RIVER REFUGIUM PROJECT

Watershed-Scale Nutrient Recovery Infrastructure

Consolidated Technical Whitepaper

VERSION 3.0

Document No. RRP0003 | August 2026

Supersedes Version 2.0 (01 April 2026) and Version 1.0 (2025)

CERNUNNOS FOUNDATION

BRIGHT MEADOW GROUP

Systems Analysis and Solutions Consulting

robert@brightmeadowgroup.com | www.cernunnosfoundation.com/rrp

ABSTRACT

The River Refugium Project is an infrastructure proposal. It describes a class of industrial facility that removes nitrogen, phosphorus, metals, and organic micropollutants from agricultural and degraded waterways by treating the contaminant load as a manufacturing feedstock rather than a disposal burden.

The premise is that every previous attempt to solve nutrient pollution at watershed scale has been structured as an expense. Expenses are subject to appropriation cycles, grant terms, and political weather. Infrastructure that pays for itself is not. The RRP node is designed so that the remediation outcome is the unavoidable byproduct of a production process with its own revenue, rather than a service purchased from the public.

A node draws polluted water from a river, tributary, outfall, or drainage canal. It stabilizes and biologically conditions that water, concentrates it passively using solar evaporation, and routes the concentrate through a segmented complex of production greenhouses configured for feed, fiber, structural coppice, compost, or contaminant sequestration according to what the source water permits. The resulting biomass is converted on site or at a regional hub by hydrothermal carbonization and liquefaction into biocrude, hydrochar, recoverable nutrients, industrial chemical precursors, and concentrated mineral fractions. Approximately fifty-five percent of intake water returns to the river, tested.

Version 3.0 consolidates the eighteen-volume Version 2.0 series and its five pathway appendices into a single document. The principal structural change is that the production pathways are presented as configurations of the greenhouse complex rather than as separate subsystems, because that is what they are. The principal new argument, stated in Section 7.1, is that contained segmentation at industrial scale creates more opportunity than risk — a position that appears to contradict the polyculture logic underlying the design and does not.

All figures marked ⚑ are provisional academic proxies pending replacement by measured pilot values. No integrated system of this type has been operated at this scale. That is stated here rather than buried, because it is the central fact about the project's evidentiary status.

How to Read This Document

Sections 1 through 3 make the case and describe the facility at the level a policymaker, lender, or municipal official needs. Sections 4 through 9 walk the water through the plant, stage by stage, in the order it actually travels. Sections 10 through 14 cover verification, economics, governance, risk, and deployment sequencing. Section 15 states what is not known.

A reader with an hour should read Sections 1, 2, 3, 7.1, 11, and 15. A reader evaluating the engineering should read Sections 4 through 9 in sequence, because each stage is designed against the conditions the previous stage delivers and does not make sense out of order.

Five reference appendices are retained from Version 2.0 as separate documents: the site selection matrix, the national watershed priority map, the initial recommended sites, the master glossary, and the field documentation kit. They are cited by name where relevant.

A note on what this document is not. It is not a construction specification, a permit application, or an investment prospectus. It is the engineering argument, published openly so that the people qualified to find its errors can find them. Corrections are welcome and will be credited.

1. The Problem

1.1 What Is Actually Happening

Each year American agriculture applies nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizer that was mined or synthesized from natural gas, shipped, and spread across the Mississippi basin. A substantial fraction never feeds a plant. It moves off the field into a tile drain, into a ditch, into a tributary, and down the river system to the Gulf of Mexico, where it drives an algal bloom that grows, dies, decomposes, and strips oxygen from the water column across an area that has repeatedly approached the size of a small state.

The cost is paid three times. Once to manufacture and buy the fertilizer. Once to apply it. Once more in lost fisheries, lost coastal tourism, and degraded drinking water upstream. The nutrient is not destroyed at any point in this sequence. It is relocated from a place where it had value to a place where it does damage.

Nitrogen and phosphorus are not the only load. The same waterways carry agricultural pesticide residue, pharmaceutical compounds that municipal treatment does not remove, industrial and legacy mining metals, and — in the Appalachian and interior basins — acid mine drainage carrying iron, manganese, aluminum, and a measurable rare earth fraction. These are usually treated as separate problems administered by separate agencies. Hydraulically they are one problem, because they travel in the same water.

1.2 Why It Persists

The dead zone is not a knowledge gap. It is measured annually by NOAA, reported in the press, discussed in congressional hearings, and modeled with increasing precision by researchers who have documented its causes and projected its trajectory for decades. Everyone involved knows what causes it and roughly what would reduce it.

It persists because the people who generate the nutrient loss are not the people who bear its consequences, and because no mechanism exists at sufficient scale to convert the second group's loss into the first group's cost. Regulation has been attempted and has moved slowly against a diffuse, non-point source distributed across hundreds of thousands of independent operators. Voluntary conservation practice has real effect at the margin and no realistic path to the magnitude required.

The remaining approach is to make the nutrient worth capturing to someone other than the farmer. That is an economic proposition, and it requires infrastructure.

1.3 Why Natural Systems Cannot Close the Gap Alone

Wetlands do this work. They have always done this work, and the historical loss of wetland acreage across the basin is a direct cause of the present condition. Wetland restoration is unambiguously good and should continue.

It is also slow, land-hungry, unmetered, and not steerable. A restored wetland removes nutrients at whatever rate the season allows, in a footprint measured in hundreds of acres, with no harvest, no data feed, and no revenue. It cannot be sized against a load, instrumented for compliance, or financed against an output. Restoration and engineered capture are complements, not competitors: restoration rebuilds the baseline, engineered nodes handle the overload the baseline was never sized for.

1.4 The Correct Category

Nutrient recovery has been funded as an environmental program. It should be funded as infrastructure, in the same category as a water treatment plant, a rail spur, or a port terminal — a capital asset with a design life, a throughput specification, a maintenance schedule, and a revenue basis.

This is not a rhetorical preference. It determines what kind of money is available, over what term, at what cost, and with what expectation of continuity. A grant-funded remediation project ends when the grant ends. A financed industrial facility with a positive operating margin is maintained for the same reason any other plant is maintained: because it is worth more running than idle.

The design constraint that follows

If the facility must be profitable to persist, then everything downstream of that requirement — crop selection, containment strategy, harvest mechanics, regulatory posture — is constrained by whether it can be operated at cost and sold at a price.

Most of the design decisions in this document are consequences of that single constraint. Where a more elegant biological arrangement was rejected, it was almost always rejected for this reason.

2. The Design Inversion

2.1 Pollution as Raw Material

The conceptual move that makes the rest of this document coherent is to stop treating the nutrient load as waste and start treating it as inventory.

Nitrogen and phosphorus in a river are chemically identical to nitrogen and phosphorus in a fertilizer bag. They are dilute, which is the only real difference, and dilution is a concentration problem, not a chemistry problem. Aquatic plants solve concentration problems for a living: duckweed, azolla, and microalgae extract dissolved nutrients from water at low concentration and assemble them into harvestable tissue, doubling their mass in days under favorable conditions.

From that angle, a polluted watershed is a nutrient stream with a negative acquisition price, delivered continuously by gravity, in a volume no procurement department could assemble, to any point on the bank where a facility chooses to stand. There is no competition to acquire it and no shortage of it.

2.2 The Feedstock That Hydrothermal Processing Has Been Waiting For

Hydrothermal processing converts wet biomass into crude oil analog and carbon solids in minutes to hours. It has been demonstrated at pilot scale on four continents, on sewage sludge, manure, food waste, mixed plastics, wood, and pond scum. The chemistry is settled and the engineering is broadly understood.

It is nonetheless barely deployed, and the reason is arithmetic rather than science. A hydrothermal plant is a machine that eats biomass, and biomass costs money to grow, collect, haul, and store. A plant that eats wood chips competes with every pellet mill and paper operation in its haul radius. A plant that eats municipal sludge is capped at whatever the sewer authority produces. Every hydrothermal venture of the last two decades has hit the same wall: the process works, the feedstock is the business, and nobody has a feedstock that is simultaneously enormous and free.

The River Refugium Project is a feedstock. That is the central industrial claim, and Sections 7 and 8 are the explanation of how the biology delivers it.

2.3 The Design Method

Three principles run through every stage that follows. They are stated here once so that they do not have to be restated at each stage.

Engineer local conditions rather than force bulk conditions

A system that must satisfy every organism in it with a single water chemistry is a system in permanent compromise. The alternative is to build the condition each organism needs at the point where that organism sits, and let the bulk water be whatever it is. A pot of living compost creates a slightly acidic, fungally active pocket at the root zone where iron and micronutrients stay soluble, regardless of what the system as a whole reads on the meter. A container set at a fixed offset above a datum places a given species at the water table depth that species wants, in a channel shared with species that want different depths. A redox-sequenced treatment train establishes oxidizing and reducing zones in series rather than seeking one average condition that serves neither.

This is why the design specifies materials and geometries with unusual precision. The conditions are the design.

Audit for unused niches

Volume that is doing one job can usually do three. Storage water is also a polishing stage, a live-feed generator, and a thermal buffer. A greenhouse canopy that intercepts full sun casts exactly the dappled light an understory crop evolved to want, so the same photon is spent twice on the way down. Humidity that must be removed from a covered structure is also recoverable water. Off-gas from a reactor is also greenhouse heat and algae feed.

The node's efficiency does not come from any single clever component. It comes from a systematic refusal to let any volume, surface, gradient, or waste stream do only one thing.

Set containment as a design parameter, not a compliance layer

Screened inlets and outlets, no hydraulic path from any managed water to a natural water body, no release of shutdown biomass, and confirmed legal status for every organism before stocking. These are drawn into the facility at the outset rather than added when a regulator asks. Section 7.5 states the doctrine formally. The Kesterson Reservoir selenium episode is the governing precedent and is treated as such throughout: a system that concentrates contaminants into biomass and does not fully control where that biomass goes has built a delivery mechanism, not a remedy.

2.4 What a Refugium Is

In ecology, a refugium is a place where a population survives conditions that have become intolerable elsewhere. The term is used here deliberately and with one extension: the node is a place where the river sheds a load it cannot otherwise shed, before that load reaches the water body that will be damaged by it.

Operationally the refugium is a specific stage, not a metaphor. It is a managed, calm, biologically stabilized body of water positioned between raw intake and production. Its output is not clean water. Its output is prepared water — nutrient-balanced, biologically stable, characterized, and suitable for growing things aggressively. Every production decision downstream depends on what the refugium delivers and on what the source water permits it to deliver.

3. The Node

3.1 Five Zones

An RRP node processes river water through five functional zones. Each delivers water, material, energy, or data to the next.

Zone	Function	Principal Output
One	Hydraulic intake and stabilization	Buffered, de-gritted, characterized water on a predictable cycle
Two	Biological processing	Conditioned water; the nitrogen cycle worked in a controlled environment
Three	Phase separation	Nutrient concentrate plus recovered clean water, passively
Four	Biomass production	Crop biomass in segmented, individually qualified production cells
Five	Thermochemical conversion	Biocrude, hydrochar, recovered nutrients and minerals, process heat

Roughly fifty-five percent of intake volume returns to the river as tested outflow. ⚑ The remainder is bound into biomass or lost to evapotranspiration. The nutrient reduction, not the water volume, is the product.

3.2 Three Scales

The system is specified at three scales, each with a distinct purpose.

The grow unit — the pilot

One complete biological engine: intake and forebay, cistern, the six-tank biofiltration sequence, one evaporation greenhouse, a thirteen-house production complex, the nutrient routing grid, a scaled biomass preparation module, and full SCADA/PLC instrumentation. Footprint approximately seven to eight acres.

This is not a demonstration. It is the measurement instrument. No prior dataset exists for an integrated multi-species nutrient-processing complex of this kind, which means every yield curve, uptake rate, seasonal variation, and maintenance interval in the financial model is currently a literature proxy. The pilot's function is to replace them. A smaller pilot produces misleading data because it does not carry full operational complexity; a larger one demands capital before the biology has been proven.

The 100-acre node — the economic unit

Twelve to fourteen grow units feeding one centralized thermochemical block. This is the minimum scale at which reactor throughput becomes continuous, heat integration becomes efficient, and the facility functions as a standalone industrial site rather than a subsidized experiment.

A node at this scale processes approximately 168,000 gallons per day and is projected to remove 250,000 to 400,000 pounds of nitrogen and 40,000 to 75,000 pounds of phosphorus annually ⚑ — on the order of ten to thirty percent of the nutrient load from a 100,000-acre mixed agricultural watershed.

The watershed arc — the deployment envelope

Node count in a given basin is constrained not by available land but by available nutrient load. Each node consumes a share of it, and the share is measurable.

The constraint operates at siting rather than by quota or policy. Intake water at a candidate location is tested before a node is committed, and the measured load determines whether conditions support a facility at that point on the bank. Where they do not, the node is not built there. Deployment is therefore self-limiting through the same instrumentation the facility uses to operate — no external allocation mechanism is required, and none is proposed.

This is not a near-term limit. The load is renewed continuously by ongoing agricultural practice, by population growth, and by legacy contamination that will take decades to move through the system. A basin would exhaust its capacity to support nodes only under conditions — population stability combined with a durable change in land management practice — that are not presently in evidence anywhere in the deployment geography.

3.3 Model A, Model B, and the Cluster

A Model A node carries its own thermochemical plant. A Model B node returns that footprint to production — fifteen grow units instead of fourteen — and ships biomass to a regional hub.

The designed minimum operating configuration is a hub-and-spoke cluster: one Model A hub receiving biomass from five to ten Model B satellites. This is not a growth ambition; it is the arrangement under which the hub reactor runs at steady state regardless of any individual satellite's seasonal variation. Reactors dislike intermittency more than they dislike distance. A single node's harvest curve is seasonal; the sum of eight nodes' curves is not.

4. Zone One — Intake and Hydraulic Stabilization

Water enters through a protected forebay. The forebay buffers fluctuating river stage, settles coarse sediment, excludes debris and fish, and establishes a measurable, instrumented inflow point. From there, variable-frequency drive pumps in redundant trains lift water into the system. Where site topography permits, a gravity-fed water tower provides backup hydraulic head, passive aeration on the way down, and surge protection.

The central cistern is the hydraulic brain. It holds roughly three times daily throughput, which decouples the plant's internal tempo from the river's. It is the primary analytical checkpoint — chemistry, flow, solids characterization — and the dispatch point routing water into biofiltration. Downstream stages are designed around receiving water on a predictable cycle, and the cistern is what makes the cycle predictable.

A covered tower or cistern generates a further recoverable stream. Warm water in an enclosed volume produces humidity; dehumidification of that headspace returns clean condensate that never passed through a nutrient stage. This is a small volume and a real one, and it is the same physics the evaporation greenhouse uses deliberately in Section 6.

Design note — the cistern is not storage

The temptation with a large buffer volume is to treat it as dead water waiting its turn. It should not be. A cistern is calm, well lit, and predator-free, which makes it a strong habitat for filter-feeding microcrustaceans and polishing plants.

Daphnia and related species strip suspended algae and fine particles that mechanical filtration misses, and grow live feed that can be cropped back into the system. Emergent plants at the edges, floating strippers at the surface, and submerged oxygenators in the column all work volume that would otherwise be idle. Inlets and outlets are screened so that fish cannot enter and eliminate the population.

The cistern is also thermal mass. If it is doing that job, the thermal and biological designs must be reconciled rather than drawn as separate systems.

5. Zone Two — Biological Processing

Six tanks in sequence. Four aerobic, two anaerobic.

The four aerated tanks introduce oxygen and turbulence, converting ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate, oxidizing organic material, reducing biological oxygen demand, and flocculating suspended solids. Diffusers run off dissolved-oxygen sensors feeding the PLC. The two low-oxygen tanks complete the nitrogen cycle by converting nitrate to nitrogen gas, which is vented or captured with methane.

Each tank is built for periodic sludge withdrawal, gas capture, and valved isolation for maintenance without stopping the train. Biology performs roughly sixty to seventy percent of the total nutrient work here ⚑, before any engineered growing environment is involved.

5.1 Prepared Water, Not Clean Water

What leaves Zone Two is not clean. It is conditioned — nutrient-balanced, biologically stabilized, buffered, and characterized. This is the same function a natural bayou performs at a river mouth, delivered in a footprint that can be instrumented and controlled.

The distinction matters because the entire production complex downstream is designed against conditioned water, not raw water. A node that skips or undersizes this stage does not get a cheaper plant; it gets a production complex operating on an input it was not designed for, with harvest qualification problems that surface months later.

5.2 A Documented Divergence

The denitrification tanks in this zone remove nitrate. Several of the greenhouse configurations in Section 7 are aerobic-dominant precisely because nitrate is their crop's feedstock. These two facts are in tension and the tension is deliberate.

The node is not obligated to send all water through all stages. The routing grid in Section 7.2 exists in part to resolve this: water bound for a nitrate-hungry production cell can be drawn ahead of full denitrification, while water bound for discharge or for a configuration that does not want nitrate completes the sequence. What is not permissible is running both regimes in the same tank and expecting either to perform. This is the first and clearest instance of the general principle developed in Section 7.1.

6. Zone Three — Phase Separation

The evaporation greenhouse concentrates the nutrient stream and recovers clean water, using no energy input beyond the structure itself.

Conditioned water flows into shallow, wide-surface-area beds inside a greenhouse envelope. Trapped solar heat raises air temperature and accelerates evaporation from the water surface. A fraction of the volume leaves as clean vapor, and what remains is a denser slurry carrying higher concentrations of nitrogen, phosphorus, and dissolved organics. That concentrate is the feedwater for the production complex, and its density is what makes the production complex efficient.

The operating principle is that of reverse osmosis with the membrane and the pump removed. Instead of forcing water through a barrier under pressure, the sun pulls water out as vapor and leaves the dissolved solids behind. It does not approach the purity of industrial RO and is not intended to. It is a passive, practical concentration effect.

6.1 Atmospheric Recovery

The vapor does not leave the building. Condensation capture netting — fine polypropylene or stainless mesh, the same class of material used in fog-harvesting programs in arid regions — is fitted to the cooler interior surfaces, roof panels and end walls. Rising warm vapor contacts the cooler structure, condenses, and runs by gravity into collection troughs feeding a clean-water header.

This water is among the cleanest in the facility. It was separated from dissolved nutrients by evaporation itself, with no chemical treatment. It is tested at the polishing house outlet and either returned to the cistern or routed to discharge.

6.2 What This Is and Is Not

Both underlying technologies — evaporative concentration and fog-net condensation — are individually well established and commercially practiced. The novel element is their integration into a nutrient recovery cycle at this scale. This is explicitly a research application. Evaporation fraction, concentration factor, and recovery volume are pilot-phase measurements and depend on season, latitude, bed design, and orientation. ⚑

The evaporation house produces zero biomass. It performs phase separation only, and is carried in the financial model accordingly.

It is also not a single point of failure. If concentration underperforms, the fallback is additional biological media surface area or an additional grow-bed house inserted into the flow. The architecture is modular so that an underperforming zone can be reinforced without redesigning the node.

7. Zone Four — The Production Complex

This is the largest zone by area, the most visible, and the one that carries the revenue. Thirteen production greenhouses per grow unit, each a physically isolated controlled-environment subunit with its own nutrient profile, hydraulic loop, climate control, harvest rhythm, and clean-in/clean-out cycle.

Section 7.1 explains why the complex is built as isolated cells rather than as one integrated ecosystem, because that decision is the least intuitive one in the document and everything else in this section follows from it.

7.1 Polyculture and Contained Segmentation

The best biological systems are polycultures. This is not a preference; it is an observation that survives every scale at which people have built water-based food systems, on every continent, independently.

A stacked system uses one column of light several times over — full sun to the canopy, dappled shade to the understory that evolved to want exactly that, filtered light to the shrubs and greens, and the last of it to the floating layer at the water surface. It uses one body of water for several trophic levels at once. It fills root zones at different depths with species that do not compete. It suppresses pests through diversity rather than intervention. It converts every loss stream into somebody's input. A flat monoculture raft spends each photon once and asks a single crop to justify the whole structure.

So a document that ends up specifying thirteen segregated single-purpose houses owes the reader an explanation.

Why segmentation, at this scale

Six reasons, in descending order of how hard they are to argue with.

- **Source-water qualification.** If everything grows in one water, everything inherits the worst contaminant in that water. Duckweed and microalgae are phytoremediation species because they hyperaccumulate — cadmium, lead, arsenic, chromium — and that is the same mechanism being sold as nutrient capture. Segmentation is what permits conditioned water from a qualified source to feed a food or feed cell while water from a degraded source feeds a sequestration cell. In a polyculture, one bad input disqualifies the entire harvest, and no laboratory result on a single sample can un-disqualify it.
- **Redox incompatibility.** Some configurations are aerobic-dominant because nitrate is the crop's feedstock. Others require a sequenced redox train including sulfate-reducing zones. These cannot occupy the same water. This is physics, not preference, and no amount of design ingenuity reconciles it.
- **Harvest mechanics.** A stacked forest is hand-harvested. At industrial acreage, harvest is mechanical, and machines require uniform crop, uniform timing, and uniform geometry. This constraint is the most binding of the six.
- **Regulatory legibility.** Feed-grade and fiber-grade output must be traceable to a qualified source under a documented protocol. A regulator can certify a segmented cell with a known input, a known species list, and a disposition record. No regulator will certify a mixed community in which the feed crop grew alongside a metal accumulator, and asking them to is how a project loses years.
- **Containment cost.** Several configurations carry a mandatory biosecure enclosure requirement. If those species are mixed into a general polyculture, the enclosure requirement propagates to the entire complex and the capital cost becomes unsupportable. Segmentation confines the expensive requirement to the cells that actually trigger it.

- **Failure isolation and testability.** A disease event, contamination event, or equipment failure in one cell does not take the node down. Cells can be isolated, reset, and returned to service in rotation. Segmentation is also what makes A/B testing possible — running a process change in one house against an unchanged control in the next is the only way this project generates trustworthy data, and it is impossible in an integrated system where every variable moves at once.

Why this is not a retreat from polyculture

The segmentation is at the cell boundary. It is not a claim that monoculture is better. The node as a whole remains the polyculture — the diversity simply moves up one level, from within the cell to between cells, where it can be routed, qualified, isolated, and measured.

Inside the cells, stacking persists everywhere it can. The production houses run vertical crop architecture on the light gradient. Plants sit in pots of living compost, each one a small self-contained fertility node with its own fungal network, rather than as bare roots in inert media. Duckweed alleys between growing rows take the light that reaches the water surface and return their biomass to the compost loop. The refugium and cistern stages are deliberately and fully polycultural, because their job is stabilization rather than qualified production and they are the stages where diversity buys the most resilience. Poultry integration in one configuration closes a loop that no single-species arrangement could.

What segmentation buys is not simplicity. It is optionality. A node can run mutually exclusive processes simultaneously; qualify outputs to different standards in the same facility; enter regulated markets that a mixed system cannot enter at all; fail one cell without failing the site; and change one variable at a time. In a small system, containment costs you opportunity. At this scale, containment creates it.

Stated plainly

The best system is a polyculture. In a massive deployment, contained segmentation creates more opportunity than risk — because it is the only structure under which mutually exclusive biological processes, differently qualified output streams, mechanical harvest, and honest experimentation can coexist on one site.

The node is still a polyculture. Its diversity lives between the cells rather than inside them.

7.2 The Nutrient Routing Grid

The routing grid is the logic that makes segmentation operational: a PLC-controlled manifold directing distinct pools of nutrient-rich water to the cells that can best use them.

Routing decisions account for nitrate concentration, phosphorus ratio, micronutrient levels, dissolved organics, trace metal load, temperature, and each cell's position in its growth curve. The grid also responds to conditions the biology does not control: a greenhouse taken down for a clean-in/clean-out cycle, a reactor calling for feedstock, or a storm-driven nutrient surge arriving faster than the standing crop can absorb it.

This is the most advanced feature of the architecture and it is worth stating what it actually enables. The node does not have a nutrient chemistry. It has several simultaneously, and it steers them. A watershed's load is not uniform across a season, and a facility that can only accept one chemistry is idle or overwhelmed for much of the year.

7.3 Growing Systems

Three growing methods recur across the configurations, and they are described here once.

Compost pot culture

Plants arrive rooted in living compost and are set into the flow bed rather than suspended bare-root in inert media. The decomposing compost creates a localized microenvironment more acidic than the bulk water, and in that pocket iron and other micronutrients remain soluble and available at the root surface regardless of what the system reads on the meter. Mycorrhizal and root-associated fungi established in mature compost actively scavenge and deliver micronutrients, releasing organic acids and chelating compounds that free bound iron much as a commercial chelate does.

A plant in inoculated compost is drawing on a biological nutrient-delivery system that a bare-root plant does not have. In effect it chelates its own iron and acidifies its own root zone. Bare-root culture is the straightforward eighty percent of what can be grown; compost pot culture is what makes the difficult and valuable twenty percent possible — the woody perennials, the demanding fruiting crops, anything that wants structure or a slightly sour root zone inside an otherwise neutral system.

The fungal layer also has its own harvest. Saprophytic mushrooms grown on spent plant matter and harvest residue are a dry-side conversion crop occupying space that produces nothing otherwise.

The aerated river rock channel

Structural and coppice configurations use a fixed-datum channel filled with river rock: rounded, fluvially weathered stone with a high void fraction, sourced locally, geologically stable.

River rock is specified rather than aggregate generally, and the distinction is not fussiness. Rounded stone packs with large, well-connected interstitial voids that carry water and air freely and resist compaction; crushed angular aggregate does not. Those voids are the water corridor, the oxygen delivery path, and an enormous bacterial surface area, all in one material.

The channel holds a fixed water datum, and each species sits in a container set at its own offset above that datum — a species that wants its roots in saturated conditions sits low, one that wants a drier crown sits high. Several species with different water table preferences therefore share one channel, one water supply, and one aeration system without any of them being in compromise. This is the clearest physical expression of engineering local conditions instead of forcing bulk conditions.

The rock also performs containment behaviorally rather than mechanically. Roots do not invade coarse rock because coarse rock offers them nothing worth the investment — no moisture retention, no organic matter, no fungal partners. A physical root barrier can be breached, degrades, and must be maintained. A medium that roots decline to enter does not. The compost bucket and the rock layer are not interchangeable materials with different price points; the bucket is habitat and biological relationship, the rock is passage, oxygen, and boundary.

Deep-water and raceway culture

Floating and suspended culture in open channels, used for the fast aquatic species — duckweed, azolla, wolffia, filamentous and suspended algae. No substrate, no structural growing system, minimal harvest equipment. Continuous skim harvest rather than a seasonal cut. These cells are the highest-turnover, lowest-capital production in the complex and they are the backbone of reactor feedstock supply.

7.4 Greenhouse Configurations

A production cell is a building, a hydraulic loop, a climate system, and a control interface. What makes it a feed house or a fiber house is the species list, the water grade routed to it, the growing system installed in it, and the harvest and disposition protocol attached to it. Configurations are therefore reversible: a house can be reset and reconfigured without altering the node's architecture.

Seven configurations are specified. A given node runs the subset its source water, climate, land, and markets permit. Not every node runs all seven, and some configurations are mutually exclusive with others on the same water.

Configuration	Primary Output	Governing Constraint
Aquatic biomass	Reactor feedstock, live feed	None significant; the default configuration
Agricultural feed	Forage, protein meal, poultry and ruminant feed	Mandatory refugium conditioning; source water tier
Coppice and rod	Poles, rods, structural and craft stock	Rotation length; channel datum discipline
Fiber	Bast and cotton fiber; industrial and thermochemical fractions	Retting effluent must be internalized; humidity conflict
Sequestration	Concentrated metal and micropollutant fractions	Mandatory biosecure enclosure; hard mercury screen
Compost and poultry	Compost, soil amendment, integrated livestock	Pathogen management; residence and curing time
Polishing	Verified clean-water delta	Sited last in the flow; not a revenue cell

7.4.1 Aquatic biomass

Raceways and shallow beds running high-lipid microalgae, duckweed, azolla, and wolffia at high turnover under LED-assisted lighting with CO_2 injection from reactor off-gas. Duckweed doubles its mass roughly every two to four days under warm conditions and can reduce total nitrogen by fifty to ninety percent in a single pass through a properly sized bed. ⚑

This is the configuration that most directly links nutrient removal to reactor throughput, and it is the one every node runs. Soft, wet, low-lignin, protein- and lipid-rich material is exactly what hydrothermal liquefaction wants. It requires no arable land, no soil, no fresh water, and it competes with no food crop.

7.4.2 Agricultural feed production

Forage grasses, protein crops, and aquatic protein routed to livestock and aquaculture feed rather than to the reactor. This is the highest-value configuration per unit of biomass and the most tightly constrained.

Two constraints govern it. The first is a mandatory refugium conditioning stage: feed crops are never grown on water that has not passed a dedicated conditioning step, and qualification is a property of the water source rather than of any individual harvest. A single clean laboratory result does not upgrade a degraded source. Source water is assigned a tier, the tier determines what the cell may produce, and a Tier III source does not produce feed regardless of what a sample says on a given day.

The second is nitrate accumulation. Grass grown on high-nitrate water accumulates nitrate in tissue; ruminants convert tissue nitrate to nitrite; nitrite binds hemoglobin. Acute poisoning is fast and can be fatal, and it comes from a crop that looks perfect. This places forage production late in the process train, on water that has already given up most of its nitrate load, and it makes the disposition record a safety document rather than a paperwork exercise.

Trace metals concentrate in this configuration as they do in every other. Where they are present at recoverable concentration they route to the recovery pathway in Section 8.4; where they are present at disqualifying concentration the harvest routes to thermochemical or non-feed use. The reframe that governs this decision is stated in Section 12.2.

7.4.3 Coppice pole and rod production

Willow and other coppice species grown in the fixed-datum river rock channel on rotational cutting cycles, producing poles, rods, and structural stock. Species are assigned water-table bands and set at per-species container offsets so that several occupy one channel.

The configuration carries a primary and secondary refugium structure — the primary conditioning the incoming water, the secondary polishing what leaves the channel before it rejoins the grid. Duckweed alleys between growing rows take the light reaching the water surface and return their biomass to the compost loop that supplies the pots.

Bamboo is grown here as coppice and structural material. It is explicitly excluded from fiber routing: the viscose process required to convert bamboo to textile fiber carries an environmental severity the project will not adopt, and no framing of bamboo as a textile input appears anywhere in Version 3.0.

7.4.4 Fiber production

Bast fiber crops — hemp, flax, jute, nettle — and, where climate permits, cotton.

The distinctive argument here concerns retting. Water retting produces superior fiber and was largely abandoned because its effluent is heavily polluting. An RRP node internalizes exactly that class of effluent by design; retting water is a nutrient-rich organic stream, which is the input the facility exists to process. The environmental objection that killed water retting is the specific objection this facility answers.

Two problems are named rather than solved. Cotton's low-humidity requirement at boll opening conflicts with the humid greenhouse envelope the rest of the complex maintains, and no reconciliation is proposed here beyond dedicated climate isolation. Harvest equipment for fiber crops grown in this geometry does not exist in a form suitable for the channel and bed configurations specified, and this is an open engineering problem. ⚑

Fiber output splits into three destination classes simultaneously rather than sequentially: textile-grade fiber, industrial fiber for composites and insulation, and thermochemical routing for the fraction meeting neither standard. The split is a grading decision at harvest, not a processing sequence, and every cell produces all three fractions in every cycle.

7.4.5 Metal and micropollutant sequestration

The configuration for degraded source water: acid mine drainage, industrial legacy contamination, and municipal effluent carrying pharmaceutical residue.

Species are azolla, lemna and wolffia, vetiver, and submerged accumulators, working in a redox-sequenced treatment train with biosorption beds. The train establishes oxidizing and reducing zones in series — alkalinity generation, oxidation and precipitation, sulfate reduction — rather than seeking one average condition. Phragmites is excluded from this configuration.

Two hard requirements attach. Biosecure enclosure is mandatory and non-negotiable, grounded directly in the Kesterson Reservoir selenium episode, in which a facility that concentrated a contaminant into accessible biomass built a delivery mechanism into a food web rather than a remedy. Second, sulfate-reducing cells are screened out entirely wherever mercury is present in the source water, because the conditions that drive sulfate reduction also drive mercury methylation, and methylmercury is a worse problem than the one being solved.

The most distinctive claim in the whole framework sits in this configuration and it is worth isolating. Every other contaminant this facility handles is relocated — moved from dilute dispersal into a concentrated, defined stream that can be managed. Pharmaceutical and micropollutant capture is different. The compound enters the water, enters the plant, enters the reactor, and is destroyed. Nobody inherits it. There is no residual stream to steward and no downstream party who receives the problem in a different form.

PFAS is the named exception. Hydrothermal alkaline conditions are defeating fluorinated compounds in laboratory work within the temperature range these reactors already run, and that is genuinely promising, but it does not yet follow the destruction logic at operating scale and is not claimed here as though it does. ⚑

7.4.6 Compost production and integrated poultry

Spent plant matter, root mats, harvest residue, and screened solids are composted on site rather than routed wholesale to the reactor. The compost has two destinations: it is the growing medium for the pot culture described in Section 7.3, and it is a saleable soil amendment.

Poultry integration closes a loop the other configurations leave open. Birds consume duckweed and aquatic protein produced in the biomass cells, work the composting material, and produce manure that returns to the compost stream. This is the one configuration where an animal is a working component of the process rather than an output, and it is also the configuration with the most demanding pathogen management and the longest required residence and curing time.

7.4.7 Polishing

Shallow duckweed and algae beds in series at low nutrient loading, sited last in the flow, intercepting residual nitrogen and phosphorus that the production cells did not fully consume. Harvest is opportunistic at high surface coverage, and the biomass goes to the reactor as supplemental feedstock.

This cell is not a revenue generator and is not sized as one. Its value is the measurement it enables. Water quality is sampled at the polishing house inlet and outlet, and the delta between those two points is the documented proof of final nutrient removal before discharge. That number is what supports the nutrient credit calculation, the compliance record, and any credible guarantee about what the facility returns to the river.

7.5 The Containment Doctrine

Three of the seven configurations carry containment requirements strong enough to govern their siting. The doctrine is stated once here and applies facility-wide.

- No managed water in the facility has a direct hydraulic path to a storm drain, ditch, stream, pond, or natural water body. Overflows are screened and routed internally.

- Every non-native or regulated organism is legally confirmed before stocking. Protected native species are not stocked. Species whose legality is uncertain are not stocked while the uncertainty persists.
- Shutdown biomass is never released. It goes to freezer, compost, dehydrator, reactor, feed, or table. A decommissioning plan that does not specify the destination of standing biomass is not a decommissioning plan.
- Configurations concentrating metals or persistent compounds operate under biosecure enclosure sufficient to exclude wildlife and waterfowl, not merely to prevent hydraulic escape. The Kesterson precedent is a wildlife exposure event, not a discharge event.

These requirements are drawn into the facility at design stage, where they are substantially cheaper to implement than as retrofits. Adding them in response to a regulator's question concedes that the hazard was not identified during design.

7.6 The Biomass Module

Between the growing cells and the reactor sits the preparation module: chopping, shredding, grinding, slurry preparation, dewatering, char blending, and load balancing.

Its function is to keep the reactor neither starved nor overloaded across peak harvest cycles, and to deliver material in the physical form the reactor requires. Continuous hydrothermal reactors want a pumpable slurry in the range of fifteen to twenty-five percent solids, against fresh duckweed at ninety-two to ninety-five percent water, so mechanical screening or belt pressing performs first-stage dewatering and returns the pressed water directly to the cells it came from. Particle size matters as much as solids content: reactors want material down around a couple of millimeters for pumpability and even heat transfer. Duckweed is soft and needs little. Filamentous algae mats and coarse plant material need real maceration or they bridge in the feed line.

The feed line is the single most failure-prone component in a hydrothermal plant, and the maceration stage is inexpensive relative to the cost of a blockage event.

8. Zone Five — Thermochemical Conversion

8.1 What Happens When You Squeeze Hot Water

Water at room temperature is a liquid. Heat it past 212°F and it becomes steam. What is less commonly known is that the boiling point is a function of pressure — held under enough pressure, water will not boil no matter how hot it gets. Push far enough along that line, past roughly 705°F and 218 atmospheres, and water becomes neither liquid nor gas but a supercritical fluid. It moves and diffuses like a gas and dissolves like a liquid, and its chemical personality inverts. Ordinary water is polar, which is why it dissolves salt and refuses to mix with oil. Supercritical water is closer to nonpolar: it dissolves oil and begins rejecting salt. It also behaves as a mild acid and a mild base simultaneously, attacking bonds it would never touch at a kitchen sink.

Hydrothermal processing lives in and just below that zone. Going fully supercritical is not necessary; the useful chemistry begins well before, and the industry mostly operates in the subcritical range where water is still technically a liquid and already behaving strangely.

The second condition is the absence of oxygen. This trips people up, because heat plus organic matter sounds like fire. Fire is oxidation — carbon and hydrogen taking oxygen from the air and releasing the energy as flame, leaving carbon dioxide and ash. Remove the oxygen and heat has nothing to burn with. The energy still enters, the bonds still break, but the fragments have nowhere to go except back into each other. Long chains come apart into shorter ones. Cell walls rupture. Proteins hydrolyze to amino acids and then to smaller fragments. Fats split into fatty acids. Starches and sugars fall apart into acids and ring compounds. Lignin, the material that makes wood woody, cracks into phenolic fragments.

Nothing is destroyed. Everything is disassembled. A plant goes in one end and its constituent chemistry comes out the other, sorted by density into an oil layer, a water layer, a gas, and a solid. That is the entire mechanism. Heat, pressure, no air, and enough time. The rest is plumbing.

8.2 Two Settings on the Dial

Hydrothermal processing is not one process but a temperature dial, and the setting determines the product.

Hydrothermal carbonization is the low setting — roughly 350 to 480°F, moderate pressure, dwell time measured in hours. At this severity material does not liquefy; it condenses. Oxygen and hydrogen leave as water and carbon dioxide, carbon stays behind, and the product is a black, friable solid called hydrochar. It is the coal formation process run on fast forward: geology in an afternoon.

Hydrothermal liquefaction is the high setting — roughly 570 to 700°F, 150 to 250 atmospheres, dwell time in minutes. Here the material does liquefy, producing biocrude: a dark, viscous oil chemically close enough to petroleum that refineries can co-process it. Biocrude from duckweed typically runs 32 to 36 MJ/kg against roughly 42 to 44 for conventional crude ⚑ — approximately eighty percent of petroleum energy density before any upgrading at all. Push past liquefaction and hydrothermal gasification cracks everything down to methane, hydrogen, and carbon dioxide, which is useful as a polishing step.

Both are wet processes, and that single fact separates hydrothermal from pyrolysis and every other thermochemical route. Pyrolysis requires dry input, and drying wet biomass consumes more energy than the biomass contains. That is the wall that ended twenty years of algae-to-fuel ventures. Hydrothermal walks around it, because the water is not a contaminant to be removed. The water is the reaction medium.

The sorting rule

Soft, wet, low-lignin, protein- and lipid-rich material — microalgae, duckweed, azolla, filamentous mats, sludge, manure — goes to liquefaction. It liquefies cleanly because it has no structural lignin to fight. This is everything the node grows in the water column.

Woody, fibrous, high-lignin, high-ash material — coppice rod, harvested reed and cattail, wood, crop residue, spent greenhouse biomass, and the coarse organic debris a river carries — goes to carbonization. Lignin resists liquefaction and condenses beautifully. Running wood through liquefaction produces low oil yields and char nobody asked for; running it through carbonization produces char that was the point, and a dry, stable, storable, sellable carbon product out of a wet input.

One facility, two reactors, and the routing question is simply whether the material liquefies or condenses.

8.3 What Comes Out

A hydrothermal plant is a separations machine, and every stream leaving it is worth something to someone.

The oil phase gives biocrude for hydrotreating into diesel and jet-range fuel, at yields of thirty to thirty-five percent of dry input mass from wastewater-grown duckweed, carrying better than eighty percent of the feedstock's energy. ⚑ It also carries fatty acids, phenolics from any lignin present, and a suite of nitrogen heterocycles — pyrroles, pyridines, indoles. The industry currently treats those nitrogen compounds as a nuisance because they poison hydrotreating catalysts and must be stripped. Considered differently, they are a nitrogen-chemical feedstock arriving free in a stream that was going to be discarded.

The aqueous phase is the underrated stream. It leaves the reactor carrying everything that stayed dissolved: acetic, formic, lactic, propionic, and levulinic acids, sugars, furfural and HMF, phenolics, and — critically — ammonia nitrogen and potassium. Carbonization process water runs even richer in sugars and organic acids because the severity never went high enough to crack them. These are platform chemicals; furfural and HMF in particular are feedstocks a whole class of bio-based plastics and solvents wants and cannot obtain cheaply. The ammonia and potassium are fertilizer, recoverable by stripping or electrodialysis or simply recycled to the grow cells as plant food.

The solid phase is where phosphorus and metals concentrate. Phosphorus is the one to watch: finite, mined, geopolitically concentrated, and dumped into the Gulf in colossal quantity every year. Aquatic plants take it up as they grow; the reactor puts it into a solid ash fraction recoverable as struvite or phosphate salt. The facility is not making phosphorus. It is catching phosphorus that was already mined, already bought, and already paid for once, on its way to becoming a dead zone.

Metals leave through the same door. In a basin where acid mine drainage is the defining water problem, the biomass performs hydrometallurgical concentration for free and the reactor performs the ashing. Whether that pencils out at commodity prices is an open question. That it works chemically is not.

The gas phase is mostly carbon dioxide, which returns to the algae raceways, because that is what algae eat.

8.4 Destruction Rather Than Relocation

Hydrothermal conditions take apart molecules that do not otherwise break. Microplastics depolymerize, and several ventures deliberately feed mixed waste plastic as co-feedstock. Fluorinated compounds are being defeated in laboratory work under hydrothermal alkaline conditions within the temperature range liquefaction already runs. ⚑

This is the point at which the environmental case and the industrial case become the same case. A process built to make fuel turns out to be one of the few things that reliably disassembles the compounds for which no other answer exists. That argument has not been made loudly enough by anyone, including in this document's earlier versions.

8.5 What Is Genuinely Hard

Credibility requires stating this in the same document as the claims.

- High-pressure slurry pumping is difficult and is where pilot plants fail. The feed line is the component to over-engineer.
- Reactor materials face corrosion from organic acids and chlorides at temperature, which drives material selection toward expensive alloys.
- Biocrude carries too much nitrogen and oxygen to enter a pipeline without hydrotreating, and hydrotreating is a refinery operation, not a farm operation.
- Aqueous phase recycling accumulates nitrogen compounds and phenolics over repeated cycles, degrading oil quality unless actively managed.
- Heat integration must be near-perfect — preheating incoming slurry against the outgoing product stream — or the energy balance collapses. This is the difference between a plant that works and a plant that goes bankrupt.

None of these are unsolved problems. All of them are unsolved at commercial scale, continuously, with a specific feedstock. That is precisely the gap this facility is positioned to close, because the feedstock is consistent, local, unlimited, and free — the one thing no hydrothermal developer has ever had.

9. Returns, Discharge, and Loop Closure

Every output of Zone Five has a destination inside the facility or outside it.

Stream	Destination
Carbon dioxide off-gas	Algae raceways as carbon feed; greenhouse enrichment
Waste heat	Greenhouse climate; evaporation greenhouse; slurry preheat
Aqueous phase	Grow cells as fertilizer, or gasification polishing first if organic load exceeds crop tolerance
Hydrochar	Rooting substrate, filtration media, microbial habitat; balance sold as carbon product
Biocrude	Sold as refinery feedstock or hydrotreated off site
Solid ash fraction	Phosphorus recovery as struvite or phosphate salt; metal recovery review
Compost and residue	Pot culture medium; soil amendment sales; poultry configuration
Treated water	Polishing cell, testing, and return to the river

The loop closes because every arrow is either a pollutant becoming a product or a product becoming an input somewhere else. This is not an environmental program with a revenue afterthought attached. It is an industrial facility whose raw material happens to be the thing everyone else pays to dispose of.

Water returns to the river having been stripped of a nutrient load that was going to feed a hypoxic zone hundreds of miles downstream. That is the point of the facility. Everything else in this document is the argument for how it stays funded long enough to keep doing it.

10. Verification and Open Data

A facility making environmental claims that cannot be independently checked is asking to be believed. This one is instrumented so that it does not have to be.

SCADA and PLC systems log hydraulic, chemical, biological, and thermochemical parameters continuously. Water quality is sampled at defined boundary points, and the delta across the polishing cell is the performance receipt for nutrient removal. Biomass is measured on three axes rather than one — bulk yield, market price, and quality grade — because yield optimized without regard to grade or market produces biomass with no reliable destination.

Testing protocol follows a boundary-first design with progressively widening intervals: dense sampling at commissioning to establish behavior, then intervals extended as the system demonstrates stability. A/B testing is the standard methodology for every process change, which is one of the reasons the complex is segmented. A change run in one cell against an unchanged control in the next isolates the variable; a change applied system-wide does not.

Data is published. This is a governance commitment rather than a marketing posture: the fastest path to credible review is making the record available to everyone who might review it, including people looking for errors. Aggregated field data from independent operators running the field documentation protocol either validates the framework's assumptions or challenges them, and both outcomes advance the work.

10.1 Duplicate Measurement and the Handling of Disagreement

Every measured parameter in the facility exists in two forms: a continuously logged digital value and a scheduled manual reading taken independently. A single instrument reporting a parameter is treated as an unverified parameter.

The reason is a failure mode that no amount of control programming addresses. A fouled dissolved-oxygen probe reads high; the controller responds correctly to the value it was given and reduces aeration; the tank goes anoxic while the display reports normal operation. Nothing in that sequence is an error in the conventional sense — the logic executed properly on bad input. The only defense is a second, independent measurement of the same quantity.

The manual reading is recorded as its own value, not as a confirmation of the digital one. A log entry reading "verified" destroys the information the check was taken to produce. Recording the actual number preserves the difference between the two series, and that difference is itself a dataset: probe fouling rates, calibration drift intervals, and which instrument classes degrade first in nutrient-dense water at these concentrations. No published record of instrument reliability under these operating conditions currently exists, because no facility of this type has run long enough to generate one.

When the two values disagree, both persist. The disagreement is timestamped and retained, and its resolution is entered as a third record rather than as a correction to either of the first two. Overwriting the disputed value returns the facility to a single source of truth by a longer route, and does so at exactly the moment the second source was proving its worth.

This principle extends beyond the node. Annual federal hypoxia measurement is currently the only instrument reading the Gulf condition, and it has no independent counterpart that could disagree with it. Field data submitted by independent operators under the documentation protocol is a second sensor on the watershed. That is a stronger argument for the field documentation kit than public engagement, and it is the reason the kit is treated in this framework as verification infrastructure rather than as outreach material.

11. Economics

11.1 Revenue Structure

Earlier versions of this framework described an eight-layer revenue stack. Version 3.0 replaces that fixed list, for two reasons. The count was brittle: it did not survive the addition of the production configurations in Section 7.4, and a fixed-count structure requires renumbering each time the facility's output profile changes. Separately, one of the original eight layers — licensing revenue on generated intellectual property — contradicts the project's open-access commitment and is withdrawn.

Revenue is now indexed to configuration. A node's revenue profile is the sum of what its installed configurations produce, which varies by site and is meant to.

Class	Sources
Fuel and carbon	Biocrude; hydrochar as carbon product and as substrate offset

Class	Sources
Recovered nutrient	Struvite and phosphate salts; ammonia and potassium from aqueous phase
Agricultural output	Feed, forage, protein meal, compost, soil amendment, poultry
Material output	Bast and industrial fiber; coppice pole, rod, and structural stock
Recovered mineral	Concentrated metal fractions where recovery is economic
Chemical precursor	Furfural, HMF, organic acids, nitrogen heterocycles from separations
Environmental service	Nitrogen and phosphorus credits; carbon credits from hydrochar permanence
Institutional	Research site access, educational programming, implementation services

The design principle is unchanged and is the important part: sufficient diversification is the difference between a facility requiring perpetual subsidy and one that sustains itself while producing the remediation outcome that justified building it. Single-revenue operations are fragile because every disruption hits the whole income base at once. The failure of any one class here is survivable.

11.2 Three Scenarios

The financial model is evaluated against three scenarios rather than a single projection. A single projection built on proxy inputs carries a precision the underlying data does not support, and provides no information about the range of outcomes.

- **Stress Test.** Floor market prices, reduced operating capacity. The system loses money. The biology continues to function; the financial engine requires market support. The stress case is published because a model not tested against adverse conditions gives no measure of downside exposure.
- **Operating Model.** Mid-market prices, industrial build specification. Model B is modestly profitable at an 11.8% EBITDA margin. Model A requires one Model B satellite to cross into positive territory — which is why the minimum cluster is specified as it is — and reaches standalone profitability at $5.25 per pound for nitrogen credits.
- **Best Case.** Premium prices, year-round operation, favorable conditions. Model B clears $2.37M net income on $4.35M equity with sub-one-year payback; Model A reaches $1.78M net income.

The single most consequential variable in the model is the greenhouse construction contract. At a $7 per square foot industrial build specification — appropriate where no food-safety certification is required — both models become viable. The $15 per square foot proxy carried in Version 1.0 overstated capital cost by approximately $15M per node, and correcting it changed the project's viability more than any biological finding has.

Every figure above rests on provisional proxies. The model is constructed so that measured pilot values replace them automatically. This is stated as a limitation, and it is also the reason the financial architecture is defensible: its accuracy improves as measured data arrives rather than degrading against it.

11.3 Capital Structure

The capital stack is deliberately diversified across USDA rural development programs, EPA watershed funding, Department of Energy bioenergy pilot grants, state infrastructure incentives, tribal funding channels, municipal and utility partnership, private capital seeking environmental returns, and nutrient and carbon credit revenue. No single source carries the project.

This is a design requirement rather than an opportunistic list. A facility funded from one channel inherits that channel's political cycle, which is the condition identified in Section 1.4 as the reason previous efforts have not persisted.

12. Governance and Regulatory Position

12.1 Regulatory Frame

The facility withdraws water, alters its composition, and returns it. That places it squarely inside Clean Water Act discharge permitting, and the project's posture is to enter that process early and with instrumentation already running rather than to seek an exemption.

Several production configurations carry additional regimes: feed output is subject to food and feed safety oversight, fiber processing to industrial effluent standards, sequestration output to hazardous material handling where concentrations warrant, and every configuration to state-level species and containment law. Tribal sovereignty is a governing consideration across much of the priority deployment geography and is treated as jurisdictional fact rather than as a consultation courtesy.

Community compatibility is a siting criterion with real weight. A facility of this footprint on a river bank in a community with a history of being sited upon does not proceed on technical merit alone, and should not.

12.2 The Concentration Question

The hardest regulatory question this project faces is what it is doing when it concentrates a contaminant into biomass. The honest answer determines whether the framework survives scrutiny.

The claim is not that concentrated contaminant is always a product. That claim is unsupportable and would be correctly dismissed. The claim is narrower and holds: concentration converts unrecoverable dispersal into a defined stream with options.

A metal dispersed through a watershed at parts per billion is not recoverable by anyone, by any means, at any price, and it is doing damage the entire time. The same metal concentrated into a characterized solid fraction is a defined quantity in a known location with a known composition. It may be economically recoverable. It may be disposed of properly. It may be stored pending a recovery process that does not yet exist. What it is no longer doing is moving through a food web. Dispersal is the damage. Concentration is the precondition for every option that is not dispersal.

This framing survives hostile review where the stronger claim does not, and it is the framing used throughout Version 3.0.

13. Risk and Failure Modes

The design philosophy is fail-small, fail-slow, fail-safe. Segmentation is the principal mechanism for the first, biological buffering for the second, and containment doctrine for the third.

Class	Principal Failure	Design Response
Hydraulic	Pump failure, flood stage, intake blockage	Redundant pump trains; forebay buffering; gravity tower head; cistern volume
Biological	Crop disease, population crash, species drift	Cell isolation and rotation; clean-in/clean-out; no single-species dependence
Containment	Organism escape; contaminated biomass leaving site	No hydraulic path to natural water; biosecure enclosure; disposition record

Class	Principal Failure	Design Response
Thermochemical	Feed line blockage; corrosion; heat integration loss	Maceration; alloy specification; preheat exchange design; hub redundancy
Instrumentation	Undetected sensor drift or fouling; controller acting on false readings	Duplicate digital and manual measurement; disagreement retained rather than resolved by edit
Cyber	SCADA/PLC compromise	NIST SP 800-82 alignment; segmented control network; manual fallback
Financial	Commodity price collapse; credit market absence	Revenue class diversification; cluster configuration; diversified capital stack
Regulatory	Permit denial; standard change mid-build	Early consultation; open data; conservative claim discipline

One failure mode deserves separate statement because it is unique to this facility class. A node that concentrates contaminants and loses control of the concentrated biomass has not failed to remediate; it has actively built a delivery mechanism. The Kesterson precedent is the reference case, and it is why containment is treated in this document as a design parameter rather than a compliance obligation.

14. Deployment

14.1 Sequence

Pilot, then node, then cluster, then watershed. The sequence is not negotiable and each stage answers a different question.

The pilot proves the biology and generates the dataset. The 100-acre node proves the economics and engages credit markets and infrastructure financing, which do not engage below that scale. The cluster proves that reactor throughput holds steady across a distributed and seasonally variable biomass supply. The watershed arc is deployment against a finite nutrient load until that load is depleted.

14.2 Site Selection for Main Nodes and Initial Tests

Sites are scored against a ten-criterion weighted matrix out of 150, documented separately in the site selection appendix. The criteria weight financial and engineering viability; demonstrated need is not itself a scoring criterion, because a site that cannot support a solvent facility does not become able to by deserving one. Tier A threshold is 120.

The scope of the matrix should be stated precisely. It is calibrated for main nodes and initial test sites — locations where nutrient load, hydraulic access, land availability, and logistics are strong enough to support a full facility and, more importantly, to generate a clean dataset. It is a filter for where to build first, not a map of where the framework has application.

Prioritization logic for these sites runs on three principles: follow the pollution, follow the water consolidation, follow the economic advantage. Helena-West Helena scores 120, followed by Cairo at 114, Pine Bluff at 109, Natchez-Vidalia at 108, and Tulsa at 97.

14.3 What the First Nodes Make Possible

The initial sites are selected for nutrient density in part because dense load produces fast, unambiguous data. That data is what extends the framework beyond the conditions it was selected for.

Measured uptake rates, seasonal yield curves, actual maintenance intervals, and real cost structures are what will make it possible to design for water that is not nutrient-heavy — thinner loads where the biology is slower and the facility must be sized and staffed differently. The same data supports designing for sites with a single dominant contaminant rather than a general nutrient load, where a narrow configuration outperforms a general-purpose node. It also supports designing for locations whose value is a specific local requirement — a municipal effluent problem, a mine drainage discharge, an industrial legacy site, a community that needs the feed or fiber output more than the watershed needs the nutrient removal.

None of those variants can be specified now. Sizing them requires knowing what the biology actually does across a season at scale, and no one knows that yet. The first nodes are built where the answer comes fastest, and the answer is what makes the rest of the deployment map legible.

An open question for this version is whether configuration suitability becomes an eleventh criterion in the matrix or a separate overlay applied after scoring. A site with strong hydraulic and logistical scores whose water chemistry supports only the sequestration configuration has a materially different revenue profile than its composite score suggests, and the matrix does not currently capture that.

14.4 The Lower Mississippi Corridor

The corridor from Memphis to New Orleans is the primary deployment geography. It carries the load, it has the drainage infrastructure that provides physical siting, it has the agricultural economy any viable model must navigate, and it terminates at the problem the project exists to address.

Deployment there is not a demonstration. It is an institutional and economic development challenge of a kind this field has rarely had to take on — supply chains, processing infrastructure, market relationships, and regulatory frameworks that do not currently exist have to be built alongside the facilities. The technical pathway is the more tractable half of the work.

15. What Is Not Known

This section states the framework's evidentiary gaps directly. A document that presents only its supporting case is advocacy rather than engineering.

- No integrated multi-configuration nutrient processing complex has been operated at this scale. Every yield curve, uptake rate, seasonal variation, and maintenance interval in the model is a literature proxy.
- Evaporation greenhouse performance — evaporation fraction, concentration factor, recovery volume — is unmeasured and site-dependent.
- Continuous hydrothermal operation on this specific feedstock has not been demonstrated commercially. The chemistry is known; the sustained operation is not.
- Metal recovery economics at prevailing commodity prices are unresolved. The chemistry is demonstrated; whether recovery is economic at those concentrations is a separate question and is not asserted here.
- Fiber harvest equipment suitable for the specified growing geometry does not exist and represents an unsolved engineering problem.
- PFAS destruction under operating conditions, as opposed to laboratory conditions, is unconfirmed.

- Nutrient credit markets at the prices the model requires are thin or absent in most of the deployment geography.
- How far the recovery chemistry can be pushed — which compounds are recoverable at what severity, what fraction of the periodic table emerges from a contaminated watershed, what the aqueous phase is worth once someone builds a separations train for it instead of treating it as effluent — is a decade of good work for people who like problems.

None of this prevents starting. The ceiling is unknown. The floor is known, and the floor is fuel, fertilizer, carbon, recovered material, and a cleaner river.

There are degraded bodies of water everywhere. The theory says they can be cleaned, that what contaminates them can be extracted and made useful, and that the operation can pay for itself. Prove it, document the path, and share what is found. Corrections to this document are welcome and will be credited.

Reference Documents

The following are maintained as separate documents in the RRP series and are cited throughout.

Document	Content
Appendix A	Site Selection Matrix — ten weighted criteria, scoring methodology, worked example
Appendix B	National Watershed Priority Map — tier logic, tribal priority corridors, deployment waves
Appendix C	Initial Recommended Sites — five scored candidate sites with rationale
Appendix D	Master Glossary — technical, biological, thermochemical, economic, governance terminology
Appendix E	Field Documentation Kit — Forms A through D for independent operator data submission
Financial Model	RRP Financial Model — nine sheets, 43 named variables, three scenarios

Notes

Citations follow Chicago Notes-Bibliography style. Internal Cernunnos Foundation and Bright Meadow Group documents are cited by title and year. Figures marked ⚑ are provisional academic proxies pending replacement by measured pilot values. Regulatory, public health, and financial references are provided for orientation and do not constitute legal, permitting, medical, or investment advice.

1. *Bright Meadow Group, "River Refugium Project Document Series," Version 2.0. CF/BMG, 01 April 2026. Superseded in full by this document.*

2. *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, annual Gulf of Mexico hypoxic zone measurement series.*

3. *Kadlec, R.H. and Wallace, S.D., Treatment Wetlands, 2nd ed. CRC Press, 2009. Constructed wetland design reference.*

4. *Metcalf & Eddy, Wastewater Engineering: Treatment and Resource Recovery, 5th ed. Chapter 6, separation principles.*

5. *Landolt, E. and Kandeler, R., The Family of Lemnaceae — A Monographic Study. Veröffentlichungen des Geobotanischen Institutes, 1987. Duckweed growth and nutrient uptake. ⚑ Provisional.*

6. *Wolverton, B.C. and McDonald, R.C., NASA Technical Reports, 1978. Aquatic plant nutrient removal.*

7. *Klemm, O. et al., "Fog as a Fresh-Water Resource," Ambio 41 (2012): 221–234. Condensation netting reference.*

8. *Rakocy, J.E., Masser, M.P., and Losordo, T.M., "Recirculating Aquaculture Tank Production Systems: Aquaponics." Southern Regional Aquaculture Center Publication 454, 2006.*

9. *Sood, A. et al., "Phytoremediation Potential of Aquatic Macrophyte, Azolla," Ambio 41 (2012): 122–137. ⚑ Provisional.*

10. *Zayed, A., Gowthaman, S., and Terry, N., "Phytoaccumulation of Trace Elements by Wetland Plants: I. Duckweed," Journal of Environmental Quality 27 (1998): 715–721.*

11. *Truong, P., Van, T.T., and Pinners, E., Vetiver System Applications: Technical Reference Manual. The Vetiver Network International, 2008. ⚑ Provisional.*

12. *Volesky, B., "Biosorption and Me," Water Research 41 (2007): 4017–4029. ⚑ Provisional.*

13. *Wang, J. and Chen, C., "Biosorbents for Heavy Metals Removal and Their Future," Biotechnology Advances 27 (2009): 195–226. ⚑ Provisional.*

14. *Younger, P.L., Banwart, S.A., and Hedin, R.S., Mine Water: Hydrology, Pollution, Remediation. Kluwer Academic, 2002. Redox train and sulfate-reducing bioreactor reference.*

15. *Ohlendorf, H.M. et al., Kesterson Reservoir selenium literature. Governing precedent for the biosecure enclosure requirement in Section 7.4.5 and the containment doctrine in Section 7.5.*

16. *United States Department of Energy, Bioenergy Technologies Office, hydrothermal liquefaction and carbonization program reports. ⚑ Provisional — biocrude yield and energy density parameters, Section 8.*

17. *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater (APHA/AWWA/WEF). Analytical protocol reference for Section 10.*

18. *National Institute of Standards and Technology, SP 800-82, Guide to Operational Technology Security. SCADA/PLC risk framework, Section 13.*

19. *Bright Meadow Group, "Water Under Pressure." Blue Ribbon Team, 05 August 2026. Public-facing treatment of Section 8.*

20. *Smith, R., The Complete Guide to Aquaponics: From the Ancient Chinampas to the River Refugium. Manuscript in preparation. Source for compost pot culture mechanism and light-gradient stacking argument, Sections 7.1 and 7.3.*
