

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Journal of
Environmental Chemical Engineering
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: JECE-D-15-00916R1

Title: DETERMINATION OF THE FORMS AND STABILITY OF PHOSPHORUS IN
WASTEWATER EFFLUENT FROM A VARIETY OF TREATMENT PROCESSES

Article Type: Research Paper

Keywords: Phosphorus; speciation; wastewater; effluent; soluble; reactive

Corresponding Author: Dr. Sean Comber,

Corresponding Author's Institution: Plymouth University

First Author: Michael Gardner

Order of Authors: Michael Gardner; Jana Darmovzalova; Brian Ellor; Sean Comber

Abstract: Eutrophication of surface waters is a major issue across the planet, with diffuse (agricultural) and point sources (wastewater treatment works, WwTW) being the main inputs. In the UK WwTW effluent discharges are currently permitted for discharge based on total phosphorus concentration, whereas environmental quality standards (EQS) are set as soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP), which better reflects the bioavailable fraction of phosphorus present in water. This study reports for the first time, concentrations and relative proportions of SRP in effluent from a number of different WwTW employing aluminium and iron dosing for phosphorus removal. In the case of aluminium treatment, SRP constituted only 10 ±4% of the 0.75mg P/l total phosphorus in the effluent. Where iron was dosed SRP comprised 66% ±20% of the total phosphorus present where a single dose was applied, which dropped to 26 ±17% after a second dose and additional tertiary sand filtration. Phosphorus was determined using two established analytical methods after acid digestion, filtration to 0.45µm (on site and after return to the laboratory and refrigeration for up to 9 days) and settlement. Phosphorus speciation was shown to be stable within all effluents for up to 6 days storage at a temperature of <5°C without the need to filter on site and this was recommended for future effluent monitoring programmes and compliance assessment. Furthermore, because iron and aluminium dosing significantly reduce the SRP proportion in effluents, future monitoring programmes and policy decisions regarding meeting the phosphorus EQS derived as SRP should take this into account.

B525 Portland Square
Plymouth University
Drakes Circus
Plymouth
PL4 8AA

10 August 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

**DETERMINATION OF THE FORMS AND STABILITY OF PHOSPHORUS IN
WASTEWATER EFFLUENT FROM A VARIETY OF TREATMENT PROCESSES**


Please find attached our manuscript for consideration for publication in Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering. The paper determines the speciation of phosphorus in effluents from a number of different sewage treatment works including those that dose iron and aluminium salts for P reduction. Our data for the first time shows that the form of the P discharged at dosed works has very little soluble reactive P compared with undosed works. The regulatory significance of this is highlighted regarding phosphorus management under the Water Framework Directive.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully



Dr Sean Comber
Associate Professor (Senior Lecturer) in Environmental Sciences
B525 Portland Square
Plymouth University
Drake Circus
Plymouth
Devon
PL4 8AA
T: +44(0)1752 585974
E: sean.comber@plymouth.ac.uk



JECE Conflict of Interest Form

If submitting materials via Editorial Manager, please complete this form electronically and upload the file with your final submission.

Otherwise, please return the form as an email attachment to the copyeditor handling your manuscript.

We wish to confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this publication and there has been no significant financial support for this work that could have influenced its outcome.

We confirm that the manuscript has been read and approved by all named authors and that there are no other persons who satisfied the criteria for authorship but are not listed. We further confirm that the order of authors listed in the manuscript has been approved by all of us.

We confirm that we have given due consideration to the protection of intellectual property associated with this work and that there are no impediments to publication, including the timing of publication, with respect to intellectual property. In so doing we confirm that we have followed the regulations of our institutions concerning intellectual property.

We understand that the Corresponding Author is the sole contact for the Editorial process (including Editorial Manager and direct communications with the office). He/she is responsible for communicating with the other authors about progress, submissions of revisions and final approval of proofs. We confirm that we have provided a current, correct email address which is accessible by the Corresponding Author and which has been configured to accept email from sean.comber@plymouth.ac.uk

Please provide the following information:

Please check this box to indicate that you have asked every author of this work to declare any conflicts of interest. Your answers on this form are on behalf of every author of this work.

Manuscript #:

Title: **DETERMINATION OF THE FORMS AND STABILITY OF
PHOSPHORUS IN WASTEWATER EFFLUENT FROM A VARIETY OF TREATMENT
PROCESSES**

Author list: Dr Sean Comber, M Gardner, J Darmovzalova, B Ellor

Your name: Dr Sean Comber

Date 10 August 2015

Ms. Ref. No.: JECE-D-15-00916

Title: DETERMINATION OF THE FORMS AND STABILITY OF PHOSPHORUS IN WASTEWATER EFFLUENT FROM A VARIETY OF TREATMENT PROCESSES Journal of Environmental Chemical Engineering

The due date for submitting your revised manuscript is Oct 03, 2015

Thank you for the useful comments provided for our manuscript. We have set out below our responses and have provided a revised manuscript with and without track changes to show the amendments.

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #2:

I. Multiple errors related to formatting, editing, and technical language.

The manuscript has been carefully checked for formatting, editing and technical language.

II. Author have utilized activated sludge process (ASP), biological aerated filter (BAFF) and Biofilter for the present study but did not mentioned anything about the process parameters attained for the same.

Process data now summarised in more detail in a table.

III. Because the study was concerned to Phosphorous removal for corresponding combinations of Coagulants-Biological treatment, it is must to mention the dose of the coagulants (Ferrous or Alum) used and important parameters of biological treatment. Unfortunately, no information have been presented in the present form of manuscript.

Additional process details have been provided.

IV. The activated sludge process temperature is one of the critical process parameter for the removal, solubility and conversion of the Phosphorous in any form. The relevant temperature range and its impact over treatment yield have not been presented.

We were not assessing the performance of the works *per se*, rather the speciation and stability of the P being discharged. It was therefore assumed that the works were being run sufficiently efficiently to meet their discharge consents. This point has been made in the manuscript.

V. Do the sampling at five consecutive time (nine days) is enough as a witness to reframe the present status of the UK's pollution regulations for P-removal, as well as the prominence of study at scientific platform.

Agreed – further studies are required to confirm the data provided here. This point is made in the conclusions.

VI. The kinetics of the Phosphorous existence may be beneficial for better scientific elucidation of the trends witnessed throughout the study. It is highly recommended to include the same.

The kinetics of P stability over a period of up to 9 days is provided.

VII. Author did not mentioned in clarity about the type of wastewater utilized and its characteristics, whether sanitary (high strength, low strength) or industrial.

Good point – wastewater characteristics provided.

VIII. It is highly recommended that to compare the present study trends with a probable treatment carried out for wastewater type (may be industrial) having no phosphorous (may be as literature).

As part of the literature review, other P speciation data was sought from the literature for other WwTW with or without P removal using metal salts, but no data could be obtained, this point is now made stronger in the text.

IX. The formation of biological Phosphorous is directly influenced with the change in MCRT or SRT (sludge retention time) of the activated sludge process. No relevant information have been presented for the MCRT of system during given duration of the study.

Yes this is a fair point, however, again the objectives of the research were to determine the speciation and chemical stability of P in the final effluents post a variety of treatment processes. A full assessment of within works processes was outside the scope of this study.

X. The type and dose of coagulant promotes a particular species of bacteria and also its capability and inhibition. In relevance to the present instance, a numerous number of studies have already been published, and prominently revealed the impact of Ferrous and Aluminium salts on microbiology (ASP or BAFF) of the wastewater treatment system . It is highly recommended that to utilize the same to draw the critical justification for existence and removal of Phosphorous in the present form of manuscript.

Yes, it is agreed that metal dosing can change the microbial community with the WwTW, however, investigating the literature, we cannot find any data regarding how this may impact on P removal (may of the papers published are related to load reduction or odour control. Furthermore the main focus of this research was not to assess the efficiency of P removal and mechanisms within the sewage treatment process, but to determine the P speciation in effluent and its stability. This point has been made more clear in the text.

Reviewer #3:

The Abstract does not address key points. The abstract should attract interests of scientists in this field and wide public. The reviewer suggests the author revising the abstract to make it have the research aims, methods, main results and importance.

Abstract now revised taking account of these points

For the METHODOLOGY part, it could be clearer to make a table for 'The five WwTW processes selected for sampling'.

Table provided

In the Result part, the "Figure 1. SRP for samples filtered on site and stored (4 o329 C) over a period of 9 days" is not clear, please use different shapes for different run, so readers could read it if it is printed black and white.

Different shape markers now provided

Reviewer #4:

1. Introduction. It is quite long, but very useful.

a. Maybe Table 1 and its discussion should be removed because it is not used elsewhere in the manuscript.

Text removed as suggested.

b. Lines 195-198: Please introduce better the manuscript content.

Text amended and made more clear.

2. Methodology. About WWTPs:

a. Why do you choose small plants? Because they are the major source of UK river pollution? Please explain it.

They were selected to ensure they received predominantly domestic sewage. This point is now made in the text.

b. Please describe with more details the WWTPs (e.g. retention time of filters; dosing of Fe-Al; source of raw sewage: urban only or mixed urban-industrial?). The features are useful for better explain the results.

c. Is WWTP A without final sedimentation?

More data now provided in the table as suggested above.

3. Results and discussion.

a. Why do you split them? Please merge them. In my opinion the results should be clearer and not dispersive.

Results and discussion combined and text tidied up.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

In my opinion, there are few data to affirm that Al is better than Fe for P removal. After Fe/Al addition, a filtration stage is always needed in order to remove the Al/Fe+P particles. Plant B (Al addition) has a type of final filtration which is not present in WWTP C and D (Fe addition). Comparing WWTP B (Al addition) and E (Fe addition) with a filtration final stage, P in the effluent is comparable. Therefore, I suggest you to modify the manuscript.

Fair point, text amended accordingly.

Lines 475-478: Where are the results which support such recommendations? Please modify the manuscript.

Text amended, although we feel the data provided supports the conclusions regarding sample filtration and storage. It was the point of the work in the first place.

Minor comments:

- Lines 105-108: please check the sentences;

Text amended

- Please check the units (e.g.: "l" or "L"? "mg/l" or "mg L⁻¹?");

Consistently mg P/l now.

- Line 257: ICP-MS is not explained before;

Abbreviation explained

- Lines 235-262: In my opinion, the indentation of the section is not clear. Please try to improve it;

Better explanation provided.

- Figures: please improve them (e.g. remove the title inside the graph; improve x/y-axis labels).

Figures improved as suggested

Highlights

- Phosphorus forms in metal salt dosed sewage works effluent reported for first time
- Soluble reactive phosphorus in dosed effluents as low as 10% of total phosphorus
- Soluble reactive phosphorus stable in refrigerated samples for up to 9 days
- Future permitting of discharges should take account of phosphorus speciation

1 DETERMINATION OF THE FORMS AND STABILITY OF PHOSPHORUS IN 2 WASTEWATER EFFLUENT FROM A VARIETY OF TREATMENT PROCESSES

3
4
5
6 Sean Comber¹, Mike Gardner², Jana Darmovzalova¹, Brian Ellor³

7
8 ¹ Corresponding author, Biogeochemistry Research Centre, Plymouth University, Drake Circus,
9 Plymouth, PL4 8AA, UK. Tel: 01752 858974, email : sean.comber@plymouth.ac.uk.

10
11 ² Atkins Limited, 500, Park Avenue, Aztec West, Almondsbury, Bristol BS32 4RZ, UK.

12
13 ³ UK Water Industry Research, 8th floor, 50 Broadway, London SW1H 0RG

14 15 16 17 18 **Abstract**

19
20 Eutrophication of surface waters is a major issue across the planet, with diffuse (agricultural)
21 and point sources (wastewater treatment works, WwTW) being the main inputs. In the UK
22 WwTW effluent discharges are currently permitted for discharge based on total phosphorus
23 concentration, whereas environmental quality standards (EQS) are set as soluble reactive
24 phosphorus (SRP), which better reflects the bioavailable fraction of phosphorus present in
25 water. This study reports for the first time, concentrations and relative proportions of SRP in
26 effluent from a number of different WwTW employing aluminium and iron dosing for
27 phosphorus removal. In the case of aluminium treatment, SRP constituted only 10 ±4% of the
28 0.75mg P/l total phosphorus in the effluent. Where iron was dosed SRP comprised 66%
29 ±20% of the total phosphorus present where a single dose was applied, which dropped to 26
30 ±17% after a second dose and additional tertiary sand filtration. Phosphorus was determined
31 using two established analytical methods after acid digestion, filtration to 0.45µm (on site and
32 after return to the laboratory and refrigeration for up to 9 days) and settlement. Phosphorus
33 speciation was shown to be stable within all effluents for up to 6 days storage at a
34 temperature of <5°C without the need to filter on site and this was recommended for future
35 effluent monitoring programmes and compliance assessment. Furthermore, because iron and
36 aluminium dosing significantly reduce the SRP proportion in effluents, future monitoring
37 programmes and policy decisions regarding meeting the phosphorus EQS derived as SRP
38 should take this into account.

39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 **Key Words**

57
58 Phosphorus, speciation, wastewater, effluent, soluble, reactive
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. INTRODUCTION

Inputs of phosphorus from wastewater treatment works (WwTW) and agricultural diffuse sources have led to significant contamination of much of the UK's and the planet's surface waters (Hogan, 2014). Across Europe, river basins are failing nutrient standards with typically more than half of all waterbodies not meeting the standards set as soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP), the immediately bioavailable fraction of phosphorus (EEB, 2010). For the UK for example, assessments under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) have estimated that only 53% of waterbodies are compliant with the new site specific Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) designed to provide conditions suitable to support good ecological status for diatoms and macrophytes (WFD, 2013). Phosphorus present in many forms in sewage (Houhou et al., 2009) can become bioavailable during wastewater treatment processes to the extent that the majority discharged into receiving waters is measured as SRP and considered bioavailable to aquatic plants (Millier and Hooda, 2011). Several EU Directives have set out to decrease concentrations of phosphorus in EU rivers, including the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive (UWwTD, EU, 1991), Birds and Habitats Directive (EU, 1992) and Water Framework Directive (WFD, 2000). Diffuse agriculture sources of phosphorus have been reduced via measures funded under agricultural countryside stewardship schemes (Defra, 2015). For point source WwTW effluents, measures are available and have been implemented for reducing phosphorus loads to waterbodies through chemical dosing using iron or aluminium salts (Omoike and van Loon, 1999). Currently across the EU a population of 187 million is served by WwTW reducing phosphorus concentrations under the Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive (UWwTD, EU, 1991), approximately 37% of the entire population (EEA, 2015). In the UK there is phosphorus reduction at almost 700 WwTW treating a total population of approximately 24 million people. In the UK alone, over £10bn has been invested in wastewater treatment between 1990 and 2005 (Defra 2002), however, there is still widespread non compliance with WFD EQS and few measureable improvements in ecological status (UKWIR, 2012). The UK has now starting a new cycle of investment (2015-2020) which will include treatment at yet further WwTW, as well as investigations to achieve effluent phosphorus levels of less than 1 mg-P/l as total P, the currently accepted Best Available Technique for chemical dosing (EA, 2012). Whether or not this additional treatment is likely to result in widespread compliance is uncertain.

65

66 Interpreting the fate and compliance of phosphorus in the aquatic environment is complicated
67 by the fact that different Directives have set differing criteria for phosphorus standards and
68 permits, for example:

69

- 70 • **WFD EQS** (WFD, 2013) is set as **soluble reactive phosphorus**, samples are filtered
71 (0.45µm) followed by molybdenum blue colorimetric determination(Murphy and
72 Riley, 1962).
- 73 • **Habitats Directive** standards are set as **total reactive phosphorus**,on unfiltered
74 sample determined by molybdenum blue colorimetric determination(Murphy and
75 Riley, 1962).
- 76 • **UWwTD**permits for WwTW effluents discharged to rivers are set as **total**
77 **phosphorus**, determined by Inductively Couple Plasma (ICP) d on unfiltered sample
78 using acid digestion (Jarvie et al., 2002).

79

80 There may be a number of reasons why different forms of phosphorus have been determined,
81 ranging from application of the precautionary principle, assuming that eventually particulate
82 bound phosphorus may become bioavailable once discharged into the aquatic environment;
83 through to the convenience of using colorimetric analysis of unfiltered samples. However,
84 understanding the form of phosphorus in effluents (particularly SRP) and receiving waters
85 and using an appropriate analytical technique not only allows the application of sound
86 science to environmental regulation, but can also avoid excessive conservatism in standard
87 setting leading to the implementation of expensive technologies which deliver little or no
88 environmental benefit.

89

90 The situation is further complicated by previous definitions used and analytical procedures
91 implemented to monitor phosphorus in the aquatic environment.The forms of phosphorus
92 considered to be of particular environmental/ecological relevance are referred to in current
93 UK technical recommendations for the implementation of the Water Framework Directive
94 (WFD, 2013) and UK government river basin planning guidance (Defra, 2014) as “reactive
95 phosphorus” (RP). This was previously and more commonly in the scientific literature
96 described using the term “soluble reactive phosphorus” (SRP). Both these authoritative

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 97 reports contain the following statements relating to the definition of relevant phosphorus
2 98 species:

3 99
4
5 100 a) *“Reactive phosphorus” means the concentration of phosphorus as determined using*
6
7 101 *the phosphomolybdenum blue colorimetric method. Where necessary to ensure the*
8
9 102 *accuracy of the method, samples are recommended to be filtered using a filter not*
10
11 103 *smaller than 0.45 µm pore size to remove gross particulate matter.*

12
13 104 b) *Previous UKTAG standards were referred to as soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP).*
14
15 105 *Most analyses by UK agencies are of molybdate reactive phosphorus in unfiltered*
16
17 106 *samples from which large particles have been allowed to settle and referred to here*
18
19 107 *as “reactive phosphorus” (RP). In practice, the difference between RP and SRP is*
20
21 108 *usually minor”.*

22
23 109 Statement (a) prompts the question *“when might it be necessary to filter to ensure the*
24
25 110 *accuracy of the method”?* The answer obviously is “always”, otherwise how is it possible to
26
27 111 decide whether or not accuracy is compromised? The truth of the first sentence of statement
28
29 112 (b) was confirmed by a review of the existing methodology (referred to as “orthophosphate”)
30
31 113 used by thirteen laboratories involved in the analysis of surface waters and sewage effluents.
32
33 114 Responses to inquiries regarding methodology were in general agreement, indicating that
34
35 115 samples were not filtered, with several respondents mentioning that “dirty” samples were
36
37 116 allowed to settle before analysis. The statement in (b) that *“In practice, the difference*
38
39 117 *between RP and SRP is usually minor”* is shown by this research to be incorrect.

40 118
41
42 119 This raises important questions concerning inadequacies in the specification of the analytical
43
44 120 methodology for reactive phosphorus, specifically with respect to sample pre-treatment. It is
45
46 121 worth noting that the analytical method (based on the method of Murphy and Riley (1962),
47
48 122 updated as a Standard Method, (SCA, 1992) for reactive phosphorus involves sulphuric acid
49
50 123 based reagents that have the potential to extract phosphorus from particulate matter if this is
51
52 124 present in the sample of interest. The vaguely defined procedure used in the past is therefore
53
54 125 likely to result in the (unwelcome) inclusion of a variable proportion of particulate
55
56 126 phosphorus in the “reactive forms”, depending on:

57 127

- 128 • the type of particulate matter present, its phosphorus content and the lability of such
129 phosphorus forms to acid dissolution; all widely variable between say sewage effluent
130 and river water and between different rivers (Haygarth, 1997; Hens and Mercx, 2002);
- 131 • the propensity for particles to settle (not known but variable);
- 132 • the settlement time allowed (not defined);
- 133 • the strengths of the reagents used, which are not necessarily the same in different
134 laboratories((Jarvie *et al.*, 2002) and the different analytical techniques applied (e.g.
135 manual, flow injection, auto- or discrete- analysers).

136 It may be concluded that the historic determination of reactive phosphorus might be
137 considered imprecise and with unknown and inconsistent accuracy. Basing consenting policy
138 and potentially substantial investment on analytical data of unknown and variable reliability
139 is not sound or credible science.

140
141 There have been previously reported numerous studies into (i) the form and fate of
142 phosphorus in the aquatic environment (McKelvie *et al.*, 1995; Jarvie *et al.*, 1998; Neal *et al.*,
143 2000; Palmer-Felgate *et al.*, 2008), (ii) catchment modelling of phosphorus concentrations
144 (Neal *et al.*, 2010) and (iii) ecological impacts (Stutter *et al.*, 2010). Data are available that
145 show WwTW not dosing for phosphorus reduction discharge mostly SRP (Millier and
146 Hooda, 2011). There are, however, no readily available data for phosphorus speciation, and in
147 particular SRP concentrations, in WwTW effluents dosing iron or aluminium salts for
148 phosphorus reduction.

149
150 The work reported in this paper was prompted by two factors. Firstly, ecologically relevant
151 forms of phosphorus for a number of reasons were not being determined sufficiently
152 rigorously in UK wastewaters discharged to surface waters. Secondly, this was likely to have
153 serious consequences to the framing of measures under the EU Water Framework Directive
154 (WFD) (EC, 2000) to control concentrations of phosphorus in surface water. Given that such
155 measures have the potential to prompt multi-million pound investments in the
156 implementation of new treatment technologies, it is essential that they are based on a reliable
157 monitoring data. The pending launch of a major series of UK investigations into phosphorus

158 concentrations in effluents (*The National Phosphorus Trials*) also required the identification
159 of a robust methodology.

160

161 The aim of this study was to establish a suitable methodology for sample filtration and
162 storage to preserve phosphorus speciation in WwTW effluents using a variety of treatment
163 processes, including with and without aluminium or iron dosing for phosphorus reduction. At
164 the same time, data is presented on the forms of phosphorus in effluents for the first time. It
165 should be noted that wastewater treatment processes are complex and subject to numerous
166 microbiological and physico-chemical factors which impact on removal rates and speciation
167 of chemicals present, including phosphorus. The data presented here focus on the speciation
168 and stability of phosphorus in the final effluent discharged to the receiving waters **after** a
169 variety of treatment processes, from a regulatory point of view..

170

171

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

172

173 2. METHODOLOGY

174

175 Details of the five WwTW processes selected for sampling are provided in Table 1. Works
 176 receiving predominantly domestic wastewater were chosen to avoid complicating
 177 factors associated with any industrial effluent entering the sewerage system.

178

179 **Table 1** Details of the selected WwTW treatment processes

	Works A	Works B	Works C	Works D	Works E
Estimated population	10,000	12,000	13,000	6,000	6,000
Preliminary treatment	Inlet screens & grit removal	Inlet screens & grit removal	Inlet screens & grit removal	Inlet screens & grit removal	Inlet screens & grit removal
Primary treatment	Primary settlement	Primary settlement (2 tanks)	Primary settlement	Primary settlement (4 tanks)	Primary settlement
Secondary treatment	Activated sludge	Trickling filters (4)	Activated sludge (oxidation ditch)	Trickling filters (4)	Trickling filters (4)
Final settlement	Humus tank	Humus tank (4)	Humus tank	Humus tank	Humus tank
Tertiary treatment	None	Nitrifying filter, biological aerated flooded filter (BAFF), UV treatment	None	None	Fluidised bed sand filters (3)
Dosing for P removal?	No	Polyaluminium chloride (Brenntag) into the nitrifying filter dosed at a 2:1 Al:P stoichiometry	Iron (II) sulphate added after screening at a 2:1 Fe:P stoichiometry	Iron (II) sulphate added after screening at a 2:1 Fe:P stoichiometry	Iron (II) sulphate added after screening and before sand filters at a 2:1 Fe:P stoichiometry

180

181

182 Samples were collected on five occasions between September and November 2014. Samples
 183 were collected using acid washed (5% hydrochloric acid) 1 litre capacity spot samples and
 184 stored in 1.5 litre acid washed (5% hydrochloric acid) polyethylene terephthalate (PET)
 185 bottles. Four replicate determinations for the different forms of phosphorus at time = 0, 1, 3,
 186 6 and 9 days. Time =0 day samples were determined on site using the same colorimetric
 187 method, utilising a Jenway6051 portable colorimeter at a wavelength of 710nm using a 4cm
 188 pathlength cuvette. All samples were stored in a cool box on site and subsequently under
 189 refrigeration at 3-5 °C, before being brought to room temperature immediately prior to
 190 analysis. All filtration was undertaken using disposable 25mm diameter 0.45µm cellulose

191 acetate membranes supplied by Cole Parmer Ltd. Filter blanks used for each batch of analysis
192 showed no significant contamination with phosphorus.

193 194 **2.1 Sample pre-treatment**

195 A number of different types of sample manipulation were carried out to establish the form of
196 phosphorus present in the different types of WwTW effluent, to either replicate the methods
197 currently used for compliance assessment, or to investigate sample stability over a 9 day
198 period:

- 199 • **Soluble Reactive Phosphorus (SRP)** - used here to denote a determination made on a
200 0.45 µm filtered sample using the molybdenum blue colorimetric procedure based on
201 SCA Method A(SCA, 1992) implemented in a batch-wise (15ml scale) manual
202 process. This was designed to demonstrate adequate sample stability, consistency of
203 results and to act as a reference point for other determinations and other phosphorus
204 forms.
- 205 • **Unfiltered SRP(uf SRP)fully mixed sample** was determined in order to demonstrate
206 the consequences of not filtering samples and to establish how the distribution of
207 particulate and soluble reactive forms might change over time, for different storage
208 periods. This is an analogue of TRP as specified under the Habitats Directive.
- 209 • **Refiltered SRP** was determined in order to make sure that once filtered there was no
210 further precipitation of particulate phosphorus during storage, which might have
211 consequences for the operation and usefulness of tertiary filtration processes.
- 212 • **Unfiltered settled SRP** was determined in order to illustrate that orthophosphate
213 (historically used for monitoring water quality and WwTWUWwTD compliance)
214 might not be relevant for either of the key regulated forms of phosphorus: total
215 phosphorus and SRP.
- 216 • **Filtered laboratorySRP** was determined as a check on the need to filter on-site
217 (filtration on site is an onerous requirement that it would be practically advantageous
218 to avoid, provided there was clear evidence that it was not essential).

219 **Total phosphorus using ICP-MS**

- 220 • **Total Phosphorus (TP)** is the benchmark for all phosphorus forms and offers a total
221 concentration.

- **Total soluble phosphorus (TSP)** was determined by digesting and determining by Inductively Coupled Plasma – Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS) on filtered samples. This provided a check on the extent to which SRP determines all soluble forms.

2.2 Analytical methodology

2.2.1 Molybdenum blue colorimetric method

The method based on the established Murphy and Riley (1962) approach used the following reagents which were of analytical laboratory grade or higher: Sulphuric acid (25% of concentrated acid in high purity water, >18 MΩ/cm), ascorbic acid (10g dissolved in 50ml high purity water plus 50ml 25% sulphuric acid solution). This was stored in an amber lab glass bottle in refrigerator and was stable for at least a week and can be used as long as it remains colourless.

A mixed reagent was prepared as follows: 12.5g ammonium heptamolybdate tetrahydrate, was dissolved in 125ml high purity water. 0.5g potassium antimony tartrate, was dissolved in 20ml high purity water. The molybdate solution was added to 350ml 25% sulphuric acid solution, stirring continuously, followed by the tartrate solution and mixed well. Stored in a borosilicate glass bottle the reagent was stable for several months.

For phosphorus determination, 0.25 ml ascorbic acid was added to 12.5ml sample in HCl washed (5%) 15ml centrifuge tubes (Fisher Scientific, UK) followed by 0.25ml mixed reagent to the solution. Colour was allowed to develop for 10 minutes, followed by measurement within 30 minutes at 710nm in a 1cm acrylic disposable cuvette, using a Cecil 2021 colorimeter.

Limit of detection (LOD) was estimated from 6 replicates of blank determinations and calculated as 3 times the standard deviation of the blank using a 1cm cell. To ensure data quality the following procedures were carried out:

- 1) Blanks for each batch of analysis
- 2) Filter blanks for each batch of filtrations
- 3) External reference material to be included in each batch of analysis: EnviroMAT EP-L-3 drinking water, low level concentrate (QMX Ltd).
- 4) Control chart constructed for duration of the studies.

254

1
2 **2.2.2 Total P**

3
4 Total phosphorus was determined by adding concentrated hydrochloric acid (to a
5 concentration of 10% (e.g. 1.25ml concentrated HCl –Romil-Spa super purity acid, Fisher,
6 Scientific, UK + 12.5ml sample) into acid washed (5% HCl) 15ml centrifuge tubes (Fisher
7 Scientific UK) and heated to 90°C for 3 hours until all particulates were digested. Total
8
9 phosphorus determinations were made using a Thermo Scientific X Series 2 Inductively
10
11 Coupled Plasma-Mass Spectrometer in collision cell mode.
12
13
14

15 262

16 263 Overall analytical performance data are provided in Table 2.
17
18

19 264

20 **Table 2. SRP and total soluble phosphorus analytical performance data**
21

		Unit (mgP/l)			
		Within batch sd ¹	Between batch sd ¹	Total sd ¹	Limit of detection
Molybdenum Blue method (SRP)					
	Sd¹	0.021	0.014	0.025	0.03
	DoF²	12	12	38	12
	rsd%	4.2	2.7	5.0	
ICP-MS (TP)					
	Sd¹	0.023	0.033	0.040	0.01
	DoF²	12	12	15	12
	rsd%	4.6	6.6	8.0	

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 266 ¹sd = standard deviation; ²DoF = degrees of freedom
42
43 267
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

268 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

269

270 Data for the different processes are shown separately. The five different sampling occasions
271 at each works are termed “runs”. It should be noted that for different runs the effluent
272 concentrations were different (they were different samples) so these differences do not show
273 anything other than acting as indications of the variability of phosphorus concentrations at the
274 works concerned at the time of sampling. Figure 1 shows the stability of SRP in solution,
275 after filtering the sample on site and then refrigerating for up to a period of 9 days. No
276 statistical differences in measured concentrations were observed across the storage period.

277

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

278

279




Figure 1. SRP for samples filtered on site then stored (4 °C) over a period of 9 days

Figure 2 shows the mean sample stability over the course of 9 days for samples collected from the WwTW unfiltered then refrigerated at 4 °C for 1, 3, 6 and 9 days before filtration followed by SRP determination. The data show that SRP is sufficiently stable not to require filtration on site; any observed changes in SRP concentration were statistically

insignificant based on the techniques used ($<0.03\text{mg P/l}$ at concentrations less than 0.5mg P/l or $<5\text{-}10\%$ variance at higher observed concentrations).




Figure 2. SRP concentrations for samples collected unfiltered then refrigerated for up to 9 days prior to filtration and analysis

Table 3 provides a comparison of proportion of phosphorus present in the effluents in the different forms. WwTW A, the undosed works unsurprisingly has the highest total phosphorus concentration of over 5mgP/l , with 96% present as SRP. The aluminium dosed WwTW B had a mean TP of 0.81mgP/l significantly below its 2mgP/l permit value, with only 10% of the phosphorus present as SRP. Total soluble phosphorus (TSP), i.e. phosphorus filtered through $0.45\ \mu\text{m}$ and determined via acid digestion ICP-MS comprised 34% of the TP, suggesting filterable colloidal material is detectable by ICP-MS but not molybdenum blue 'reactive'. The iron dosed effluents lie somewhere between these extreme values. WwTW C where Fe was dosed prior to primary treatment with secondary oxidation ditch treatment had low concentrations of TP (1.2mgP/l) but 84% was present as SRP (which was not statistically significantly different from TP) and therefore accounted for all of the filterable phosphorus.

WwTW D which was a biofiltration plant receiving iron dosing prior to primary settlement had slightly lower TP concentrations of 0.79mgP/l , 66% of which was SRP, which again

337 comprised all of the filterable P. WwTW E was another biofiltration plant, but received 2
1 338 doses of iron, once before primary treatment and once again prior to filtration through a
2
3 339 fluidised bed sand filter. TP concentrations in the effluent were very low (0.22mgP/l) and
4
5 340 SRP was only 26% of the TP concentration. Similar to the Al dosing works TSP was higher
6
7 341 at 49% suggesting that there is filterable phosphorus present in the effluent that is not
8
9 342 reactive.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

343 **Table 3. SRP and total soluble phosphorus (TSP) versus total phosphorus**


WwTW	TP (mg P/l)	% of TP			
		SRP (%)	±%	TSP (%)	±%
A	5.5	96	2	94	1
B	0.81	10	4	34	13
C	1.2	84	26	90	6
D	0.79	66	20	67	12
E	0.22	26	17	49	16

344 ± Values are confidence intervals (p=0.1) on between day average estimates

345

346 Figure 3 shows the P speciation graphically and highlights the loss of SRP in the aluminium
 347 dosed and iron 'double dosed' effluent with associated error bars representing variation about
 348 the mean for the sample replicates.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




349
350 **Figure 3. Overall summary of concentrations and species for the different treatment**
351 **processes (with 90 percentile error bars)**

352 The influence of chemical dosing is shown to be potentially important to the form of
353 phosphorus discharged and its likely environmental impact in the receiving water. Without
354 chemical dosing, the total phosphorus concentration in the effluent tested was of the order of
355 5mg P/l. This is consistent with previous values obtained for WwTW effluents (e.g. Gardner
356 et al., 2012). Phosphorus discharged consisted almost entirely (85-95%) of SRP. Other un-
357 dosed WwTWs might have different discharge concentrations, but there is no reason to
358 believe that the proportion present as SRP should differ greatly, unless there are non-
359 domestic sources or other significant contaminants present. At the works employing
360 aluminium dosing the effluent SRP concentration, determined over several days, was
361 between 0.02 and 0.12mg P/l (though overall nearer to the upper part of this range). Total

362 phosphorus concentrations were in the range 0.3 to 0.6mg P/l. Apportionment of forms as a
363 percentage of this total value were: uf SRP 65-75%, ufsettled SRP 45-55% and SRP 9-12%.

364
365 A clear conclusion can be drawn here showing that dosing with iron or aluminium at WwTW
366 employing a number of post-secondary treatments (nitrifying filters and BAFF in the case of
367 WwTW B and tertiary sand filters in the case of WwTW E) reduces the total phosphorus
368 concentration by a factor of 10 to 20, compared with an undosed works, which is not
369 unexpected based on the chemistry involved (Galarneau and Gehr, 1997). Furthermore,
370 dosing significantly reduces the proportion of SRP in the effluent, even as a fraction of the
371 much diminished total, by 80-90% (assuming a non-dosed concentration of approximately
372 5mgP/l). Both these conclusions are subject to the caveat that these findings relate only to this
373 one WwTW (and therefore will need to be confirmed).

374
375 The overall proportion of the key P species present in the effluent from an ecological impact
376 point of view, namely SRP is provided in Figure 4.



377
378
379 **Figure 4. Mean percentage present as SRP (error bars show 90% confidence interval on**
380 **the mean value)**

381 Results from the iron dosed treatment processes (WwTW C, D and E) suggest that whilst iron
382 does indeed reduce the concentrations of total phosphorus and SRP from a notional 5-6 mg
383 P/l to approximately 1 mg P/l or lower, the fraction of total phosphorus present as SRP in the
384 final effluent is not definitively lower. For the ASP process (WwTWC) there was no
385 significant difference between average SRP and TP concentrations; for the iron dosed
386 biofilter the difference was larger but barely significant. However, for the double iron dosed
387 tertiary filtered biofilter effluent the reduction in SRP was significant (SRP 26 ±17% of TP)
388 but not as dramatic as that achieved by aluminium dosing. WwTW E did, however, exhibit the
389 lowest TP and SRP concentrations of all of the WwTW sampled. The within WwTW
390 processes impacting on phosphorus solubility, across primary, secondary and tertiary
391 treatment will all effect final effluent quality and require further investigation. However, the
392 focus of this research was on the effluent phosphorus speciation and how it relates to sample
393 treatment and regulation.

394
395 It is interesting to note that the tertiary filtration stage for WwTW E achieved a reduction
396 from 0.7 to 0.2mg P/l, a reduction in SRP of a similar amount and a reduction in the
397 proportion as SRP from 66±20% to 26±17%. It appears therefore that the effect of the further
398 dosing and filtration stage is to remove a further 0.5mgP/l of SRP from the effluent. Hence
399 further precipitation of SRP (and concurrent removal) appears to be occurring during tertiary
400 sand filtration. This tertiary treatment stage therefore serves two purposes; it allows sufficient
401 time for the dosed iron to react with residual SRP and then it removes the resulting particulate
402 phosphorus. This is a potentially important observation. Tertiary filters appear not only allow
403 more time for chemical reaction in the liquid phase, it is likely that under certain conditions
404 chemical dosing can change the surface properties of the media, promoting further chemical
405 adsorption of SRP. The degree of this mechanism may be influenced by the surface
406 composition and properties of the media as well as properties of coagulant intermediate
407 products as they reach the filter bed. The latter will be affected by dosing point, mixing and
408 chemical property of the wastewater such as alkalinity and pH value (Xu et al., 2015). As
409 noted above in relation to aluminium these findings require further confirmation before they
410 can be accepted as more general phenomena.

411
412 Previous findings for phosphorus removal mechanisms during wastewater treatment (Wu et
413 al., 2015) have shown that for iron dosing, the split between the reaction to form mineral iron
414 phosphate and coprecipitation onto iron oxyhydroxide minerals was about 50:50 and

1 415 accounted for 90% of the phosphorus speciation in material collected from a membrane
2 416 bioreactor. There are little data available to compare the fraction of SRP in WwTW effluents.
3 417 Previous unpublished Environment Agency monitoring data at a limited number of sites have
4 418 suggested that the percentage of phosphorus present as SRP in iron dosed WwTW was also
5 419 low at around 16% (Comber et al., 2009) and the US Water Environment Research
6 420 Foundation (WERF) have reported low SRP ($\mu\text{gP/l}$ range) concentrations in dosed effluent
7 421 (WERF, 2014).

8 422
9 423 With respect to historical methodology, the practical value of unfiltered / settled unfiltered
10 424 SRP is therefore highly questionable since it is not a reliable estimate of the two measures
11 425 (TP, SRP) of phosphorus concentrations that form the basis of current regulation. It can only
12 426 be assumed that at an earlier time when metal dosing of wastewaters was not widespread (and
13 427 when in effluents SRP and TP were close in concentration) unfiltered so-called
14 428 orthophosphate was a sufficiently accurate measure to meet monitoring requirements. This is
15 429 emphatically no longer the case and the convenience of not filtering a sample is no longer an
16 430 acceptable compromise.

17 431
18 432 Consequently for future planning of measures to improve ecological quality within river
19 433 systems, it is essential to take account of the speciation of phosphorus present in the water
20 434 column, and in particular the most readily bioavailable form namely, SRP. Furthermore when
21 435 modelling the possible outcome of applying iron or aluminium dosing for phosphorus
22 436 reduction during the wastewater treatment process, SRP should be the phosphorus form used
23 437 to ensure consistency with the water quality objectives set for receiving waters (Bowes et al.,
24 438 2010). Regulators across the developed world need to plan effective policy for phosphorus
25 439 management, which will require monitoring and modelling in order to assess the consistency
26 440 between striking the correct balance between point and diffuse sources of phosphorus to
27 441 ensure compliance and adherence to the 'polluter pays' principle (Neal et al., 2005, 2008;
28 442 Jarvie et al., 2006).

29 443
30 444
31 445
32 446
33 447

448 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

1
2 449 The data generated from this research leads to a number of key conclusions regarding the
3
4 450 monitoring, compliance assessment and possible future consenting of phosphorus discharged
5
6 451 from WwTW:

7 452 1) In order to generate data that are consistent and comparable between different
8
9 453 sources, determination of SRP should always involve sample filtration to 0.45 µm.
10
11 454 The results presented here provide confidence that the phosphorus speciation within
12
13 455 an effluent sample is stable for up to 6 days storage at a temperature of <5°C.

14
15
16 456 2) Data for phosphorus in effluents described as “orthophosphate” should be treated with
17
18 457 caution because they may or may not reflect the phosphorus forms of interest. The
19
20 458 difference between orthophosphate concentration and SRP might be as large as 80%
21
22 459 of the value of the former. Orthophosphate, whilst still being of potential value in
23
24 460 operational monitoring (e.g. examining trends or changes in operational performance),
25
26 461 is therefore not considered a reliable metric in any regulatory context.

27
28 462 3) Dosing with aluminium or iron was found to reduce the total phosphorus
29
30 463 concentration in effluents by a factor of 5 to 10 fold, with additional tertiary treatment
31
32 464 such as nitrifying filters, BAFFs and sand filtration serving to further reduce
33
34 465 concentrations of TP and SRP in WwTW effluents (to less than 10% of TP),
35
36 466 compared with straightforward secondary biological treatment coupled with metal salt
37
38 467 dosing. Further trials are required to support these preliminary data, however, if
39
40 468 confirmed, these marked differences between the forms of phosphorus present in
41
42 469 effluents applying different treatment processes need to be taken into account when
43
44 470 planning future effluent permitting policy.

45 471

46
47 **Acknowledgements**

48
49 473 The authors would like to thank UK Water Industry Research (UKWIR) for funding this
50
51 474 research.

52
53 475

54
55 476

56
57 477

58
59 478

60
61
62
63
64
65

REFERENCES

- 481 Bowes M., Neal C., Jarvie H., Smith T. and Davies H. (2010) Science of the Total
482 Environment 408 (2010) 4239–4250.
- 483
- 484 Comber, S., Blackwood D., Gilmour D., Issacs J., Piekarniak L. (2009) Phosphorus Lifecycle
485 Management (10/SL/02/9).UK Water Industry Research (UKWIR), 1 Queen Anne’s Gate,
486 London, UK. ISBN: 1 84057 570 0.
- 487
- 488 EA (2012) Review of best practice in treatment and reuse/recycling of phosphorus at
489 wastewater treatment works. Report no. SCHO0812BUSK-E-E.Environment Agency
490 Horizon House, Deanery Road Bristol BS1 5AH.
- 491
- 492 EU (2000) European Commission Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of
493 the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field
494 of water policy. Accessed 23/05/2012 at [http://eur-
495 lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32000L0060:EN:NOT](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32000L0060:EN:NOT)
- 496
- 497 Defra (2014) River Basin Planning Standards, May 2014, accessed May 2015:
498 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307788/river-
499 basin-planning-standards.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/307788/river-basin-planning-standards.pdf)
- 500
- 501 Defra (2002) Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Sewage Treatment in the
502 UK: UK Implementation of the EC Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive.
- 503
- 504 Defra (2015) Countryside Stewardship water capital grants: catchment sensitive farming.
505 [https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/countryside-stewardship-water-capital-grants-
506 catchment-sensitive-farming](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/countryside-stewardship-water-capital-grants-catchment-sensitive-farming).
- 507
- 508 EEA (2015) European Environment Agency, Waterbase - UWWTD: Urban Waste Water
509 Treatment Directive – reported data, Data Created 15 Oct 2014 Published 27 Feb 2015 Last
510 modified 06 May 2015, 06:56 PM.
- 511
- 512 EEB (2010) 10 years of the Water Framework Directive: a toothless tiger? - A snapshot
513 assessment of EU environmental ambitions. European Environmental Bureau, Federation of
514 Environmental Citizens Organisations, Boulevard de Waterloo 34, B-1000 Brussels,
515 Belgium.
- 516
- 517 EU (1992) Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural
518 habitats and of wild fauna and flora.
- 519
- 520 EU (1991) Council Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste-water treatment.
- 521
- 522 Galarneau E. and Gehr R. (1997) Phosphorus removal from wastewaters:experimental and
523 theoretical support for alternative mechanisms. Water Research, 31, 2, 328-338.
- 524
- 525 Gardner, M.J., Comber, S.D.W., Scrimshaw, M.D., Cartmell, E., Lester, J, and Ellor, B. The
526 Significance of Hazardous Chemicals in Wastewater Treatment Works Effluents. Sci. Total
527 Environ. (2012), 437: 363-372.

528

- 1 529 Haygarth, P.M., Warwick, M.S. and House, A.W.(1997)Size distribution of colloidal
2 530 molybdate reactive phosphorus in river waters and soil solution. *Wat, Res.* Vol. 31, No. 3, pp.
3 531 439-448.
4 532
- 5 533 Hens, M. and Merckx, R. (2002) The role of colloidal particles in the speciation and analysis
6 534 of “dissolved” phosphorus. *Water Research* 36 1483–1492.
7 535
- 8 536 Hogan M.C. (2014) Water pollution.
9 537 Retrieved from <http://www.eoearth.org/view/article/156920>.
10 538
- 11 539 Houhou J., Lartiges B.S., Hofmann A., Frappier G., Ghanbaja J. and Temgoua A. (2009)
12 540 Phosphate dynamics in an urban sewer: A case study of Nancy, France. *Water Research*,
13 541 1088–1100.
14 542
- 15 543 Jarvie H.P., Withers J.A. and Neal C. (2002) Review of robust measurement of phosphorus in
16 544 river water: sampling, storage, fractionation and sensitivity. *Hydrology and Earth System
17 545 Sciences Discussions*, Copernicus Publications, 6 (1), 113-131.
18 546
- 19 547 Jarvie H.P., Whitton B.A. and Neal C. (1998) Nitrogen and phosphorus in east coast British
20 548 rivers: speciation, sources and biological significance. *Science of the Total Environment*
21 549 210/211, 79-109.
22 550
- 23 551 Jarvie H.P., Neal C. and Withers P.J.A. (2006) Sewage-effluent phosphorus: A greater risk to
24 552 river eutrophication than agricultural phosphorus? *Science of the Total Environment*, 360,
25 553 246– 253.
26 554
- 27 555 Kelly, M.G., Adams C., Graves A.C., Jamieson J., Krokowski K., Lycett E.B., Murray Bligh
28 556 J., Pritchard S. and Wilkins C. (2001) *The Trophic Diatom Index. A User’s Manual*, R&D
29 557 Report E2/TR2, ISBN: 1-857-05597-7. Environment Agency, Bristol, UK.
30 558
- 31 559 McKelvie I.D., Peat D.M.W. and Worsfold P.J. (1995) Techniques for the quantification and
32 560 speciation of phosphorus in natural waters. *Analytical Proceedings Including Analytical
33 561 Communications*, 32, 437-445.
34 562
- 35 563 Millier H.K.G.R and Hooda P.S. (2011) Phosphorus species and fractionation: Why sewage
36 564 derived phosphorus is a problem. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 92, 1210-1214.
37 565
- 38 566 Neal C., Jarvie H., Howarth S.M., Whitehead P., Williams R., Neal N., Harrow M. and
39 567 Wickham H. (2000) The water quality of the River Kennet: initial observations on a lowland
40 568 chalk stream impacted by sewage inputs and phosphorus remediation. *The Science of the
41 569 Total Environment*, 251/252, 477-495.
42 570
- 43 571 Neal C., Jarvie H., Love A., Neal M., Love A., Hill L., and Wickham H. (2005) Water quality
44 572 of treated sewage effluent in a rural area of the upper Thames Basin, southern England, and
45 573 the impacts of such effluents on riverine phosphorus concentrations. *Journal of Hydrology*,
46 574 304, 103–117.
47 575

58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

576 Neal C., Jarvie H., Love A., Neal M., Harman S., and Wickham H. (2008) Water quality
1 577 along a river continuum subject to point and diffuse sources. *Journal of Hydrology*, 350, 154–
2 578 165.
3 579

4 580 Neal C., Jarvie H., Williams R., Neal M., Love A., Harman S., Wickham H. and Armstrong
5 581 L. (2010) Declines in phosphorus concentration in the upper River Thames (UK): Links to
6 582 sewage effluent cleanup and extended end-member mixing analysis. *Science of the Total*
7 583 *Environment* 408 (2010) 1315–1330.
8 584

9 585 Omoike A.L. and Vanloon G.W. (1999) Removal of phosphorus and organic matter removal
10 586 by alum during wastewater treatment. *Wat. Res.* Vol. 33, No. 17, pp. 3617-3627.
11 587

12 588 Palmer-Felgate E.J., Jarvie H., Williams R., Mortimer R., Loewenthal M. and Neal C. (2008)
13 589 Phosphorus dynamics and productivity in a sewage-impacted lowland chalk stream. *Journal*
14 590 *of Hydrology*, 351, 87– 97.
15 591

16 592 Stutter M.I., Demars B.O.L and Langan S.J. (2010) River phosphorus cycling: Separating
17 593 biotic and abiotic uptakeduring short-term changes in sewage effluent loading. *water*
18 594 *research*, 44, 4425-4436.
19 595

20 596 Jarvie H.P., Withers, P.A and Neal, C. (2002) Review of robust measurement of phosphorus
21 597 in river water: sampling, storage, fractionation and sensitivity *Hydrology and Earth System*
22 598 *Sciences* 6. (1) 113 – 132.
23 599

24 600 Murphy, J., and J.P. Riley.(1962). A modified single solution method for the determination of
25 601 phosphate in natural waters. *Anal.Chim.Acta* 27:31-36.
26 602 SCA (Standing Committee of Analysts) Method A - Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1992).
27 603 *Methods for the examination of waters and associated materials: phosphorus and silicon in*
28 604 *waters, effluents and sludges.* London: HMSO. 1992. 64 p ISBN 0117523771
29 605

30 606 UKTAG (2006) UK Environmental Standards and Conditions, (Phase 1). Draft provided to
31 607 groups and organisations for review and comment. (SR1 – 2006), January 2006.
32 608

33 609 UKTAG (2012) A revised approach to setting Water Framework Directive phosphorus
34 610 standards. UK Technical Advisory Group, October 2012.
35 611

36 612 UKWIR (2012) Phosphorus Contributions from WwTW Discharges to Watercourses and
37 613 their Long Term Impacts Relative to Other Sources (12/WW/20/5). ISBN:1 84057 652 9.
38 614 UKWIR, London, UK.
39 615

40 616 WERF (2014) Phosphorus fractionation and removal in wastewater treatment: implications
41 617 for minimizing effluent phosphorus. Water Environment Research Foundation report
42 618 NUTR1R061.
43 619

44 620 WFD (2013) Updated Recommendations on Phosphorus Standards for Rivers, River Basin
45 621 Management (2015-2021) Final Report. August 2013.
46 622

47 623 Wu H., Ikeda-Ohno A., Wang Y. And Waite D. (2015) Iron and phosphorus speciation in Fe-
48 624 conditioned membrane bioreactor activated sludge. *Water Research*, 76, 213-226.
49 625
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

626 Xu Y., Hu H., Liu J., Lou J., Qian G. and Wang A. (2015) pH dependent phosphorus release
1 627 from waste activated sludge: contributions of phosphorus speciation. Chemical Engineering
2 628 Journal, 267, 260-265.
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65