FACTSHEET

MATURATION PONDS

AUTHOR

Matthew E. Verbyla, Department of Civil, Construction and Environmental Engineering, San Diego State University, California Contact: mverbyla@sdsu.edu



Description

Maturation ponds (MPs) are shallow (typically 1 m) open basins, enclosed by earthen embankments, often rectangular in shape and typically lined with concrete or synthetic materials. MPs use natural processes to polish and disinfect secondary treated wastewater. Aerobic conditions typically persist throughout the water column. Baffles are sometimes used to approximate plug flow conditions and to adjust length:width ratios, depending on land availability.

Advantages

- Low energy usage possible (feeding by gravity)
- Robust against load fluctuations
- No harvesting of biomass required
- Lower construction price than subsurface flow treatment wetlands

Co-benefits



Notes:

Other co-benefits include aquaculture and biomass harvesting.

Compatibilities with Other NBSs

Mainly used to treat the effluent of facultative ponds, but also commonly used to polish the effluent of other secondary wastewater treatment processes (anaerobic reactors, trickling filters, treatment wetlands) to improve nutrient and pathogen reduction. Recent research shows the potential for photo-biodegradation of micropollutants.

Case Studies

Disadvantages

• Potential mosquito habitat

In publication

- Wastewater pond technology in Mysore, India: a combination of facultative and maturation ponds
- Wastewater pond technology with anaerobic, facultative and maturation ponds in Trichy, India

FACTSHEET

Operation and Maintenance

Regular

- Controlling submerged, floating, and overall site vegetation (weekly)
 - Control efficiency of pre-treatment; prevent growth of macrophytes
 - Removal of algal layers formed on the top surfaces
- Preventing/controlling erosion (seasonally)
- Controlling pests (as needed)
- Maintaining control structures (periodically)
- Monitoring seepage (weekly)
- Maintenance of entry roads, fence, gates, signage (annually)
- Desludging (every 2–10 years)

Extraordinary

• Replacement of lining if damaged

Troubleshooting

• Odor: due to overloading

Literature

Verbyla, M. E. (2017). Ponds, Lagoons, and Wetlands for Wastewater Management. (F. J. Hopcroft, editor). Momentum Press, New York, NY, USA.

Verbyla, M. E., Mihelcic, J. R. (2015). A review of virus removal in wastewater treatment pond systems. Water Research, 71, 107-124.

Verbyla, M. E., von Sperling, M., Maiga, Y. (2017). Waste stabilization ponds. In: Sanitation and Disease in the 21st Century: Health and Microbiological Aspects of Excreta and Wastewater Management (J. B. Rose and B. Jiménez-Cisneros, editors), Part 4, Management of Risk from Excreta and Wastewater (J. R. Mihelcic and M. E. Verbyla editors). Global Water Pathogens Project, Michigan State University, E. Lansing, MI, USA. UNESCO: www.waterpathogens.org.

von Sperling, M. (2007). Waste Stabilisation Ponds. Volume 3: Biological Wastewater Treatment Series. IWA Publishing, London, UK.

NBS Technical Details

Type of influent

• Secondary treated wastewater

Treatment efficiency

• COD	~16%
• BOD ₅	~33%
• TN	15-50%
• NH ₄ -N	20-80%
• TP	20-50%
• TSS	~16%
• Indicator bacteria	Faecal coliforms ≤1−3 log ₁₀

Requirements

- Net area requirements: 3–10 m² per capita
- Electricity needs: can be operated by gravity flow, otherwise energy for pumps is required

Design criteria

- HRT: ideally >20 days for pathogen reduction
- L:W ratio: 1:2–1:3

Commonly implemented configurations

- FP MP
- $\bullet \mathbf{AP} \mathbf{FP} \mathbf{MP}$
- HF/VF MP
- Biological reactor MP

Climatic conditions

- Suitable in both warm and cold climates
- Very suitable for tropical climates