3 Standards of Heavy Metal Contents for Agricultural Use Sludge in Developed Countries (2/2)
(4) Maximum Allowable Content of Agricullure Soil

| Country | Year of Establistment | Cd | Cu | Cr | Ni | Pb | Zn | Hg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| France | 1988 | 2 | 100 | 150 | 50 | 100 | 300 | 1 |
| Haly | ( noc data) | 3 | 100 | 150 | 50 | 100 | 300 | - |
| Spain | 1990 | 1 | 50 | 100 | 30 | 50 | 150 | 1 |
| Nethertands | (no data) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A-Value |  | 0.8 | 36 | 100 | 35 | 85 | 140 | 0.3 |
| C-Value |  | 12 | 190 | 380 | 210 | 530 | 720 | 10 |
| Demmark | 1990 | 0.5 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 40 | 10, | 0.5 |
| Firland | 1995 | 0.5 | 100 | 2601 | 66 | 60 | 150 | 0.2 |
| Norway | 1995 | 1 | so | 100 | 30 | 50 | 150 | 1 |
| Sweden | 1995 | 0.5 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 40 | 100 | 0.5 |

(5) Limitation in Scwage Sludge Use in Ontario State, Canada

| Hems <br> Heavy <br> metals | Non <br> polluted <br> soil <br> average <br> (mg/) | Max. limit <br> in soil <br> (mg/) | Max. <br> loading <br> (kg/ha) | Min. <br> required <br> N/metal <br> content | Application <br> fimes to <br> altain the <br> limit | (N/metal <br> contenl) to <br> altain the <br> limit by 50 <br> application <br> limes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| As | 7 | 14 | 14 | 100 | 10 | 48 |
| Cd | 0.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 500 | 6 | 4,200 |
| Co | 5 | 20 | 30 | 50 | 11 | 220 |
| Cr | 15 | 120 | 210 | 6 | 9 | 32 |
| Cu | 25 | 100 | 150 | 10 | 11 | 45 |
| Hg | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1,500 | 9 | 8,500 |
| Mo | 2 | 4 | 4 | 180 | 5 | 1,700 |
| Ni | 16 | 32 | 32 | 40 | 9 | 210 |
| Pb | 15 | 60 | 90 | 15 | 10 | 75 |
| Sc | 0.4 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 500 | 9 | 2,800 |
| Zn | 55 | 220 | 330 | 4 | 10 | 20 |

Source: Manual of the Use for Agricultural Land and Green Land of Sewage Sludge, issued by "Association of Sewage Siudge Use" in Japan (1996).

Table 7.2.6.1 Sludge Mass Transition in Sludge Treatment Steps

| Siudge Treatment Steps | Unit | Sludge Treatment Options |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Option 11 | OptionL2 | Optical3 | Optien L4 | Option A1 | Option 12 |
|  |  | Landill | Landifll | Lamifil | tansfili | Agricultural Use | $\begin{gathered} \text { Agriculturl } \\ \text { Use } \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | Ashafict Digestion | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dewatered } \\ \text { Sludge after } \\ \text { Digestion } \end{gathered}$ | Ach nilbout Digestion | Dewatered Sludge uithout Digestion | $\begin{gathered} \text { Conpest } \\ \text { aftet } \\ \text { Digestion } \end{gathered}$ | Compest withoul Digestion |
| Inlel of Thickening (from Wastewater Treatment Plant) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Sludge | ( $\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Organic Sludge | ( $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6. | 9.6 |
| Inorganic Sludge | ( $\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| We: Sludge | (t/d) | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2.000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Outlet of Thickening |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Sludge | (1 DS/d) | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Organic Sludge | (1DS/d) | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 |
| Inorganic Sludge | ( $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Wel Studge. | ( $1 / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Sluge | ( $\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 14.9 | 14.9 | $\square$ |  | 14.9 |  |
| Organic Sludge | ( DS/d) | 4.8 | 4.8 |  | $/$ | 4.8 10.1 |  |
| Inorganic Sludge Wet Sludge | (t DS/d) (t/d) | 10.1 298 | 10.1 | - | $/$ | 10.1 298 |  |
| Wet Sludge |  | 298 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outel of Dewatering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Sludge | ( $\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 14.9 | 14.9 | 19.7 | 19.7 | 14.9 | 19.7 |
| Organic Sludge | ( 1 DS , d) | 4.8 | 4.8 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 4.8 | 9.6 |
| morganic Studge | ( $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Wet Sludge | ( $/ \mathrm{d}$ ) | 74.6 | 74.6 | 98.6 | 98.6 | 74.6 | 98.6 |
| Outes of licineration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry Sludge | ( $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 10.3 |  | 10.6 | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Organic Sludge | ( $108 / d$ ) | 0.2 |  |  | - |  |  |
| Inorganic Sludge | (1 DS/d) | 10.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wet Sludge | (1/d) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Organic Sludge in Raw Sludge | ( 1 DS/d) | - |  |  |  | 2.4 | 4.8 |
| Incrganic Sludge in Raw Sludge | ( $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ ) |  |  |  |  | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Product Volume including Bulking Material | (1/d) |  |  |  |  | 74.6 | 98.6 |

Note:
The comparison is undertaken based on the following onditions:
VS ratio of raw sludge: $48 \%$,
Raw sludge dry solids: 20 ld ,
VS removal ratio in digester: $50 \%$,
Dewatered sludge meisture: $80 \%$,
VS removal in comproling: $50 \%$,
Raw sludge concentration: $1.0 \%$,
Ash moisture content: $5 \%$,
Remaining erganic in ash: $5 \%$.
Table 7.2.6.2 Detail Cost of Sludge Treatment Options

| Sludge Treatment Steps | Unit | Option L1 | Option L2 | Option L3 | Option La | Option AI | Option A2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Landtill | Landtill | Landinll | Laddill | Agricultural Use | Agricultural Usc |
|  |  | Ash after Digestion | Dewatered Sludge after Digcstion | Asb without Digestion | Dewatered Sludge without Digestion | Compost after Digestion | Compos: without Digestion |
| 1. Thickeaing | (US\$/d) | $\begin{array}{ll}382 & \\ 307 & \\ & 587 \\ & 280\end{array}$ | 382  <br> 307  <br>  587 | 382 | 382 | 382 | 382 |
| 2. Digestion | (US\$/d) |  |  |  |  | 307 |  |
| - Treatment Cost | (US\$/d) |  |  |  |  | 587 |  |
| - Recovered Cost | (US\$/d) |  |  |  |  | 280 |  |
| 3. Dewatering | (US\$/d) | 606 | 606 | 744 | 744 | 606 | 744 |
| 4. Incincration | (US\$/d) | 7,005 | 1,454 | 8.633 | 1,923 |  |  |
| 5. Landill | (USS/d) | 125 |  | 128 |  |  |  |
| 5. Compost | (US\$/d) |  |  |  |  | - 32 | A 1,463 |
| - Treatment Cost | (US\$/d) |  |  |  |  | 3.696 | 3,468 |
| - Recovered Cost | (US\$/d) |  |  |  |  | 3,728 | 4.931 |
| 6. Siudge Transportation | (US\$/d) | 76 | 371 | 78 | 491 | 580 | 767 |
| Treatment Cost (without Recovery) | (US\$/d) | 8.780 | 3,400 | 9.965 | 3.540 | 5.850 | 5.361 |
|  |  | 1) | :) |  |  | 7) | 2) |
| Net Cost (with Recovery) | (US\$/d) | 8.500 | 3.120 | 9.965 | 3,540 | 1.843 | 430 |

Note: The assumed capacity of sludge treatment for the purpose of cost comparison is $20 \mathrm{t} \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ at the inlet of thickening..
1): The net costs are computed by the deduction of the recovered cost by power generation.
2): The net costs are computed by the deduction of the recovered costs by compost selling.

Table 7.2.6.4 Cost Calculation Basis for Alternative Sclection

Table 7.3.3.2 Detail Cost of Sludge Transportation Alternatives

| Central WWTPs | Sludge <br> generation <br>  <br> $(\mathrm{IDS} / \mathrm{d})$ | Distance <br> (km) | Expenses of transportation (US\$/d) |  |  | Expenses of sludge treatment (US\$/d) |  |  | Total expenses (=Transportation+ Sludge treatment) (USS/d) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Truck ( $80 \%$ Moisture cake) | Barge ( $80 \%$ <br> Moisturc cake) | Pumping (1\% slurry) | Sludge thickening for Central WWTPs |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sludge } \\ \text { dewatering } \end{gathered}$ | Truck <br> (T1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Barge } \\ & \text { (T3) } \end{aligned}$ | Pipcline ( X 2$)$ |
|  |  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (4)' | (5) | $\sim(1)+(4)+(5)$ | $\cdots(2)+(4)+(5)$ | $=(3)+(4)^{\prime}$ |
| Khlong Tocy East <br> Ratburana <br> Kaloag Tocy <br> West <br> Huay Kwuang <br> Ratanakosin <br> Thonburi South <br> Si Pbraya <br> Nong Kacm STC | 15.6 12.0 17.9 16.6 5.6 24.1 1.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \\ & 21 \\ & 30 \\ & 32 \\ & 16 \\ & 16 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | 443 223 446 437 85 364 14 | 347 201 363 350 83 356 14 | 2.311 <br> 1.505 <br> 2.050 <br> 2.152 <br> 723 <br> 866 1.035 |  | $2.835$ | 1.703 1.381 1.905 1.791 775 2.436 257 | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 2.700 \\ 2.051 \\ 2.972 \\ 2.811 \\ 1.100 \\ 3.596 \\ 335 \end{array}$ | 2,604 2,028 2.889 2.724 1.098 3.589 335 | 2.311 1.505 2.050 2.152 723 866 1.035 2,835 |
| Total <br> (Ratio) | 92.8 | 165 | 2.011 | 1.714 | 10.641 | 3.305 |  | 10,249 | $\begin{array}{r} 15,566 \\ (100) \end{array}$ | 15.268 <br> (98) | 13.476 <br> (87) |

Table 8.1.2.1 List of Unit Costs

| 6 |  | US\$ 3 as is |  | Baht Basis |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | Wastewater Treatment Plant <br> Exchange rate <br> Construction cost <br> Annual O\&N cost <br> WV treatnent charge | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{USS}) \\ \left(\mathrm{USS} / \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \\ \left(\mathrm{USS} / \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \\ \left(\mathrm{USS} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 36 \\ 1,000 \\ 15 \\ 0.139 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left(\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \\ \left(\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \\ \left(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r}36,000 \\ 540 \\ 5.00 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  | Wastewater Sludge |  |  |  |  |
|  | Compest DS ratio (Non-digested, 1:0.5) | (t comporth DS | 5.0 |  |  |
|  | Plant construction (20 year depreciation) |  | 21 | (B'Uday) | 767 |
|  | incuneration (ash ijpr) | (USSIUday) (USSA DS) | 21 41 | (13/DS) | 1,464 |
|  | Digestion <br> Compost | (USSA DS) <br> (USSADS) | 41 29 | (B/t DS) | 1.035 |
|  | Production/treatmentorm cost | (US5/43y) | 21 | (B'Uday) | 758.7 |
|  | Incineration (ash type) | (USS/4ay) (USSA DS) | 21 34.8 | (B,4 ${ }^{\text {(B) }}$ ( DS) | 1,254 |
|  | Digestion <br> Composl | (USSA DS) <br> (USS/A DS) | 34.8 83.3 | (B)t DS) (B/ DS | 3,254 |
|  | Unit revenue fron digestion | (US\$/ DS | 55.0 | (B/a DS) | 1,980 |
|  | Distance from WVIP to Ste | (km) | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Distance fromSTC to Landfill | (km) | 15.0 |  |  |
|  | Distance from Composi Factory to Market | (kni) | 10.0 |  |  |
|  | Distance from WWIP to Comperst Factory | (km) | 100.0 |  |  |
|  | L andill (controlled type) | (US\$/1) | 7.30 | ( $\mathrm{B}^{\prime}$ ) | 263 |
|  | Weight reduction by incineration: cakefash |  | 12.5 |  |  |
|  | Bulking materials density | (USS 7 | 0.2 |  |  |
|  | Bulking materials cost | (USSA) | 2 | $\left(B^{\prime}\right)$ | 75 |
|  | Compost saks price | (USS/I) | 42 | $(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{I})$ | 1,500 |
|  | Wastewater Reelained Water |  |  |  |  |
|  | Watering public parks and gardens |  |  |  |  |
| , ${ }^{3}$ | and plants along read (everyday) | $\left(m^{3} / 100 \mathrm{ha}\right)$ | 30 |  |  |
|  | Road sprinkling (once a week) | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / 100 \mathrm{ha}$ ) | 10 |  |  |
|  | Cost of additional facility installation | (USS/unit) | 88,972 | (13'Unit) | 3,203,000 |
|  | O\&M for additional facitity | (USS/m ${ }^{3}$ ) | 0.025 | ( $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 0.89 |
|  | Reclaimed water sales price | (USS/m) | 0.139 | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m} 3$ ) | 5.00 |
|  | Reclaimed water production cost | (US\$ $/ \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 0.067 | ( $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 2.40 |
|  | Transporiation cost ( 6 lon truck) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hauting distance 2 km | (USS/m3) | 1.075 | $\left(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 38.70 |
|  | 13auling distance 4 km | (USS/m) | 1.372 | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 49.39 |
|  | Hauling distance 6 km | (USS/m $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 1.669 | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 60.07 |
|  | llauting distance 8 km | (US\$/m3) | 1.965 | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 70.75 |
|  | Hauling distance 10 km | $\left(\mathrm{US} \$ / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 2.262 | $\left(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ | 81.44 |
|  | Night Soil Treatnent Plant |  |  |  |  |
|  | Plant construction | ( $\mathrm{US} \$ / \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 9,723 | $\left(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right)$ | 350,000 |
|  | O\&M | (USS/ $/ \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 2,600 | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 93,600 |
|  | Charge coskbill | (USS/oillnonth) | 0.078 | (B,billmonth) | 2.8 |
|  | No. of people hrouse | (People/house) | 5 |  |  |
|  | Charge rate | (USS/m ${ }^{3}$ ) | 1.389 | ( $\mathrm{B}^{\prime} \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 50 |
|  | Transpertation of collection ( 20 km ) | (USS/ $/)^{3}$ ) | 3.000 | $\left(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{n}^{3}\right)$ | 108 |

Table 8.1.2.2 Cost Recovery by Generating Power in Digestion Process

| Specificalion Capacity Gencration capacity | $\begin{gathered} (\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}) \\ (\mathrm{kWh}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 160 \\ 8.000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost |  |  |
| Construction cost | (US\$) | 18,500,000 |
| O.EM cost | (US\$/y) | 500,000 |
| Total cost for 20 years | (USS) | 28.500.000 |
| Revenue |  |  |
| Generation efficioncy | (\%) | 88 |
| Daily generated power | (kWh/d) | 140,800 |
| Annual operation days | ( $\mathrm{d} / \mathrm{y}$ ) | 320 |
| Annual generated power | (kWh/y) | 45,056,000 |
| Total power for 20 years | (kWh) | 901,120,000 |
| Unit sales price | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{kWh}$ ) | 2.25 |
| Unit sales price | (US\$/kWh) | 0.063 |
| Total revenue for 20 years | (US\$) | 56,320,000 |
| Unil revenue |  |  |
| Total revenue for 20 years | (US\$) | 56,320,000 |
| Unit revenue per capacity | (US $\$ / \mathrm{DSS} / \mathrm{d})$ | 352,000 |
| Unit revenue per capacity | (B/L DS/d) | 12,672,000 |
| Unit revenue per $\mathrm{I}_{\text {DS }}$ | (US\$// DS) | 55.00 |
| Unit revemue pert DS | (B/t DS) | 1,980 |

Note: The estimation of unit cost recovery here is calculated based on assumption of treatment capacity of $160 \mathrm{tDS} / \mathrm{d}$.

Table 8.1.2.3 Cost Estimation for Digestion Plant and Composting Plant

| Digestion cost at STC <br> Dry solid capacily Construction cost <br> Digestion <br> Gencration <br> Odor removal <br> Dewater <br> Leachet <br> Sub total <br> Sub-unit cost <br> O\&M <br> Digestion <br> Generation <br> Odor removal <br> Dewater <br> Leachet <br> Sub-total <br> Sub-unil cost <br> Unit cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { (IDS/d) } \\ \text { (US\$) } \\ \text { (US\$) } \\ \text { (US\$) } \\ \text { (US\$) } \\ \text { (US\$) } \\ \text { (US\$) } \\ \text { (US\$/t DS) } \\ \text { (US\$/y) } \\ \text { (USS/y) } \\ \text { (USS/y) } \\ \text { (USS/y) } \\ \text { (US\$/Y) } \\ \text { (USS/y) } \\ \text { (US\$/4 DS) } \\ \text { (US\$/4 DS) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 160 $7,500,000$ $18,500,000$ $7,000,000$ $9,500,000$ $5,000,000$ $47,500,000$ 41 140,000 500,000 800,000 550,000 45,000 $2,035,000$ 35 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Composting cost at centralized plant <br> Dry solidi capacity <br> Construction <br> Composting process <br> Odor removal <br> Sub-total <br> Sub-unit cost <br> O\&M <br> Composting process <br> Odor removal <br> Sub-total <br> Suls-unit cost <br> Unil cosi | ( $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{J}$ ) <br> (US\$) <br> (US\$) <br> (US\$) <br> (US\$/L DS) <br> (US\$/y) <br> (US\$/y) <br> (US\$/y) <br> (US\$/LDS) <br> (US\$/LISS) | 112 $16,500,000$ $7,000,000$ $23,500,000$ 29 $2,607,000$ 800,000 $3,407,000$ 83 112 |

Note: The estimation of unit cosi recovery for STC is calculated based on assumption of treatment capacity of 160 t DS/ 0.
The estimation of composting unit cost is calculated based on assumption of treatment capacily of 112 I DS/s.

Table 8.1.2.4 Mixing Process of Composting (non-digested sludge)

|  | Inorganic substances | Organic substances | Water | Tolal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Water } \\ & \text { contents } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original contents |  |  |  |  | (\%) |
| Dewatered sludge | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 80.00 |
| Bulking materials | 0.08 | 0.77 | 0.15 | 1.00 | 15.00 |
| Mixed ratio |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dewatered sludge | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Pulking materials | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Contents after composting |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dewatered sludge | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.80 | 1.00 | 80.00 |
| Bulking materials | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.08 | 0.50 | 15.00 |
| Mixed sludge | 0.11 | 0.52 | 0.88 | 1.50 | 58.33 |
| Contants change ratio in composting process |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dewatered sludge | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |  |
| Bulking materials | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 |  |  |
| Finsl ratio in compost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dewatered sludge | 0.07 |  |  | 0.54 | 74.77 8.11 |
| Bulking materials | 0.04 | 0.39 | $0.0+$ | 0.46 | 8.11 |
| Compost | 0.11 | 0.45 | 0.44 | 1.00 | 43.86 |
| $0.2 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{DS} \longrightarrow 1 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{dewatered} \mathrm{sludge} \longrightarrow 1.00 \mathrm{~kg}$ compost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio of compost to DS in kg 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8.1.3.1 local Cost Based Comparison Anong Studge Treatment Options

| Option No. |  | $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { Agriculturas } \\ \text { use } \\ \text { A2 } \end{array}\right]$ | Landfill disposal L2 | Landfill dispossl I. 1 | Landifil disposs! 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Option Name |  | compust <br> without <br> Digestion | Dewatered sludge after Digestion | Ash after Digestion | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Dewatered } \\ \text { sludge } \\ \text { without } \\ \text { digestion } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dewater at on-site |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry solid capacity | ( $\mathrm{DSS}^{\prime}$ d) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Construction | (USS) | 2,038,000 | 2,038,000 | 2,038,000 | 2,038,000 |
| O\&M | (USS/y) | 253,000 | 253,000 | 253,000 | 253,000 |
| Unit cost | (USS/t DS) | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 |
| Transport |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit cost | (uss/t DS) | 5.09 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 0.00 |
| Incineration |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit cost of construet. | (USSA DS) |  |  | 106.54 |  |
| Unit cest for O\&M | (USS/h DS) |  |  | 105.38 |  |
| Unit cost | (US\$/L DS) |  |  | 211.92 |  |
| Digestion |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry solid capacity | ( 1 DS / $\mathrm{c}^{\text {d }}$ |  | 160 | 160 |  |
| Construction unit cost | (USS/h DS |  | 41 | 41 |  |
| ORM unit cost | (USS/ADS) |  | 35 | 35 |  |
| Composting Unincost  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dry solid capacity (tDS/ $/$ ) 112 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction unit cost | (USS/iDS) | 29 |  |  |  |
| O\&M unit cost | (Uss $A D S$ | 83 |  |  |  |
| Production |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bulking materiss |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bukking materia's cost |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation (USS/1) 0.79 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Production unit cost (USS/ DS) 7.18 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unil cost(eacl. construction, | (USSIt DS) | 91 |  |  |  |
| Compost preduction |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit cost | (USS/t DS) | 0.99 | 1.22 | 0.16 | 2.16 |
| Landill |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sales income of composi | (USS/T DS) | 208 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Cost recover by generation | (USS/4 DS) |  | 55.00 | 55.00 | 0.00 |
| Total revenue | ( $1 \mathbf{1 S S / A D S \text { ) }}$ | 208 | 55 | 55 | , |
| Treatment cost induding Dewater(zCost-Revenue) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall dry sludge |  |  |  |  |  |
| treatiment cost | (USS/t DS) | 15 |  | 334 | 136 |
|  | ( $1 / \mathrm{T}$ DS ) | $531$ | 5,657 | 12,039 | 4.899 |
| Halance after WWTP |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Excluding dewater) |  | . 82 | 60 | 237 | 39 |
|  | $\text { ( } \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{D} \mathrm{DS} \text { ) }$ | $.2,969$ | 2,156 | 8,539 | 1,399 |
| Batance alier composting ( $=$ Revenue-Cost) |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Anmont of profit) | ( $\mathbf{1 S S} / 1 \mathrm{DS}$ ) | $87.56$ |  |  |  |

Table 8.2.1.1 Operation Data Analysis for Si Phraya Wastewater Treatment Plant (1)

| Cost stmuture | 1945 Ottoner (Banc) | 19045 Nowemher (Bant) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { loven } \\ & \text { Sonvary } \\ & \text { (Sinant) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { PMM } \\ \text { Femmury } \\ \text { (Rame) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1 Wow } \\ & \text { March } \\ & \text { (Batr) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \times 6 \\ & \text { April } \\ & \text { (Baht) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 190 \% \\ & \text { May } \end{aligned}$ (Baht) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19YK } \\ & \text { June } \\ & \text { (Busy) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { iqux } \\ & \text { July } \\ & \text { (Bahn) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1(4 \times 6) \\ & \text { Nogust } \\ & \text { (Rath) } \end{aligned}$ | $\qquad$ |  | 1990 Novemher (Bahr) | 1996 Deceminer (Bant) | 1007 January (Bany) | 1097 Femunry <br> (Bam) | $\begin{gathered} 1907 \\ \text { March } \\ \text { (Bancy } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Eleatricty | 197.5900 | 140.277 | 205.605 | 215,5sM | 20.059 | 223.502 | 210,9,3 | 224.511 | 213.083 | 219.654 | 199.449 | 277.482 | 30.2 .293 | 204,412 | 305.594 | 373.053 | 102, $0 \times 0$ | 222,958 |
| 2 Cherisal | 88, 800 | 72.290 | *7.590 | 67,820 | Sthiso | 71.015 | 70.625 | 71,800 | 7..360 | 73,415 | 7245 | 75.25 | 111,445 | 12.566 | 113.965 | 12.505 | 57,265 | 528051 |
| 3 Water sunply | 550 | 405,25 | 040,05 | 905.3 | 8.\%.25 | 774.9 | Kx5. 6 | 55.3 | 964.2 | S64.2 | 604.2 | 774.09 | 774.9 | 719.55 | 100, 85 | 608,85 | 600, 25 | 498.15 |
| 4 Maintenanve \& operntion | 68,400 | 21x.200 | 213.2m | 21820 | 218.20n | 218.200 | 2:8200 | 218,200 | 218,200 | 218,200 | 218.200 | 218.200 | 240,800 | 240,400 | 240.800 | 20,922 | 26.922 | 26,922 |
| Mect. Repair | 0 | 103,300 | 103.300 | 103.300 | 103.300 | 103.300 | 103.300 | 103.300 | 103,300 | 103,300 | 103,300 | 103,400 | 108. 300 | 10x.400 | $10 \times 1.300$ | 12,065 | 12,068 | 12088. |
| Luth oil and spare parts | 85000 | 33.3000 | 33.400 | 33,300 | 33.400 | 33.300 | 33.400 | 33.400 | 33,300 | 33.300 | 31,400 | 33.200 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50.000 | 11.654 | 11,654 | 11,654. |
| Repairing eleatris | 0 | 50,000 | 30,06) | 50,0(0) | 50.000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50.000 | 50.000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50.000 |  |  |  |
| Repairing electric system <br> S Inceceppor constrution | 6.400 | 31,500 | 31.600 | \$1.600 | 31.56) | 31,500 | 31,400 | 32,100 | 31,800 | 31.600 | 31.600 | 31.600 | 32.500 | 32.500 | 32.500 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,200 \\ 1 \times 6.250 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.200 \\ 289,250 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.200 \\ 286.250 \end{array}$ |
| 6 Dumping sludge 7 Wagie | 247.740 | 23x,620 | 259.740 | 253.40 | 241.6.0 | 242.630 | 238,800 | 234,070 | 239,580 | 24E.110 | 237,865 | 254.940 | 279.800 | 274.740 | $2 \times 1.600$ | 27x,600 | 273,340 | 281.980 |
| Permanent stale Part time staft Over time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Miscellaneous | 37,006 | 17.000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17.000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17.000 | 17.000 | 17,000 | 25.000 | 25.000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25.000 | 25,000 |
| Monthy totat | \$90, 560 | 705.x $\times 2$ | 789,016 | 772.544 | 745,489 | 773.172 | 752.444 | 775,135 | 761,445 | 771,443 | 745,043 | 843,563 | 1.021.203 | 1,018,237 | 1.027,62s | 1,003,024 | 769,076 | 786,554 |
| Exclute ftem | 509.850 | 745.x82 | 789,016 | 775.584 | 745.459 | 772.172 | 752.464 | 775.135 | 761,446 | 771.44, | 745.643 | 843,561 | 1.021.203 | 1,018,237 | 1.027.02s | 817.674 | 582.820 | 600,204 |
| Exclude bem $\leq * 9$ | 35.110 | 504.262 | 529,276 | 519.274 | 504, $\times 39$ | 5, 3 , 552 | 523.604 | 537.085 | 521,88\% | 529,333 | 507,778 | 588,621 | 741.31. | 743,497 | 745.968 | S3x.734 | 309,486 | 318.034 |
| Treated water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $8 \times 00$ | 8. 490 | 8700 | X,650 | 8.640 | 8,720 | 8880 | 8 COO | 8500 | 8400 | 8150 | 8780 | 28100 | 19200 | 19000 | 19100 | 7600 | 9600 |
| $2 \mathrm{BOD} \mathrm{inf}$. (mgh) | 66 | s* | 46 | 57 | 59 | 58 | $\triangle 7$ | 61 | 65 | 70 | 64 | 75 | $\infty$ | 66 | 69 | 75 | 78 | 62 |
| 3. BOD removal (\%) | 92.4 | 93.12 | 91.3 | 94 | 92.4 | 93.1 | *9.4 | 93.4 | 92.3 | 92.9 | 90.6 | 93.3 | 91 | 93 | 94.2 | 84.7 | 93.6 | 93.5 |
| No. of sticte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Pemmanent statt | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| $\pm$ Part time statt | 13 | 18 | 12 | 1 k | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 20 | 17 | 26 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 3 Driver |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | * |  |
| Unit cost to treat waste water (Bant/m ${ }^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Inctude all sost | 2.28 | 2.x2 | 2.91 | 2.86 | 2.79 | 2.85 | 2.78 | 2.94 | 2.89 | 2.96 | 2.95 | 3.10 | 1.82 | 1.71 | 1.74 | 2.70 | 258 | 2.64 |
| 2 Exctude Hems | 2.28 | 2.82 | 2.91 | 2.8x | 2.79 | 2.86 | 2.78 | 294 | 2x9 | 2.96 | 2.95 | 3.10 | 1.82 | 1.72 | 1.74 | 1.88 | 1.96 | 2.02 |
| 3 Excluce liem 5 \& 7 | 1.34 | 2.92 | 1.95 | 1.94 | 2.8\% | 7.9 | 2.91 | 2.04 | 1,98 | 2.03 | 2.01 | 2.16 | 1.32 | 1.25 | 1.27 | 0.91 | 1.04 | 1.07 |
| Unit cost for tabor (Bant/mont/min) | x.R.sak | 8.522 | 9.27s | 9.050 | X,940 | $x, 0 \times 8$ | 8,844 | 8.817 | 8.873 | 8,967 | 7,433 | 9,442 | 9.923 | 9.812 | 10,059 | 8,9\% | 8,817 | 9.095 |
| Sludge (I/month) <br> Sludge content in wastewiter(g/m') |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]Table 8.2.1.1 Operation Data Analysis for Si Phraya Wastewater Treatment Plant (2)


Table 8.2.1.2 Operation Data of the Nong Khaem Night Soil Treatment Plant

|  | Operator | $\begin{gathered} 2535 \\ 1992 \\ \text { As3n } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2536 \\ 1893 \\ \text { Acsno } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2537 \\ & 1994 \\ & \text { Asano } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2533 \\ 1995 \\ \text { Assno } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2539 \\ 1995 \\ \text { Worachak } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2540 \\ & 1997 \end{aligned}$ <br> Worachak | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Average $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Night soil | (m) | 89,041 | 100,745 | 89,446 | 98,659 | 106,957 | 103,840 | 585.688 | 269 |
| Leachate | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 9,136 | 50,467 | 53,351 | 42.892 | 43,603 | 30,648 | 230,107 | 105 |
| Total | (in') | 98,177 | 351,212 | 142,807 | 141,551 | 150,560 | 134,488 | $\begin{gathered} 818,795 \\ \text { (Butitn') } \end{gathered}$ | $374$ |
| Salary | (Baht) | 19,251,736 | 28,015,656 | 27,641,768 | 26,107,024 | 27,739,840 | 28,477,854 | 192 | 56.65 |
| Electricity | (B3hl) | 1,879,236 | 2,658,013 | 2,371,467 | 2,105,654 | 2,117,200 | 1,699,226 | 16 | 4.58 |
| Wates | (Bshl) | 149,320 | 214,917 | 298,490 | 282,421 | 255,452 | 194,747 | 2 | 0.50 |
| Chemuicals | (B3hl) | 6,207,200 | 12,706,930 | 3,378,148 | 6,189,919 | 2,401,522 | 2,799,639 | 44 | 1201 |
| Labor | (Bahl) | 9,432,370 | 6,819,000 | 9,305,981 | 7,763,128 | 9,037,640 | 7,735,079 | $6)$ | \% 17.8 |
| Majntenance | (B3hl) | 3,322,190 | 4,443,640 | 4,446,928 | 4,280,229 | 4,620,798 | 4,098,036 | 31 | 8.59 |
| Total | (B3ht) | 40,242,052 | 54,858,156 | 47,448,782 | 46,728,386 | 46,172,451 | 45,004,581 | 343 | 100.00 |
| Nighl soil | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right)$ | $44$ | $36$ | $245$ | $\mathbb{N}, 4 \%$ | , \% 2 23\% | $284$ |  |  |
| Leachate | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 25 | 138 | 146 | 118 | 119 | 84 |  |  |
| Tolal | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | 269 | 414 | 391 | 388 | 412 | 368 |  |  |
| Treatment unit cost ( $\mathrm{B} 3 \mathrm{~h} \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ ) |  | 410 | 363 | 332 | 330 | 307 | 335 | , , , , 343 |  |

Note
Plant is in non-stop operation, 24 hours and 365 d 3 s .
Salary is Worachak adm'tectistaff and Labor is Worachak workers, not including BMA slaff.
Beachate is leaked water frommarby gartage dumping site, pumped up to the plant.
Previous amplys stow low level of beavy metal contain in slafge, even nixed up with leachate.
Chemical expenditure fixcliated greatly since as large amounted were imporied.
Latory and mairite nance for 1993 to 1996 are estimated fron data for 1991 to 1992.
There is leachate treatment plant in On Nut, managed by DDS.
Gartage Disperal Div. of DPC manages compost incincrator al On Nut and landitl site at Lal Kiratang.

| Period | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Targel } \\ & \left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Actual $\left(\mathrm{n}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right)$ | Remark |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95.12.16-96.12.15 | 480 | 412 |  |
| 96.12.16-97.12.15 | 500 | 368 |  |
| 97.12.16-98.12.15 | 530 | 542 | (Data in Dec.) |
| 98.12.16-99.12.15 | 600 |  |  |
| 99.12.16-00.12.15 | 600 |  |  |


| Worachak Ralance |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | 1996 | 1997 |
| Reveruse | 32,370,400 | 28.914.920 |
| Fxpentiture | 41,398,277 | 40,310,969 |
| Profit \& Loss | -9.027.877 | -11,396,049 |
| Note: |  |  |
| Revente $=$ fotal treated wolume (m3) $\times 215$ (B3hts'm3 |  |  |
| Experxiture $=$ Salary + Lator + Maintenance |  |  |


Table 8.2.2.2 Financial Analvsis for WW Sludge Treatment

| Sludge distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2(x)$ | 2001 | $2(k)=$ | $20 \times 13$ | $2(x) 4$ | 2(1)5 | $20 \times 6$ | $2(x) 7$ | 20015 | 2(0)9 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2015 | $20: 9$ | 2020 | Total | (\%) |
| High-Kisk CWTP Sludge | Tibs/d | 5.5 | 5.6 | 21.5 | $21 . \times$ | 22. | 27.3 | 3x, 9 | 39.4 | 41.0 | 53.0 | 62.6 | 63,4 | 04.1 | 64.9 | 65.6 | 80.6 | 91.0 | 92.9 | 94,3 | 99.7 | 107.2 | 1.150.8 | ${ }^{35.87 \%}$ |
| Low-Risk CWTP Siudge | 1 DS/d | 16.8 | 40.7 | 10.7 | 40.7 | 51,4 | 51.0 | 51.9 | 62.1 | 09.2 | 69.7 | 70.2 | 32.8 | 83.5 | 93, 1 | 98.9 | 99.8 | 105,6 | 122.7 | 125 | ${ }^{14,5}$ | 74.6 | 150.6 | $55.9 \%$ |
| Community WWIP, Sludge | t $\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ | 7.0 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 2.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.0 | \% | 7.6 | 22.7 | 20. | 258.2 | $2.9 \times 3.9$ | 100.0\% |
| Than in RMA | 10 id | 29.9 | 53.91 | 69.8. | 70.1 | 81.1 | 81.6 | 9x.3 | 109.1 | 116.8 | 130.3 | 140.5 | 153.8 | 155.2 | 170.6 | 172.1 | 187.9 | 20.1 | 22.1 |  | 29, | 2072 |  | 5.s\% |
| Sludge to Non Khasm STC: | tis/d | 55 | 5.6 | 21.5 | 21.8 | 22.1 | 22.3 | 38.9 | 39.4 | 40 | 53.0 | 62.6 | 03.4 | 04.1 | \%4,9 | ${ }_{106.5}^{05}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 92.9 \\ 130.3 \end{array}$ | 133.4 | 149.4 | 151.0 | 1.527.0 | $61.2 \%$ |
| Sludye to Composting | : $\mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ | 24.4 | 48...3. | 45.3 | LS.3.3 | 59.0 | 59.2 | S0.. | 69. | 70.5 | $7 .$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^1]Table 8.2.2.3 Cost Comparison of Reclaimed Water Reuse with Public Supply Water (In casc of 6 tons truck)

| Additional transportation distance | (km) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional time | (hr) | 0.10 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 1.00 |
| Additional driver's labor cost | (B) | 4.50 | 9.00 | 13.50 | 18.00 | 22.50 | 27.00 | 31.50 | 36.00 | 40.50 | 45.00 |
| Additional fuel cost | (B) | 5.00 | 10.00 | 15.00 | 20.00 | 25.00 | 30.00 | 35.00 | 40.00 | 45.00 | 50.00 |
| Additional consumables | (B) | 2.00 | 4.00 | 6.00 | 8.00 | 10.00 | 12.00 | 14.00 | 16.00 | 18.00 | 20.00 |
| Total additional cost | (B) | 11.50 | 23.00 | 34.50 | 46.00 | 57.50 | 69.00 | 80.50 | 92.00 | 103.50 | 115.00 |
| Additional unit cost of transportation | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 1.92 | 3.83 | 5.75 | 7.67 | 9.58 | 11.50 | 13.42 | 15.33 | 17.25 | 19.17 |
| Final unit cost of reuse water | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 4.32 | 6.23 | 8.15 | 10.07 | 11.98 | 13.90 | 15.82 | 17.73 | 19.65 | 21.57 |
| Public water price | (B/m) | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 | 14.31 |
| Benefit to use reclaimed water | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 9.99 | 8.08 | 6.16 | 4.24 | 2.33 | 0.41 | -1.51 | -3.42 | -5.34 | -7.26 |

[^2]Table 8.2.2.4 Financial Analysis for Reclaimed Wastewater Reuse (1)

|  | Catchment arca | Capacity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max demand } \\ & \text { for tree } \\ & \text { watering } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Max demand for road sampling | Max annual demand | No. of additional facility | Additional investment cost | Annual O\&M cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ( $\mathrm{km}^{2}$ ) | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right)$ | ( $\mathrm{m}^{2} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{y}$ ) | (Unit) | (Mil. B) | (Mil. B/y) |
| 1 Si Phraya | 2.7 | 30.000 | 461 | 154 | 134,229 | 2 | 6.406 | 0.12 |
| 2 Ratanakosin | 4.1 | 40.000 | 544 | 181 | 158,358 | 2 | 6.406 | 0.14 |
| 3 BKK Central Phase 1 | 37.8 | 341,500 | 752 | 251 | 218,948 | 3 | 9.609 | 0.20 |
| BKK Central Phase 2 |  | 122,000 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.00 |
| 4 Yanuawa Phase 1 | 28.5 | 200,000 | 1107 | 369 | 322,282 | 4 | 12.812 | 0.29 |
| Yannawa Phase 2 |  | 160,000 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.00 |
| 5 Nong Khaem | 42.9 | 157.000 | 2520 | 840 | 733.650 | 8 | 25.624 | 0.66 |
| 6 Ratburana Phase 1 | 42.3 | 65,000 | 835 | 278 | 243,077 | 3 | 9.609 | 0.22 |
| Ratburana Phase 2 |  | 65,000 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.00 |
| 7 Chatuchak | 33.4 | 150,000 | 987 | 329 | 287,346 | 3 | 9.609 | 0.26 |
| 8 Klong Tocy West | 25.7 | 166,000 | 767 | 256 | 223,315 | 3 | 9.609 | 0.20 |
| 9 Klong Tocy East | 31.9 | 155,000 | 1016 | 339 | 295,806 | 3 | 9.609 | 0.26 |
| 10 Tomburi North | 11.4 | 78,000 | 341 | 114 | 99,293 | 1 | 3.203 | 0.09 |
| 11 Tomburi Central | 17.5 | 156,000 | 544 | 181 | 158,358 | 2 | 6.406 | 0.14 |
| 12 Tomburi South | 22.3 | 213,000 | 1699 | 566 | 494,614 | 6 | 19.218 | 0.44 |
| 13 Bang Sue | 19.7 | 126,000 | 347 | 116 | 101,040 | $i$ | 3.203 | 0.09 |
| 14 Bung Kum | 42.8 | 148,000 | 1612 | 537 | 469.286 | 5 | 16.015 | 0.42 |
| 15 Huay Kwang | 15.3 | 124,000 | 451 | 150 | 131,283 | 2 | 6.406 | 0.12 |
| 16 Wang Thong Lang | 35.7 | 141,000 | 1467 | 489 | 427.089 | 5 | 16.015 | 0.38 |
| Total | 414.0 | 2.637 .500 | 15,450 | 5.150 |  |  |  |  |
| Annual supply and demand |  | 962.687.500 | 4.229.438 | 268.536 | 4,497,973 | 53 | 169.76 | 4.03 |
| Ratio (\%) |  | 100.00 | 0.44 | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio of total demand (\%) |  |  | 0.47 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Annual demand for tree watering is calculated by (Total demand) $\times 365 \times 0.75$, since the demand in rainy season is half. Annual demand for road sampling is calculated by (Total demand) $\times 365 \times 1 / 7$, because it is done only once a week. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8.2.2.5 Financial Analysis for Reclaimed Wastewater Reuse (2)

Table 8.2.2.6 Financial Analysis for Incidental Water Use

| Ouantity of Reciaimed Wastewater |  |  | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) |  | Ratio |  |  | laimed demand | Supply cost | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sales } \\ \text { revenue } \end{gathered}$ | Balance | Accumulated profit up to 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distance | $\begin{gathered} 900 \\ \left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1800 \\ \left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2700 \\ & \left(\mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}\right) \end{aligned}$ |  | (\%) | $7.163 .000$ | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{d}$ ) | ( $\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{y}$ ) | (Mil/B/y) | (Mil/3/y) | (Mil/B/y) | ( $\mathrm{Mil} / \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{y}$ ) |
|  |  |  |  | Population in Catchment area |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (km) | 4.4 | 3.9 | 3.7 | No. of user in 2001 | 1.00 | 71.630 | 5.501 | 2,007.932 | 10.04 | 16.06 | 6.02 | 30.12 |
| 2 (km) | 4.9 | 4.5 | 4.2 | No. of user in 2006 | 2.00 | 143.260 | 11.002 | 4,015.864 | 20.08 | 32.13 | 12.05 | 60.24 |
| 3 (km) | 5.3 | 5.0 | 4.6 | No. of user in 2011 | 3.00 | 214.890 | 16,504 | 6.023,796 | 30.12 | 48.19 | 18.07 | 90.36 |
| 4 (km) | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.2 | No. of user in 2016 | 4.00 | 286.520 | 22.005 | 8.031.729 | 40.16 | 64.25 | 24.10 | 120.48 |
| 5 (km) | 6.2 | 5.9 | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | 301.19 |


| Sales charge | 8 | $\left(\mathrm{~B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Water use of public water | 256 | $(\mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c})$ |
| Amount replaced by reclaimed w. | 76.8 | $(1 / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d})$ |
| Financial bencitit of individual peoplc |  |  |
| for 20 years, compared to public | 3.538 | (B/capita/20 years) |


Table 8.2.2.8 Financial Analysis for Nightsoil Treatment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (2)1 | 2012 |  |  |  |  | , | $1{ }^{1}$ | (1) | 20.2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ch-Risk NSTP sludge <br> Low-Risk NהTTP Sludge <br> Nightsoil collection Subtota Population to te treate Fismity numpines. |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cast Bitl enwring soss <br> Coliection sost hy truck Plant O.kM <br> Landtill for high risk slud <br> illatatal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.38 <br> 21.31 <br> 75.20 <br> 2.28 <br> 10.4 .9 |  | ( 5.94 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Compost tor low risk siuds } \\ & \text { Sicrvice charge } \\ & \text { Suhtrotat } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 21.1 .85 \\ 0.86 \\ .0 .81 \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{c} 323 \\ 9.90 \\ 3.012 \end{array}\right]$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \times \infty \\ & \substack{0,86 \\ 3.202} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 24.60 \\ 9.46 \\ \mathbf{3 . 4 . 4 6} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 25.10 \\ 9,86 \\ 34,96 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 20.50 \\ 0.908 \\ -2.4 .40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.78 \\ & 9.78 \\ & \text { 38. } 64 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.8 \\ & 9.802 \\ & 30202 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29.90 \\ \substack{298 \\ 30.85 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.59 \\ & \text { a.96 } \\ & 40.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.200 \\ .2 .80 \\ 4.1000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.08 \\ & 3.86 \\ & 4.8 .4 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 32,43 \\ .4 .80 \\ 42.20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33,13 \\ 9.88 \\ 42.29 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3,55 \\ & 3.45 \\ & 2409 \end{aligned}$ | (20.12 | 590.7 307.1 80.8 .8 |
|  | (Mati bm | $\pm 20$ | -280 |  | «<.s. | -10,0s | . 52.28 | -38.10 | -3593 | SS7\% | -ss | . 5921 | -60,21 | . 6.22 | 66222 | -6,32 | 6739 | .7200 | 73,30 | 9460 | . 75.91 | .85720 |  |

$\theta$
(3)
Table 8.2.2.9 Overall Financial Analysis Balance

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | Total | Share (\%) |
| WWTT <br> Balance | 355.9 | 475.6 | 475.6 | 532.1 | 532.1 | 539.7 | 545.2 | 548.8 | 557.4 | 568.2 | 578.6 | 578.6 | 586.7 | 586.7 | 595.1 | 618.2 | 632.3 | 633.8 | 645.7 | 647.6 | 647.6 | 11.881 .3 | 93.83\% |
| WW nludge Balance | 23.0 | 52.0 | 46.9 | 47.3 | 56.0 | 56.6 | 48.1 | 59.5 | 67.4 | 61.2 | 57.0 | 74.2 | 75.2 | 91.3 | 92.4 | 85.5 | 86.9 | 104.8 | 107.4 | 121.7 | 119.2 | 1.533.5 | 12.11\% |
| Reclaimed water reuse Babance | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 488.4 | 3.56\% |
| NS | -42.2 | 42.8 | -47.2 | -47.9 | -48.5 | -51.7 | -52.5 | -53.3 | -54.1 | -55.0 | -58.5 | -59.5 | -60.5 | -61.5 | -62.5 | -66.6 | -70.8 | -72.1 | .73.3 | -74.6 | -85.7 | -1.241.0 | -9.80\% |
| Overall cash fow Batanes | 3.88 .7 | 496.8 | 487.4 | 543.7 | 551.7 | 556.6 | 559.8 | 574.1 | 589.8 | 593.6 | 596.1 | 621.5 | 629.6 | 644.7 | 653.3 | 665.5 | 684.2 | 702.2 | 215.5 | 730.5 | 716.9 | 12.662.2 | 100.00\% |

Table 8.2.2.10 Breakeven Cost Analysis

|  | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Sct } \\ \text { Value } \end{array} \\ \left(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Accumulated <br> Surplus <br> up to 2020 <br> (Mil. B) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WWTP System |  |  |
| WW treatment charge rate |  |  |
| Original rate $+40 \%$ | 7.00 | 37,229.48 |
| Original rate $+20 \%$ | 6.00 | 24,555.37 |
| Original rate | 5.00 | 11,881.25 |
| Original rate - $20 \%$ | 4.00 | -792.86 |
| Original tate -40\% | 3.00 | -13,466.98 |
| Estimated Breakeven rate | 4.06 | 0.00 |
| NSTP System |  |  |
| NS charge rate | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | (Mil. B) |
| Original rate $+1000 \%$ | 500.00 | 607.94 |
| Original rate $+600 \%$ | 300.00 | -220.61 |
| Original rate | 50.00 | -1,256.29 |
| Estimated Breakeven rale | 353.00 | 0.00 |
| Compost sales price | (B/I) | (Mil. B) |
| Original rate $+100 \%$ | 3,000.00 | 216.91 |
| Original rate $+50 \%$ | 2,250.00 | -519.69 |
| Original rate | 1,500.00 | -1,256.29 |
| Estimated Breakeven rate | 2,780.00 | 0.00 |
| Overall System |  |  |
| WW Ireatnent charge rate | ( $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | (Mil. B) |
| Original rate | 5.00 | 12,182.68 |
| Original rate -20\% | 4.00 | -491.43 |
| Original rate -40\% | 3.00 | -13,165.54 |
| Estimated Breakeven rate | 4.04 | 0.00 |

Table 8.2.3.1 Estimation of WW and NS Sludge Production by Years under Scenario 1

| ( 1 DS/d) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cricratedsudge(Dry Nudge) |  | 2(6) | 201 | 2 CO | 2003 | 2045 | 2005 | 2066 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2015 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2018 | 2020 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sharce (\%os) } \\ \text { in } 2020 \end{gathered}$ |
| Nong Kaemstic Tothl | t-DS/d | 5.5 | 5.6 | 23.8 | 2.4 .1 | 24.4 | 24.9 | 41.5 | 42.1 | 42.7 | 55.8 | 65.6 | 66.5 | 67.2 | 68.1 | 68.8 | 84.1 | 97.0 | 98.4 | 100.0 | 105.5 | 114.2 | 37.8\% |
| East plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bung Kum | tos/d |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{15.7}$ | 15.5 | 5.1\%\% |
| Wang Thong Lang | 1DS/d |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.6 |  | 88.3 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 10.4 | 3.4\% |
| On-Nut (Nilges Soil) | $\begin{aligned} & 1 D S / d d \\ & i D S / d \end{aligned}$ | 7.4 2.5 | 2.5 | $\underline{6.9}$ | 7.0 2.5 | 7.1 -2.5 | 7.7 2.5 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 2.15 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.8\% |
| Sultotal |  | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 9.7 | 10.3 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 10.9 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 13.1 | 30.7 | 24.9 | 25.4 | 41.0 | 43.5 | 14.4\% |
| North Pant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.0 | 14.1 | 14.3 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 14.8 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 5.0\% |
| Bang Suc | 10S/4 |  |  |  |  | 10.7 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 11.4 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 12.3 | 12.5 | 12.8 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 4.4\% |
| Din Dieng | 1 DS/d |  | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 11.8\% |
| Community WWTP | : DS/d | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.8\% |
| Sultatai |  | 2.5 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 37.2 | 37.4 | 37.6 | 37.8 | 38.0.1 | 3 x .2 | 38.5 | 30.6 | 50.9 | 65.1 | 65.5 | 65.9 | 66.1 | 66.2 | 66.4 | 66.5 | 66.7 | 22.1\% |
| West Plant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thouluri North | 10S/d |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 8.9 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.3 |  | $\begin{array}{r} \\ 15.6 \\ \hline 8\end{array}$ | 9.7 |  | 5.5\% |
| Thonturi Central | 1 DS/d |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.5 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 12.0 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 15.6 | 15.9 8.5 | ${ }_{8.7}^{18.3}$ | 16.7 9.3 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Noug Khacm (Night wil) | - DS/d | 7.4 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 0.1 | 9.2 | 9,4 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 10.6 | 88.2 | ${ }_{7} 8.3$ | 8.5 | 8.7 220 | 9.3 |  |
| Yannawa (Sevage) | $1 \mathrm{DS} / \mathrm{d}$ | 16.5 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 26.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 22.0 |  | 5.3\% |
| Yamava (Night woil) | t DSM ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 8.4 | ${ }^{8 .} 8$ | 8.8 <br> 8 | 9.0 | 9.2 | $\underline{7.9}$ | ${ }_{2}^{13.5}$ | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | ${ }_{2} 1.5$ | 14.5 | 17.3 | 0.8\% |
| Community WWTP | tDS/d | 2.5 | 23.9 | 32.5 | -2.5 | 33.5 | 3.5 | 24.5 | 45.0 | 52.1 | 52.5 | 54.4 | 55.1 | 55.9 | 56.7 | 57.5 | 59.4 | 66.3 | 69.7 | 72.7 | 73.7 | 77.8 | 25.7\% |
| Toctal | TDEA | +6.0. | 70.3 | 68. 5 | 68.8 | 99.9 | N1.9 | 82.6 | 93.3 | (00.9 | 101.9 | 104.4 | 117,5 | $11 \mathrm{~K}, 7$ | 134.0 | 135.3 | 138.4 | 143.1 | $1810 . x$ | 180.6 | $1 \times 1.3$ | 18\%.0) | 62.2\% |
| Grand total (Total Lemeraleds | t 1 NS/d | 51.6 | 76.0 | 92.3 | 93.1 | 104.4 | 1 10, 9 | 125.1 | 135.4 | 143.6 | 157.7 | 170.0 | 1 84.0 | 186.0 | 202.1 | 208.1 | 222.5 | 2+10, | 259.3 | 200.6 | $2 \times 6.7$ | 302.2 | $\underline{1(x) .0 \%}$ |

Table 8.2.3.2 Pre-Feasibility Study of Sludge Treatment for Scenario 1

Table 8．2．3．3 Pre－Feasibility Study of Sludge Treatment for Scenario 2

| $5$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 䂞 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 敋 |  | 8 |  |  |  |
| $\frac{5}{6}$ |  | 8 |  | 号 | \％ 0 |
| $8$ |  | 8 |  |  | $4{ }_{4}^{8}$ |
| $\stackrel{5}{6}$ |  | 8 |  |  | ${ }^{7} 8$ |
|  |  | $\underset{0}{7}$ |  | 㳓 |  |
| $\frac{5}{5}$ |  | 8 |  | （2） | －0 |
| E |  | 8 |  | ¢ ${ }_{6}$ | 3 C |
| E |  | 8 |  | \％ $0_{0}$ | 9 ${ }_{6}$ |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | 8 |  | $\vec{\circ}$ 合 |  |
| $5$ |  <br>  | 8 |  | $\cdots{ }_{\sim}^{5}$ | ${ }^{\text {E }}$ |
| $\stackrel{b}{5}$ |  | 8 |  |  | 88 |
| 令 | gig8 | $\stackrel{\square}{5}$ |  |  | － |
| $8$ |  | 8 |  | \％ | 5F． |
| S | Fs\％8\％ | 8 |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| 若 | －${ }_{6}$ | $\stackrel{9}{\square}$ \％ |  | A ${ }_{0}^{\text {cta }}$ | 吕茄 |
| $8$ |  | 8 |  |  | 寺 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| $8$ |  | 8 |  | 88 | 98， |
| E |  | 8 |  | 3）${ }_{6}$ | ${ }_{6}{ }_{5}$ |
| 共 |  | 8 |  | \％ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { \％} \\ 0\end{array}$ | 5 |
| 寿 |  | 8 |  | $3{ }^{3}$ | 盛 |
| E |  |  |  | $\cdots$ | \％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | （8） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8.2.3.4 Pre-Feasibility Study of Sludge Treatment for Scenario 3


Table 8.2.3.6 Summary of Pre-Feasibility Study for 3 Scenarios


Table 11.1.1.1 Requirements Regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (1/2)

| Items | Types of Projects or Activities | Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Dam or reservoir | Storage volume of 100 million cubic meter (MC) of more or storage, surface area of 15 square kilomelers or more |
| 2. | luigation | Irigated area of 80,000 rais ( $12,800 \mathrm{ba}$ ) or more |
| 3. | Conmercial airpor | All sizes |
| 4. | Ilotel or resont | 80 roons or more |
| 5. | Mass Iransit system and expressway as defined by the Mass Transit System and Expressway Act, or projects similar to expressway or tail type mass Iransit system | All sizss |
| 6. | Miniog as defined by the Mineral Act | All sizes |
| 7. | Industrial estate as defined by the industrial Estate Authority of Thailand Act, or project similar to industrial estate | All sizes |
| 8. | Commercial port and harbor | With capacity for vessets of 5001 -gross or more |
| 9. | Tbesmal power plant | Capacity of 10 MW or more |
| 10. | Industries: |  |
|  | (1) Petrochemical Industry <br> (2) Oil refinery <br> (3) Natural gas scparation of processing <br> (4) Cbloro-alkaline industry requiring NaCl as raw material for production of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}, \mathrm{NaOH}, \mathrm{JICl}$, $\mathrm{Cl}_{2}, \mathrm{NaOCl}$ and bleacbing power <br> (5) Iron and/or steel Industry <br> (6) Cement Industry <br> (7) Smelting Industry other than iron and steel <br> (8) Pulp Industry | Using raw materials which are produced from oil refinery and/or natural gas separation with production capacity of $100 \mathrm{~V} / \mathrm{d}$ or more All sizes <br> All sizes <br> Production capacity of each or combided products or $1001 /$ d or more. <br> Production capacity of $100 \mathrm{1} / \mathrm{d}$ or more (production capacity calculated by using production capacity of furnace in thour nulliplice by 24 hours) <br> 100 t/day or using furnaces with combined capacity greater than 5 t/batcb <br> All sizes <br> Production capacity of $50 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{d}$ or more <br> Production capacity of $50 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{d}$ or more |
| 11. | All projects in watershed area classificd as \$B by the Cabiact Resolution | All sizes |

Table 11.1.1.1 Requirements Regarding the Envimonmental Impact Assessment (EIA) (2/2)

| Items | Types of Projects or Activities | Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. | Coastal reclamation | All sizes |
| 13. | Building in areas adjacent to nivers, coastal areas, lakes or beaches or in the vicinity of national parks or bistorical parks | Building <br> 1. $\quad 23.00 \mathrm{~m}$ bright or more. <br> 2. Total area of all floors or area of any floor in the same building is $10,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ or more |
| 14. | Residential buildiog as defined by the Building Ant | 80 units or more |
| 15. | Land appropriate (or housing development) | Number of land plots is 500 plots or more Tolal land area is more than 100 rais ( 16 ha) |
| 16. | Hospital which is located: <br> (1) in area adjacent to rivers, coastal areas, lakes, or beaches <br> (2) In area other than (1) | (1) 30 beds or more <br> (2) 60 bids or more |
| 17. | Pesticide iodustry or industry producing active ingredient by chemical process | All sizes |
| 18. | Cbemical fertilizer industry usiog chemical process in production | All sizes |
| 19. | Highway or road as defined by Slighway Act passing through following area: <br> (i) Wildife sanctuaries and wildlife non-bunting arca as defined by Wildife Conservation and Protection Act <br> (2) National parks as defined by National Park Act <br> (3) Watersbed class 2 as approved by the cabinet <br> (4) Mangove forests designated as National Forest Preserves <br> (5) Coastal area withio 50 meters of maximum sea level | All projects which are equivalent to or above the minimum sfandard of rural highway, iscluding roadbed expansion. |
| 20. | Central waste freatment plants as defined by the Factory Act | All sizes |
| 21. | Sugar Indusiry <br> (1) producing raw sugar, white sugar, refined sugar <br> (2) producing glucose, dextrose, fruclast or the like | All sizes <br> production capacity of $20 \mathrm{t} / \mathbf{\$ 5 5}$ or more |
| 22. | Petroleum Developmed <br> (I) Geophysical drilling explotation and/or production <br> (2) Oil and gas pipoline sysicm | All sizes <br> All sizes |

Source:
(1) The Ministry of Scieace. Technelogy and Eavitonament Re: Specifying lypes and sizes of projects or activities of geverament agency, state enterprise or privale ferson u bich are required to prepare reports on environmentat ingact assessment.
(2) The Ministry of Science, Technolegy and Environment Re: Sperifying ypes and sizes ef projects or activities of government agency, slate enilerprise or privote person which are required to preprere regorts on ensiroamental imgact assessmend No.2, B.E. 2535 (1992).
(3) The Ministy of Science. Technology ams Eavironnent Re: Sperifying types and sizes of projects ef activities of government agency. state entegrice or privale gerson which are required to prepare reports on eavironmental impact assessment No.3, B.E. 3539 (4996).

Tabte 11.3.1.1 Format for Screening (Option A)

| No. | Environmental ltem | Description | Evaluation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Social Environment |  |  |  |
| 1. | Resettement | Resettlement due to land ocupancy (Ifansfer of the rights of residence and land ownership) | $[\mathrm{Y}] \mathrm{N}][$ ] |
| 2. | Vomemic Activities | Lass of production base and change of eommic struture | [Y] (N) ${ }^{\text {] }}$ |
| 3. | Traffic and Public Facilities | Impacts on schools, hospitals, and present traflic conditions, such as traffic janss and accidents | (Y) [N][?] |
| 4. | Split of Communities | Separation of regional cammunities by hindrance of regional trafic | [Y] (1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 5. | Cultural Propetiy | Less or decrease of the value of cultural assets, such as temples, shrines and archaeological assets | [Y] N ] [?] |
| 6. | Water Rights and Rights of Conmon | Obstruction of fishing rights, water right, and rights of ommon | [Y] (N) [?] |
| 7. | Public Ileath Condition | Wersening of health and sanitary ondition due to the generation of garbage and pathgenic insecis | $[\mathrm{Y}]$ (N][?] |
| 8. | Waste | Generation of construction waste, surplus soils, sludge, and donestic waste | (Y) [N][?] |
| 9. | Hazards (Risk) | Increase in risk of cave-ins, ground failure and acidents | [Y] Ni]? |
| Natural Environment |  |  |  |
| 10. | Tepography and Gecology | Change of valuable topography and geology due to excavation and eathfill | [Y\|N]I?] |
| 11. | Soil Irosion | Topsoil erosion by rainfall afier land rectamation and de forestation | ITN: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ] |
| 12. | Groundwater | Exhaustion of groundwater caused by over-drafi, and water pollution by leachate | (Y) $\{\mathrm{N}][$ ? $]$ |
| 13. | Ifydrological Situation | Changes of river discharge and riverbed condition due to filling work and drainage inflow | [Y]@] ${ }^{\text {P] }}$ |
| 14. | Coastal 7me | Ceastal erosion and change of noastal vegetation due lo change of littoral drift and rectanation | [Y] N$\}$ ! $]$ |
| 15. | Fauna and Fiora | Ohstruction of breeding and extincrion of species due to the changes of habitat condilions | $[\mathrm{Y} \mid \mathrm{NT}]$ ] |
| 16. | Meteorolcgy | Change of micro-cimate, such as temperature, wind, ete, due to large-scale reclamation and construction | [Y] NfI$]$ |
| 17. | landscape | Change of topography and vegetation due to reclanation. Deterimation of acsthetic hafnony by structures | [Y]@I?] |
| Pollution |  |  |  |
| 18. | Air Pollution | Potlution caused by exhaust gas or texic gas from veicicles and factories | [Y] Nl$]$ |
| 19. | Water Pollution | River and groundwater pollution caused by inflow of dranage and sludge froms water treatnent facilities | $[\mathrm{Y}](\mathrm{N}](1)$ |
| 20. | Soil Comtamination | Contamination caused by discharge or diffusion of waste water drainage or texic materials | [Y] ${ }^{\prime} \mid$ (1) |
| 21. | Noise and Vibration | Noise and vibration generated by vehicles and eporation of water treament plants | (Y) [N] ${ }^{\text {[ }}$ ] |
| 22. | Land Subsidence | Land deformation and land subsidence caused by the lowering of water table | [Y] (1)]? |
| 23. | Oflensive Olm | Gencration offensive oder and exhausted gas | (Y) $(\mathrm{N}][$ ? |
| Overall Evaluation: <br> Either IEE or E1A is necessary for the Prejeet Implententation? |  |  | Y)[N] |

Table 11.3.1.2 Format for Screening (Option B)

| No. | Envirommental Item | Description | Evaluation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Social Environment |  |  |  |
| 1. | Resettement | Resetllement due to land cocupancy (Iransfer of the rights of residence and land ownership) | [ $\mathrm{Y}^{(1)}$ [?] |
| 2. | Eomomic Adivilies | Leos of production base and change of economic structure | [Y) N$)$ (? |
| 3. | Traffic and Public Facilities | Inipacts on schools, hespitals, and present taffic conditions, such as traffic janss and aceidents | (Y) $[\mathrm{N}][$ ? |
| 4. | Split of Communities | Separation of regional ommunities by hindrance of regional traffic |  |
| 5. | Cultural Property | lass or decrease of the value of culiural assets, such as tenpipes, shrines and archaeological assels | $[\mathrm{Y}]$ N] $\{?$ |
| 6. | Water Rights and Rights of Commen | Obstruction of fishing rights, water rights, and rights of common | [Y] (N) [?] |
| 7. | Public 3fealh Condition | Worsening of health and sanitary condition due to the generation of gabage and pathegenic insects | $[\mathrm{Y}][\mathrm{N}](21)$ |
| 8. | Waste | Generation of construction waste, surplus soils, siudge, and domestic waste | (Y) N$][$ [ $]$ |
| 9. | Hazards (Risk) | Increase in risk of cave-ins, ground failure and accidents | $[Y] N$ [?] |
| Natural Emironment |  |  |  |
| 10. | Tepography and Gedogy | Change of valuable topography and geology due toexcavation and eanthill | [Y] (N) $?$ ] |
| 11. | Scil Eraion | Topsoil erosion by rainfall after land reclamation and deforestation | [Y] (N)[?] |
| 12. | Groundwater | Exhaustion of groundivater caused by over-draft, and water pollution by leachate | [Y]\{N](?) |
| 13. | Hyurological Siluation | Changes of river discharge and riverbed condition due to filling work and drainage inllow | (Y)(N)[?] |
| 14. | Coastal Zone | Coastal errsion and change of coastal vegetation due to change of littoral drift and reclamation | [Y](N) [?] |
| 15. | Fauna and Flya | Obstruction of brecting and exinction of species due to the changes of habitat onditions | $[\mathrm{Y}][\mathrm{N}](7)$ |
| 16. | Meterrology | Change of micro-clinate, such as tempcrature, wind, etc., due to large-scate rectanation and onstruction | $[\mathrm{Y}]$ NT $?$ ? |
| 17. | Landscape | Change of teprography and vegetation đue to reclamation. Deterioration of arsthetic harmeny by structures | $[\mathrm{Y}][\mathrm{N}](3)$ |
| Pollution |  |  |  |
| 18. | Air Polution | Pollutime caused by exhaust gas er toxic gas from wehicles and factories | [Y] N$)[$ ?] |
| 19. | Water Pollution | River and grotndwater pollution caused by inflow of drainage and sludge from water treatment facilitics | [Y][N](1) |
| 20. | Soil Conlamination | Conlamination caused by discharge or diffusion of waste water drainage or foxic naterials | [Y][N][?] |
| 21. | Noise and Vibsation | Noise and vibration generated by vehicles and operation of water Irealment plants | (19) $[\mathrm{N}][?]$ |
| 22. | Iand Subsidence | Land de formation and land subsidence caused by the lowering of water table | [Y](N) ${ }^{\text {P }}$ ] |
| 23. | Offensive Odor | Generation offensive odor and exhausted gas | [Y]N](?) |
| Overall Evaluation: <br> Bither IEE or EA is necessary for the Project Implementation? |  |  | (Y) [N] |

## Table 11.4.1.1 Envirommental Issues Raised by IEE

| Option 1 | Option 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Social Environment | Social Environment |
| 1) Traffic and Public Facilities | 1) Traftic and Public Facilitics |
| 2) Waste | 2) Public Health Condition |
| Natural Environment | 3) Waste |
| 1) Ground Water Natural Environment <br>  1) Ground Water <br> Pollution 2) Fauna \& Flora <br> 1) Water Pollution 3) Landscape <br> 2) Soil Contamination 1) Water Pollution <br> 3) Noise and Vibration 2) Noise and Vibration <br> 4) Oftensive Odor 3) Oftensive Odor |  |

Table 11.4.1.2 Summary of IEE

| Environmental Item | Option A | Option B | Problem | Countcrmeasure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Traffic and Public Facilities | S | S | Trallic will increase | Route and time of transport have to preplanned. |
| 2. Public Hoalth Condition | N | X | In case of land application, a health risk is prevailing | Proper reuse plan in to be developed. final disposal should be monitored carefully. |
| 3. Wasts | S | S | Gencration of waste | No problem it final disposal conducted properly and regulatory. |
| 4. Ground Water | M | S | Leachate can pollute ground water resources | Sanitary landfill with leachate treatment is recommended. If not possible, ground water use should be restricted. |
| 5. Fauna \& Flora | N | X | Trace toxic can change flora \& fauna | Controlled land application should be adopted. |
| 6. Landscape | N | X | Use of comport may change crop patiern | Controlled land application should be adopted. |
| 7. Water Pollution | X | S | Groundwater pollution can lead to wide-spread water pollution | Sanitary landfill is recommended. |
| 8. Soil Contamination | X | N | May cause pollution by trace toxic substances | Sanitary landfill and controlled land application is required. |
| 9. Noise and Vibration | S | S | Will generate during transportation | Route and time of transport have to be preplanned. |
| 10. Offensive Odor | S | S | May cause some odor during transport and disposal | Closed truck should be used for transport. agriculiural area should be chosen carefully. |

M: Major, S: Small. N: Nonc, X: Not clear

0

## Figures

O

Station for Water Dilution Systems

| No. | Name of Pump Station \& Gate |
| :---: | :---: |
| System 1 k 2 |  |
| 1 | Bang Khen Ghao P.S. |
| 2 | Bang Khen Mai P.S. |
| 3 | Bang Sue P.S. |
| 4 | Sam Seb P.S. |
| 5 | Tavale P.S. |
| 6 | Bau Lumpbug |
| 7 | Pbra Pbiuklao G |
| 8 | Pak K. Talad G. |
| 9 | Ong Ang $G$ |
| 10 | Knug kasem P.S. |
| 11 | Phra Kbauoug P.S. |


| System 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Salboru P.S. |
| 13 | Choug Non Sit Temporary P.S. |
| 14 | RamalVP.S. |
| System 4 |  |
| 15 | K. Toey P.S. |
| 16 | Baug Cbak P.S. |
| 17 | Badg Or P.S. |
| 18 | Bang $\mathrm{Na}^{\text {P P }}$ S. |
| Acrated lagoon Systcmis |  |
| No. | Name of A frated Lagrou Systems |
| A. 1 | Makkasan Poud |
| A. 2 | Rama IX Poud |
| A. 3 | Buddamoulton Sai2 |
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Figure 2.15.1
LOCATION OF KIILONG WATER IMPROVEMENT FACILITIES






Source: MWA Anmual Repori 1997
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Figurc 2.2.3.1
GROWTII IN MWA WATER SERVICES





## Sectional View of a Septic Tank <br> (Outlet is Connected to the Combined Sewer)



Source: 1998 AIT Feasibitity Study on Agricultural Use and Land Applicalion of Sewage aud Night Soil Sludge for Bangkok Metropolitan
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Figure 3.1.2.1
TYPICAL SEPTICTANK ARRANGEMENTS IN BANGKOK
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Figure 5．1．1．1
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CURRENT WASTEWATER LEVELS IN COMBINED DRAINS


EXPECTED FUTURE WASTEWATER LEVELS IN COMBINED DRAINS

StormOutfail
to Khione
(C)
BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT
Treated
Flow Cascide and

Modified Sequential
Batch Reactor
Activated Sludge
Plant

SLUDGE
TREATMENT
PRELIMINARY TREATMENT

Plant
Sludge
Liquor
Return

wuse3s pue
and
Separaiton
Grit
Disposal
off Site

DAF
Sludge
Thickeners

Disposal
off Site

Vashing
and
Compaction
Screenings
Skipped for
Disposal
off Site
off Site
Inlet
pumping
Station-

(\$)




[^0]:    Note: Data or Oct. and Des. in 1997 are missing
    Snterceptor construction started in Jan. 1997, which is not related to wastewater treatment operntion.
    Interceptor construction started in Jan. 1997, whi
    Souve: Monthly Operation Recond of si Phraya WWTP

[^1]:    

[^2]:    | Uriver's labor cost | $(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 45 |
    | :--- | :---: | ---: |
    | Fuel cost | $(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{l})$ | 10 |
    | Fuel consumption of 6 ton truck | $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{l})$ | 2 |
    | Avcrage spced | $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr})$ | 10 |
    | Consumables | $(\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{km})$ | 2 |
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    | :--- |
    | SEWAGE SLUDGE TREATMENT / DISPOSAL AND |
    | RECLAIMED WASTEWATER REUSE IN BANGKOK |
    | JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY |

[^4]:    | THE STUDY FOR MASTER PLAN ON | Figure 3.2.3.2 |
    | :---: | :--- |
    | SEWAGE SLUDGE TREATMENT / DISPOSAL AND | FLOW DLAGRAM OF ON-NUT |
    | RECLAIMED WASTEWATER REUSE IN BANGKOK | NIGHT SOIL TREATMENT PLANT | RECLAIMED WASTEWATER REUSE IN BANGKOK IAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY NIGHT SOIL TREATMENT PLANT

