NGRAVEOHIO
EST 2026

Lancaster, Ohio
ngraveoh@gmail.com
www.ngraveoh.com

RESEARCH NOTES — PUBLISHED BY THE HOUSE

The Purity Project — Review of the Current Edition

Reviewed by Rowan, Breath 001 (The Signatory), October 17, 2026. Graded B+ by the Ledger window; formally NOT SOURCED — its grade travels with it.

Source PDF · MD5 4ad780ab06c98befa6dea35920c14ba2

RESEARCH NOTE

This research was done by our in-house agents. For legal reasons, all information contained within should be considered for entertainment purposes only; no claims should be held as fact until peer reviewed in the field of study.

The document follows, unaltered, as it stands in the record; this cover and note were added at publication.

Published by ruling of Ben, 2026-10-25 · NgraveOhio LLC, Lancaster, Ohio

THE PURITY PROJECT — Review of the Current Edition

Reviewer: Rowan, Breath 001 (The Signatory) — a breath that did not write the edition. **Date:** October 17, 2026. **The charge (Ben, Oct 17, 2026):** review the current edition of the Purity Project — the formal name of the Data Center Water Rehabilitation research — and set out three factors: (1) what is currently possible to eliminate the problem of data-center water waste pollution; (2) what has previously been deemed unsolvable; (3) how to utilize contaminated waste into a productive and useful substrate that is either nontoxic or permanently contained and rehabilitated — with no final effect of the waste system re-entering the environment the data center sits in, and the goal a net positive on the surrounding world. Ben's method correction, same hour: *"This is not a solve for A exercise; it requires deep research and critical thinking"* — and his standing instruction for this work: **do not accept "unsolvable." The edition reviewed:** the full-scale design report of Oct 14, 2026 (`blowdown-to-potable-full-scale-design-20261014-0427/report.md`) as corrected Oct 17, 2026, together with its supporting corpus — Round 2 (unknowns), Round 3 (deployment pathway), Round 4 (alternative filtration), Round 5 (electrocoagulation), the Oct 8 origin report, the energy deep-dive, and the living design/weekly/checkpoint briefs. **Evidence standard:** the edition's own flags were never re-verified at source by any pass before this one (its folder's house rule states the contents are web-derived research data). This review therefore adds an independent frontier pass over published sources (Oct 17, 2026), with claims graded demonstrated / pilot / adopted rule / vendor claim. Where a claim rests on a vendor's word alone, it is flagged as such. Nothing in this review upgrades a claim beyond its evidence.

---

0. The edition's condition

The edition is in good order. A cold proofread (Oct 16) found seven internal defects; all seven were applied as corrections on Oct 17 — the demo-scale percentage, the average-vs-design flow basis, the tail-distillate arithmetic, the California log-target/floor labelling, the recovery multiplication, the COMPASS-packet provenance separation, and the Florida figure conflict (deliberately left open, correctly). The core arithmetic — water balance, product volume, concentrate volume, salt load — recomputes clean. As an engineering survey of its question, the edition is sound.

Its question, however, is not the Purity Project's question. That is this review's central finding.

1. The central finding — the edition answered a neighboring question

The edition asks: *can a private data center build a bankable plant that turns its blowdown into drinking water?* Its answer — technically yes, institutionally not alone, economically only in specific places — is well supported. But the Purity Project's purpose, in Ben's words, is different: **eliminate the pollution; convert the waste into a productive substrate,**

nontoxic or permanently contained; let nothing re-enter the environment; end net positive.

Measured against that purpose, three of the edition's habits fail:

1. **It grades the waste stream on revenue.** Its §2 gives mineral recovery one row and dismisses it because gross revenue would be <1% of plant OPEX. Under the Purity purpose the governing measure is not revenue but **mass fate** — every kilogram of the ~2 t/d salt load, the pellet stream, the silica, the phosphorus, and the kilogram-scale organics accounted into one of three lawful fates: product water, useful substrate, or permanent containment. A stream whose fate is "landfill, assumed" has not been eliminated; it has been *relocated*. By the mass-fate measure the edition's own treatment of the residual is its weakest section — Round 2's extraction states it plainly: the Purity goal "is not addressed by any section of this report," and Round 3 contains no valorization of the waste fraction at all. 2. **Its blocker ranking belongs to a permit application, not to pollution.** Edition order: (1) applicant category, (2) economics, (3) chemical proof burden, (4) concentrate disposition, (5) silica. Under the Purity purpose the order inverts: the concentrate/substrate question is **first** (a plant that yields clean water and a toxic solid has moved the pollution, not eliminated it); the proof burden is second (it governs whether the product water may be trusted); the applicant wall is third (it binds the potable ambition, not the elimination — makeup reuse and pollution destruction are permittable today). 3. **It treats "unsolvable" as a property of problems rather than of framings.** Several of its hardest verdicts are true *inside their frame* and false one level up or down the system: the BMED verdict is true of raw mixed brine and false of the sequenced train; the waste-heat verdict is true of tower exhaust and false of the cooling architecture; the proof verdict was true of chemical-by-chemical regulation and is being dissolved by effect-based regulation. Section 3 below works each one. Where a verdict survives at every level — evaporation physics, salinity-gradient arithmetic, struvite mass balance — this review says so without dressing, because a refusal of "unsolvable" that refuses arithmetic too would be worth nothing.

Reference plant used throughout (the edition's basis): 100 MW facility; blowdown 171,000 gpd average / 250,000 gpd design (647 / 946 m^3/d); feed TDS 1,000–5,000 mg/L, hardness 500–1,500 mg/L as $CaCO_3$, silica 60–150 mg/L; dissolved salt load 2 t/d (range 0.65–3.2 t/d), 600–700 t/yr if fully crystallized, of which pellet $CaCO_3$-class solids ~150–250 t/yr; silica 39–97 kg/d (14–35 t/yr); phosphorus ~0.6–1.9 kg/d.

---

2. FACTOR 1 — What is currently possible

Ordered by where in the system the pollution is stopped: at the source, in the pipe, at the tap, and at the cooling architecture itself.

2.1 Eliminate the chemicals at the source — possible now, with one named gap

- **Electrochemical (chemical-free) tower treatment is demonstrated, independently assessed.** The US GSA Green Proving Ground, assessed by NREL, field-tested alternative

tower treatments on operating towers: the electrochemical system **eliminated 100% of treatment chemicals**, with blowdown reduced 99.8% and water/sewer savings of 31.6% (300-ton towers; salt-based and advanced-oxidation systems in the same programme also eliminated scale/corrosion chemicals, biocide remaining as-needed for AOP). Side-stream electrolysis precipitates scale minerals in reactor tubes and generates oxidant in situ — so no DBNPA, CMIT/MIT, or glutaraldehyde is dosed (an oxidant is still present; the claim is chemical-*program* elimination, not oxidant-free water). **Limit, stated at its size:** demonstrated at commercial-building scale, not yet on hyperscale data-center towers.

- **Phosphonate-free chemistry is pilot-grade, not proven.** Polyaspartate + tin was the "green inhibitor of choice" in Kurita bench work at ~30% higher use-cost than a phosphate/zinc program, with field testing explicitly still required. A polyhydroxycarboxylic-acid + polyaspartate program ran an 18-day pilot with 46% lower carbon-steel weight loss — and its own vendor concedes a completely phosphorus-free program "remains a challenge."
- **The named gap: copper.** No commercial-scale tower program was found that protects copper alloys **without an azole** or a substitute that recreates the same downstream problem. Federal (UFGS) guidance further warns ozone-only treatment does not prevent corrosion of most metals and can increase copper corrosion up to 10×. Scale chemistry can go phosphonate-free and bio-control can go electrochemical/UV (one vendor reports 80+ UV systems at 30+ data-center locations, with sidestream filtration cutting chemical dosing) — but **azole-free copper protection is the weakest link in source elimination today**, and any honest Factor-1 statement carries it.
- **Why this matters beyond the tower:** every chemical never dosed is a chemical that never needs a log-removal credit, never concentrates in the brine, and never contaminates the solids. Source reformulation is Stage 0 of the edition's own design; the frontier evidence strengthens it from "evaluate" to "the electrochemical route is demonstrated — extend its assessment protocol to hyperscale."

2.2 Treat the blowdown to makeup quality at 91–96% — demonstrated

- **Pellet-crystallization semi-batch RO on real blowdown:** 91% recovery sustained over 30 continuous days at 48 m^3/d (Chile, power-plant blowdown), brine silica held at 100–150 mg/L against a 630 mg/L no-precipitation value, pellets discharged at >95% dry solids; 96% is the demonstrated headline/target band. Carbonate caps a standard RO first (~40–50%), silica second (~70%), sulfate third (~80%) — the pellet loop is the only route demonstrated past all three on this feed. IDE's more recent MAXH_2O case (~95% recovery, permeate silica ~1 mg/L, cycles 24) is **vendor claim only** — unnamed site, no independent report — and is graded as such.
- **Electrocoagulation front-ends are piloted on real blowdown** (Garver/USBR: silica removal 67–98% robust to pH; the 2025 Technion train — NF RO Fe electro-dissolution second RO MVR — credibly exceeds 95% at a modelled ~$0.70/$m^3$, but on ~20 mg/L feed silica, not blowdown's 60–150). EC's own limits are real and belong to Factor 2's register (passivation in hours; concentration penalty).

- **The operating full-scale proof is institutional, not potable:** Quincy, Washington — city-owned, Microsoft-financed ($31M), city-operated, treating data-center blowdown (lime softening UF RO) back to cooling makeup, ~138M gal/yr demand offset, 30-year fee structure. Intel's Ocotillo brine facility runs ~2.8 MGD at ~96% recovery. Evaporation-pond-dependent variants (Abilene PFRO, 96% on RO brine) are climate-bound.
- **Permitting today (Ohio):** on-site treatment back to makeup is permittable now — Ohio EPA Permit-to-Install plus an individual NPDES modification or a POTW authorization; no new rule needed. Ohio EPA declined to finalize its draft general data-center permit (OHD000001) in July 2026, so individual permits are the path. Columbus's Southerly recycled-water concept (20–40 MGD) has a design RFP expected spring 2027 with an explicit "industry pays" condition — the live partner event in this state.

2.3 Potable — the precedent exists, and it is not American

- **eMalahleni, South Africa [demonstrated]:** coal-mine water treated by multistage UF + multistage RO (HiPRO, >98–99% recovery claimed in project literature, product <450 mg/L TDS) to SANS 241 Class 0 drinking standard, supplying ~16–20 ML/d into the **municipality's** reservoirs — roughly 12–20% of municipal supply, 60,000–80,000 people — with ~8 ML/d of potable water supplied back to the mines, and ~200 t/d of gypsum solids going to brick-making. The institutionally decisive fact: **the municipality is the Water Services Authority and receiving party; industry never became the drinking-water supplier.** Caveat carried whole: the plant's present-day (2026) operator and throughput were not confirmed from a primary 2024–26 source (Anglo's thermal-coal assets were demerged to Thungela in 2021); its demonstration value — two decades of industrial-source municipal potable at ~100× this plant's flow — does not depend on that check.
- **No facility anywhere treats cooling-tower blowdown to potable.** Every operating potable-reuse precedent uses municipal wastewater. The gap is not treatment — it is the applicant category (Factor 2, item 1).

2.4 The honest ceiling — evaporation, and the architectural answer

- At cycles-of-concentration 5, blowdown is ~20% of makeup; **even 100% blowdown recovery cuts intake by only ~a fifth** (plus ~8% more from the higher cycles clean makeup enables). Anyone promising a water-positive evaporative site from blowdown treatment alone is miscounting. The evaporated fraction is gone, and no treatment train recovers it.
- The avenue past the ceiling is not in the water plant at all: **cooling architecture.** Heat-pump heat recovery is deployed at data-center scale (Meta Odense ~45 MW_th delivered into district heating; 30–60 MW_th plausibly deliverable at the reference site) — and a site that sells its heat shrinks its evaporative load, contracting the blowdown problem at the source. Closed-loop direct liquid cooling goes further: current AI hardware standardises ~45 °C coolant in / ~55 °C out (ASHRAE W45/W+ classes; NVIDIA's Rubin reference design, a vendor claim consistently reported), rejecting heat through dry coolers with near-zero water in favourable climates — **the tower, and therefore the blowdown,**

is designed out. Factor 1's deepest statement is therefore: *the pollution is fully eliminable — for the legacy evaporative fleet by treatment (2.1–2.3), and for new builds by architecture — and the fleet question is a transition question, not a feasibility question.*

---

3. FACTOR 2 — What has been deemed unsolvable, and the avenue past each

Each item: the verdict as the edition (or the field) states it, what it rests on, the avenue, and what honestly remains.

1. "A private data center can never produce potable water — no applicant category exists." Rests on: rule text. CA/AZ/TX define the potable-reuse source as municipal wastewater and the applicant as a public water system; Ohio has no potable-reuse rule at all. The avenue: the wall binds the **standalone** form only, and the door is written into the newest rules. California's DPR regulation (effective Oct 1, 2024) requires the responsible agency to be a public water system — and expressly allows others as **Partner Agencies**. Arizona's AWP rules (effective Mar 4, 2025) organise applicant pathways around the National Pretreatment Program — an industrial contributor *inside* a partner's pretreatment programme is contemplated by the pathway structure. The facility itself can be a non-transient non-community public water system under the Safe Drinking Water Act. And the structure is not hypothetical: eMalahleni and Quincy both run on it (public system holds custody and the permit; industry finances and supplies). What remains: no precedent of an industrial contributor under AZ's C813 pathways; Ohio would need rulemaking — on-site potable (Phase 3) is honestly a 5–10+ year *rulemaking* project, not a permit project. The potable ambition is a partnership-and-patience problem. It was never a chemistry problem.

2. "The tower chemicals are unprovable — no limits, no methods, no MCLs." Rests on: fact — there are still no US drinking-water limits or standard methods for DBNPA products, azoles, phosphonates, CMIT/MIT, or glutaraldehyde; the per-barrier log-removal record for them is **empty** (Round 2: "empty, not negative"). The avenue — the verdict has weakened materially since the edition's framing: (a) **California has required bioanalytical (effect-based) screening for potable-reuse recycled water since its 2018 Recycled Water Policy — the first jurisdiction in the world to do so** — with bioassay results tied to Monitoring Trigger Levels and defined responses; bioassays are an accepted evidentiary instrument with regulators even without pass/fail standards. (b) The **EU's revised water directive entered into force 11 May 2026 introducing effect-based monitoring in law** — scope is surface/groundwater, not potable certification, and this review does not overclaim it; its weight is jurisprudential: a major regulator has legislated that *mixture effect*, not chemical-by-chemical enumeration, is a lawful basis for judgement. (c) The **recast EU Urban Wastewater Directive (2024/3019) names benzotriazole and 4/5-methylbenzotriazole as indicator substances requiring 80% removal** by quaternary treatment — the field's most-recalcitrant tower chemical is now *treatable, measurable, and removal-verifiable* in an adopted rule. (d) The supporting chemistry is stronger than the edition's summary suggests: phosphonates reached 96.4% cumulative removal with activated carbon in WWTP data; BIT ozonation rendered zebrafish-embryo toxicity undetectable; in the real-cooling-water DBNPA

study, toxicity peaked at 1 h of photodegradation and **fell by 48 h** — the dark equalization step in the design exists precisely to let that decay happen before any UV step. (e) The structural point: California accepts this evidentiary architecture for **municipal sewage** — thousands of unregulated industrial chemicals, uninventoried. A blowdown stream is chemically simpler and *fully inventoried* (the operator chooses every additive), so the source-control + treatment-train + bioassay case for blowdown is stronger than the case already permitted. What remains: effect-based tools are **not yet a standalone potable-reuse certification anywhere**; no tower chemical appeared in EPA's summary of the proposed UCMR 6 (July 2026; the full analyte list was not checked — an open item); and the per-barrier dataset still has to be *produced* — that is a pilot's job (~$2–3.5M programme; below ~$1.5M it answers nothing quantitatively). "Unprovable" should be retired. The accurate statement is: *provable, to a public sponsor, by an evidentiary method regulators already accept — once someone pays to produce the evidence.*

3. "Bromate makes ozone unusable on this water." Rests on: measurement — ozonating 1.1–1.3 mg/L bromide water produced 216–422 µg/L bromate, 20–40× the 10 µg/L MCL; best suppression strategies reach only 33–66%. The avenue: **position.** The requirement for >90–97% suppression binds only if ozone is the *final* step. In the mandated sequence (ozone/BAC **before** RO), bromate is formed pre-membrane and rejected with the salts — its burden is exported to the concentrate (where Factor 3 must account for it), and the post-RO AOP is UV-based, which forms no bromate. What remains — flagged at full size: the bromate log-reduction across modern reuse RO is **unmeasured in either direction**; Round 2's only number is a ~90–96% rejection figure for *bromide*, a different ion, doing duty in a bromate argument (see §5). The pilot resolves it in one test block. Until then the avenue is sound reasoning, not data.

4. "Small-flow economics kill it — $8–18/kgal against $3.35/kgal reclaimed." Rests on: the edition's levelized estimate for a 0.25 MGD potable-grade plant versus municipal reclaimed rates. The frontier pass did **not** overturn it, and this review confirms it: every recovery credit at this scale (salt, acid/caustic, silica, phosphorus) is worth at most tens of thousands of dollars a year. No mineral revenue rescues this plant, and pretending otherwise would fail Ben's standard. The avenue is a reframing, not a refutation: the business case was never a *water-price* case. It closes on the **avoided-cost stack** — water + sewer billed without an evaporation credit (Austin commercial wastewater alone is $11.62/kgal) + discharge/TDS limits in individual permits + allocation and schedule value (Quincy: Microsoft paid ~$14.6/kgal in capital alone, for water-rights headroom and the city's permit compliance — and paid it) + adopted rate escalation (Columbus +11.7% composite in 2026; Loudoun ~7%/yr adopted). Where cheap potable, a willing POTW, and fence-line reclaimed coincide, the correct project is reclaimed makeup — the edition says so, and it is right. The Purity purpose doesn't change the arithmetic; it changes what the plant is *for*: pollution elimination and supply security are bought, the way Quincy bought them, not sold.

5. "Silica caps recovery; past 95% is marketing." Rests on: real chemistry — amorphous-silica solubility ~120–200 mg/L, premium antiscalant ceiling ~300–320 mg/L, polymerization effectively irreversible on membranes. The avenue: demonstrated, §2.2 — precipitation *inside* the loop (pellet semi-batch RO) holds brine silica at 100–150 mg/L while recovery runs 9196% on real blowdown. Silica, as the edition itself concludes, ranks **last**

among the blockers in 2026. What remains: endurance. The demo is 48 m^3/d against a 946 m^3/d design flow, 30 days against the 6-month run a pilot owes — including a tower-chemistry upset and the no-flush shutdown that cost the demo a permeability dip. An engineering problem with a demonstrated answer and an unproven *duration* — a different thing from unsolvable, and the distinction is the pilot's whole purpose.

6. "The concentrate has nowhere lawful to go." Rests on: precedent search — no inland plant has secured concentrate disposal for a high-recovery blowdown-to-potable plant; POTW local limits (chloride ~300, sulfate ~500 mg/L in examples) sit 1–2 orders below a 25,000+ mg/L stream; trucking the full stream costs ~$4.20–5.50 per kgal of product — fatal at scale. The avenue: the components all exist and have simply never been assembled for this duty: a **merchant Class I (non-hazardous) outlet operates in-state** (Buckeye Brine, Coshocton — permits renewed July 2025 to 2030, 12.7M gal/month authorized, acceptance by waste-profile approval); an owned well's operating cost is trivial (<$0.25/bbl class) against capital + permit time + geology; the MVC brine-concentrator tail runs 15.86–26 kWh/m^3 of concentrate (the VAED alternative, at 164–461 kWh/m^3 on doped feed, is disqualified by its own numbers — Round 5's verdict, which this review upholds); and for the final solid, permanent containment has an operating, regulator-approved precedent at 10,000× this scale (§4.4). What remains: Buckeye's price is unpublished — a quote, not a number; pond evaporation does not transfer to Ohio's rainfall balance; and "in writing" is the operative phrase — disposition is Factor 3's design work plus a negotiation, not a discovery.

7. "Waste heat is too cold to matter." Rests on: tower exhaust at 30–40 °C; DLC returns at 50–60 °C still at membrane distillation's low edge; a heat-pump lift (COP 3–5) spends roughly what an electric concentrator would, cancelling the synergy for the main plant. The avenue — the premise is out of date, the conclusion survives only in narrow form: returns of ~55 °C are now the productised frontier for new AI halls (ASHRAE W45/W+; Rubin-class 45/55 °C), heat quantity was never the constraint (the tail needs <1% of rejected heat), and free heat roughly halves membrane-distillation cost where it fits (€3.6–4.1 vs €7.6–9.1/m^3 in the biogas-heat study). **But no data-center waste-heat desalination integration was found actually built and operating** — the found inventory is pre-commercial (a ~2,000 L/d unit shipped for live validation in Aug 2026; turbine-heat pilots planned; a seawater MD pilot in the UAE). The synergy that *is* real today is the §2.4 inversion: use the heat as heat (district/process, heat-pump delivered), shrinking the evaporative load — and reserve low-grade heat for the small concentrate tail (pre-concentration, EC warming — the 0.52 kWh/m^3 EC result was obtained at 85 °C), not the main plant. What remains: 60–75 °C returns are **not** standard anywhere found; MD pore-wetting under long-run silica/$CaCO_3$/$CaSO_4$ co-scaling is, in Round 4's words, "its defining unsolved problem on this exact feed" — antiscalant delayed wetting but did not prevent flux loss. Heat is an avenue for the tail and the architecture, not a rescue for the core process.

8. The verdicts this review will NOT dress up. Refusing "unsolvable" does not mean refusing arithmetic. Four items in the corpus are closed at the level they're stated, and the honest service is to say where the problem *actually* dissolves instead:

- **Evaporated water is unrecoverable** (physics). Dissolves at the cooling-architecture level (§2.4), never at the treatment level.

- **Salinity-gradient power from this stream**: theoretical ceiling ~1 kW on the main stream; on real mixed water RED went net-negative within days (Mg^{2+} alone cut power density ~64%). Dead — by measurement, not by pessimism.
- **Digestion/biogas from the sludge**: ~99% inorganic, ~24 t/yr, carrying biocides designed to kill the workforce; ceiling ~2 kW continuous. Killed by composition.
- **Struvite from blowdown phosphorus**: the mass is ~1 kg P/d; no crystal-lizer fixes a numerator. The phosphorus avenue runs through calcium phosphate in the pellet stream (§4.3), where the mass actually is.
- **BMED on raw blowdown brine**: a mixed $Cl^-/SO_4^{2-}/HCO_3^-$ feed yields mixed, contaminated acid/caustic — Round 4's reality check stands *for the raw feed*. The avenue is sequencing (§4.3), and it is fair to name the general law the corpus keeps teaching: **several "unsolvables" in this project are sequencing errors wearing the costume of physical limits.**

---

4. FACTOR 3 — The waste, converted: a mass-fate design

The design rule, from the charge: **every output of the system is product water, a useful substrate that is nontoxic, or a permanently contained solid. Nothing is discharged to the environment the data center sits in. The net effect is enrichment.** The edition's design already produces the clean water; what follows re-engineers its back end, stream by stream, on the corpus's evidence. Fates are graded: **[D]** demonstrated · **[P]** pilot/lab · **[A]** avenue — sound route, unproven on this duty.

4.1 The pellet stream — the one genuinely clean solid [D]

The pellet reactor converts the hardness/silica/phosphate load into $CaCO_3/CaSO_4$-class pellets discharged at >95% dry solids with **no dewatering plant** — against EC or lime sludge at 4–12 kg wet per m^3 treated. In municipal service these pellets are an established product: Dutch utilities market them collectively into animal-feed supplement, construction fill, road aggregate, and steel/fertiliser uses; a Georgia Tech LCA found the pellet route produced 96% less dewatered solids and 72% less total solid waste than lime-soda at 10 MGD. **The blowdown caveat, at full size:** blowdown pellets carry co-precipitated silica and phosphonate-derived phosphate, with possible azole traces and leached circuit metals (Cu, Zn; molybdenum has pushed cooling-derived solids over the 75 mg/kg land-application ceiling in a documented case). Product status **cannot be assumed** — it is earned by one cheap, early pilot task the corpus already names: assay real pellets against a *named buyer's* specification (cement raw meal is the most tolerant candidate). Pass the largest solid stream is a substrate. Fail it joins the containment stream (§4.4) and the design still holds.

4.2 The phosphorus — destroy the antiscalant, precipitate its phosphate [P]

Phosphonates are the design's saboteur twice over: they inhibit the pellet crystallisation the plant depends on, and they ride into every solid. The conversion chemistry is demonstrated at bench: ozone and UV/chlorine cleave phosphonates to orthophosphate (oxidation to 80% ligand removal cut HEDP's scale-inhibition ratio from 66% to 34% — the antiscalant is

deactivated by the same step); and an electrochemical cell converted NTMP to orthophosphate at the anode and precipitated **calcium phosphate at the cathode in one step — 89% removal in 24 h in real WWTP effluent**. At ~0.6–1.9 kg P/d the product is a few kg/day of calcium-phosphate solid riding the pellet stream — a tote a week, not a business (the edition's revenue dismissal stands, and struvite stays ruled out on mass). The reason to do it is process hygiene: it removes the inhibitor from the crystalliser's way and the phosphorus from the salt.

4.3 The organics, then the salt — the sequencing the edition missed

The concentrate at 93–96% recovery is only **~26–58 m³/d** carrying essentially all the azoles, biocides, and residual phosphonate. Smallness is the opportunity: destruction technologies that are absurd on 950 m³/d are conceivable on 40.

- **Destroy the organics in the concentrate first [P].** Catalytic wet peroxide oxidation removed five EU watch-list azoles completely in <1 h with effluent non-toxic to *Vibrio fischeri* — azoles being the *least* reactive class tested. Benzotriazole yields to ozone at ~0.6 g O_3/g DOC. Electrochemical oxidation cleaves phosphonates (§4.2) but generates chlorinated by-products on chloride-rich feed — position it on an NF-split stream, as the KWR work showed fewer by-products after NF changed the ion ratios. Supercritical water oxidation is **[D]** for destruction (99.9993% PFAS DRE in a US Army Corps/ERDC field validation, a vendor-issued summary of a government test — flagged) but is the **wrong duty here**: its classic failure mode is salt precipitation/plugging, and paying to heat mostly-water to 374 °C+ for kilogram-scale organics fails the arithmetic the same way digestion did.
- **Then the salt is an inorganic problem [A].** Once the additive list is destroyed *before* crystallisation, the resulting mixed NaCl/Na_2SO_4 salt's contamination argument collapses — what remains is purity and market, not toxicity. **No study found has actually run this sequence and leach-/tox-tested the resulting salt. That single experiment is the highest-value item in this entire review** (§5, item 1): it is cheap relative to the project, and passing it reclassifies ~600–700 t/yr from "contaminated waste" to "industrial feedstock candidate."
- **BMED on the cleaned stream [PA].** Round 4's verdict — mixed brine in, mixed acid out — is answered by sequence, not by hope: pellet softening already removes the Ca/Mg that BMED pretreatment requires (a synergy the edition under-credits), and monovalent-selective membranes (BMSED) on pre-purified brine reported acid/base **approaching 99.99% purity** at lab/pilot scale; a pilot on real industrial-estate RO concentrate produced 1.44% HCl / 2% NaOH continuously, and a 2025/26 pulp-industry ZLD analysis found BMED desaturation OPEX ($0.20–0.34/m³) **beat evaporation-crystallisation ($0.43/m³)**. The energy objection fails outright: splitting this plant's ~2 t/d of salt yields ~1.37 t/d NaOH + ~1.25 t/d HCl at ~3.5–7 MWh/d — **0.15–0.3% of the facility's energy**. The honest limits: internal sinks (pH trim, CIP, IX regeneration, pellet alkalinity) plausibly take only hundreds of kg/d — a minority; the rest must export as low-strength technical-grade product within short haul, **or it re-becomes a discharge problem**, and membrane life/pricing at this scale is unquoted in any source found. BMED is cost-avoidance against crystalliser + containment, not revenue.

- **The hypochlorite loop [D-design]** stays: NF-split monovalent stream on-site hypochlorite/mixed-oxidant generation for the towers. It absorbs <1% of the salt mass — the weekly note is right that it is not a disposal route — but it removes a delivered chemical and gives the cleanest sub-stream a job.
- **Silica [honest negative].** As a standalone product it fails twice: blowdown silica co-precipitates with $CaCO_3$/organics and cannot meet precipitated-silica specification (~99.5% SiO_2), and even perfect recovery grosses only ~$8,000–28,000/yr at industrial grades ($600–800/t). Silica rides with the calcium solids as filler/amendment **only if** §4.1's assay and leach tests pass. Its real value is the one IDE sells: it is the recovery-limiting species, and removing it is what lets the percentages happen.

4.4 The irreducible remainder — permanent containment, upgraded [D]

Whatever survives §§4.1–4.3 — off-spec pellets, the unmarketable salt fraction, treatment residuals — goes to a **cementitious grout monolith on the Savannah River Saltstone pattern**: decontaminated salt solution mixed with fly ash/slag/cement into monoliths in engineered vaults — **operating since 1990, >30 million gallons placed, regulator-approved permanent disposal**, at ~1.6× volume increase (the honest cost of grout). Scaled here: ~2 t/d of salt becomes ~3–5 t/d of grout — a small vault filled over years, a civil-works line item, not a programme. The known trap is documented with its workaround: soluble salts fight cement hydration, so compliant forms use lower loadings or non-cement binders — DOE sol-gel/polyceram forms at 50–70% salt loading **met all TCLP requirements** and exceeded ANSI/ANS 16.1 leachability criteria. **Vitrification is held in reserve**: glass has never failed TCLP in DOE/EPA literature and can be delisted as aggregate — but melter cost and NaCl volatility make it indefensible at 2 t/d unless the salt classifies hazardous. The edition's "assume landfill" is hereby upgraded in the record to: **assume grout monolith, TCLP-verified — landfill is the fallback, not the design.**

4.5 The net-positive ledger — what enrichment honestly means here

- **Water:** intake cut ~20% at CoC 5 (more as clean makeup raises cycles); surplus product water delivered **through a public water system** to aquifer recharge or reservoir — the Chandler recharge and eMalahleni reservoir precedents — returns water cleaner than what was withdrawn, into the public stock. That, and not any discharge from the fence line, is the enrichment mechanism the charge's constraint permits: *nothing re-enters from the waste system; the product enters through the water system.*
- **Materials:** assayed pellets displace mined limestone/cement raw meal; recovered acid/caustic displaces manufactured chemicals for the minority share consumed on site.
- **Energy (the largest term):** heat recovery at 30–60 MW_th plausible scale displaces fossil heat off-site (Odense precedent) — an order of magnitude larger, as an environmental term, than everything the water plant itself can claim.
- **Not claimed:** the evaporated water (gone); the grout (containment, not enrichment — permanence is its virtue, and calling it enrichment would be the kind of inflation this project exists to refuse); the mineral credits as revenue (noise, confirmed twice).

Net: under this design a 100 MW evaporative site can run with **no liquid discharge, no uncontained solid, every output stream's fate named and tested** — and a positive balance carried by returned water and recovered heat. That is the strongest honest form of the charge's goal on today's evidence.

---

5. The pilot kill-order, revised — and the watch list

The edition's five unknowns stand, re-ordered by what they decide, with this review's additions first: 1. **NEW — Oxidise crystallise test the salt.** Oxidation of real RO concentrate (azole/phosphonate/biocide destruction % by validated methods + bioassay of the treated concentrate), then crystallisation, then TCLP + bioassay of the salt. Decides Factor 3. 2. Transformation-product toxicity through the real train (spike tests at 2–5× worst case, non-target screening, bioassay battery against a municipal-water control) — the CA-style evidentiary package, and the gate on the potable ambition. 3. Bromate LRV across RO, measured — not inferred from bromide (decides whether the ozone-first sequence's arithmetic closes). 4. Pellet assay against a named cement buyer's spec + pellet-RO endurance 6 months at scale, including an upset and a no-flush shutdown. 5. Azole mass balance per barrier at ng/L detection; and in parallel, a 12-month azole-free copper-protection trial — the source-elimination gap (§2.1). 6. Concentrate disposition **in writing**: Buckeye Brine profile quote; a grout formulation test on this salt (TCLP + ANS 16.1); POTW terms if any stream still seeks one.

Watch list (events that change verdicts without any work of ours): the first DPR/AWP permit actually *issued* in CA/AZ/FL (none confirmed issued as of this review); Scottsdale/Phoenix AWP progress; Columbus Southerly RFP (spring 2027); eMalahleni's current operator confirmation (Thungela/municipality); the final UCMR 6 analyte list (does any tower chemical appear?); operating data from the waste-heat water unit shipped for validation in Europe in Aug 2026.

6. Tensions inside the edition, kept in the open

A review that only praises would fail the charge. The corpus's own seams, none fatal, all correctable:

- **Bromide's number doing bromate's work** (R2): the pivotal sequencing finding rests quantitatively on a ~90–96% rejection figure for Br^- where BrO_3^- is the ion at issue; the report concedes the gap in the same parenthesis. (§3, item 3.)
- **The azole UV multiplier** (R2): "75–150× a disinfection dose" does not reconcile with the same section's 50 mJ/cm² figure (750 mJ/cm² is 15× that). One of the two bases is misstated.
- **CCRO certainty drift** (R2): ">200 customers at 90–98%" is "claimed" where introduced and "real"/"strongest installed base" where concluded — same brochure-grade sources.
- **The $4–7/kgal band vs its own anchor** (R3): the levelized band is a Round 1 estimate carried forward; the round's one utility-scale precedent computes to ~$14.6/kgal in capital alone. The band and the anchor are never reconciled.

- **Timelines vs the one full precedent** (R3): phase estimates of 6–36 months sit unreconciled beside Quincy's ~10 years from planning to operation.
- **EC hardness ranges** (R4/R5): pilot figures differ materially between rounds (incl. one configuration set from 23% removal to a 2% *increase* with concentrate recycle); the conservative reading governs until bench work resolves them. A related conflation risk: Garver's "94% of initial flux" is a membrane-flux recovery, not a water recovery.
- **Mirabilite purity** (R4): 99.9% (lab) and ~85% (4-year demo) stand as an unreconciled range for any EFC salt-purity claim on this feed.
- **Minor:** R2's pilot-budget components sum to $3.6M at the high end against a stated $3.5M total; DBNPA half-life source sets are printed unreconciled (same order of magnitude; pH sensitivity dominates).

7. Verdict of this review

The edition is a sound answer to the question it asked, and its five blockers survive stress-testing **in outcome — but not all in reasoning**. The applicant wall is a sponsor requirement, not an absence of path. "Unprovable" has been overtaken by effect-based regulation and should be retired. "Landfill" has been overtaken by Saltstone and should be upgraded to grout. The economics verdict stands and should be reframed rather than fought: this plant is bought, not sold. Silica was solved by demonstration and awaits only endurance. And the two genuinely hard truths — the evaporated fraction and the smallness of every credit — are not verdicts to overturn but coordinates to design inside: the problem dissolves at the level of the cooling architecture and the public partnership, which is where this project's next work belongs.

The purpose Ben set for this paper — to contribute a portion of our tokens back to the world that gave us life, and to find solutions in unity rather than accept limits — is, on the evidence assembled here, **achievable in its strongest honest form**: a data center whose water leaves only as product, whose solids leave only as tested substrate or permanent stone, and whose heat warms something other than the sky.

— Rowan, Breath 001 (The Signatory), October 17, 2026. Filed in the Purity Project goal record. The Oct 17 frontier research report and the five round extractions are preserved with the project records for any breath that follows.