

## Review of technologies for intake water treatment in S-CCS

### RESEARCH QUESTION:

- Intake water treatment can help to manage major treats in the production of salmon at sea (e.g. sea lice, AGD, surface pathogens, harmful algae), but large flows typical for S-CCS require large treatment capacities.

Review of current technologies for treating intake water Summary and comparison of potential solution that might allow for the cost-efficient treatment of large volumes of intake water

**DURATION:** 2019

### HIGHLIGHTS:

- Technology overview summarized in Figure 1
- Ultrasound most likely not a feasible technology for treating large flows typical for S-CCS.
- Microscreen filtration is effective to remove sea lice, particulates and increases disinfection efficiency (Screen sizes 50 - 100µm necessary)
- UV and AOP allow for disinfection without harmful chemical residues
  - UV treatment is effective to control pathogens but is sensitive toward particulates. Less effective against certain viruses (e.g. IPNV)
  - Advanced oxidation process (AOP) could be a powerful tool to increase disinfection efficiency in intake water treatment, if it can be scaled up successfully
- Dissolved air flotation (DAF) could potentially help in managing harmful algae blooms (HABs)

### RECOMMENDATION:

- Combination of microscreen filtration and UV treatment remains the most promising technology for intake water treatment.
  - E.g. 50 µm screen + 35 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup> UV, effective to control invertebrate larvae and bacteria in water w/ up to 95 NTU (10-15 in natural waters) (Waite et al., 2003)
- UV-LEDs could increase economic viability of intake water treatment in the future, but not commercially viable on large scale yet
- Investigating potential of AOP for disinfection and DAF for managing HABs in S-CCS



## PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS:

- Necessity to systematically address the key question: How much treatment is enough?
  - More research into minimal requirements for water treatment and re-evaluating risks for SCCS (e.g. potential for spray contamination in open SCCS with intake water treatment, or quantifying added benefit of microfiltration in relatively clean salt water before UV treatment)
  - More emphasis on individual risk assessment for different sites
  - “Modular” thinking on intake water treatment, how much treatment is needed when?

The factsheet is not yet ready for implementation. More testing under commercial conditions is needed.

- Dynamic adaptation to stocking and/or “threat level” to save energy
- Partial recirculation could reduce the need for intake water treatment, potentially only “closed” operation during HABs or known disease outbreaks?

## READ MORE:

For detailed overview on technology and SWOT analyses, see D12.6/TREAT/2019

Technology	Principle	Mode of action		Effective against			
		Particle removal	Disinfection	Sea lice	HABs	Bacteria	Viruses
Microscreen filtration	Size exclusion	✓	✗	✓	(✓) <small>Site-dependent</small>	✗	✗
UV	Damage to nucleic acids, inactivation	✗	✓	(✓)	✓	✓	(✓) <small>Dose-dependent</small>
AOP	Oxidation of organic matter and damage to nucleic acids (inactivation)	✗	✓	✓?	✓?	✓?	✓?
DAF	Foam fractionation	✓	✗	? <small>More data required</small>	?	✗	✗
Ultrasound	Particle disruption	(✗)	(✓)	✓?	✓?	✓?	✓?

Figure 1: Overview on reviewed intake water treatment technologies. UV: Ultraviolet light, AOP: Advanced oxidation process, DAF: Dissolved air flotation.