

Acute ecotoxicity of effluents: comparing different wastewater treatments

Gabriela Cristina Fonseca Almeida¹ and Gisela de A. Umbuzeiro¹ ¹School of Technology, University of Campinas, Limeira, SP, Brazil.

Emerging pollutants and managing wastewater and waste

INTRODUCTION & AIM

The discharge of domestic, municipal and industrial effluents is usually the main source of aquatic toxicity observed in surface waters. One way to evaluate the quality of those effluents is to evaluate them using aquatic species. The objective of this work was to compare the acute toxicity of effluents from four Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) with different levels of treatment.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

- Effluent samples were collected from three of Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) with secondary treatment (named, A, B and C) and one (named, D) with tertiary treatment (Table I);
- Six monthly campaigns were carried and samples were collected before and after chlorination, when applicable;
- Acute test tests were performed with *Daphnia similis* (OECD 202 and ABNT NBR 12713).

Table I. WWTPs whose final effluents were sampled and types of treatment used.

WWTPs	TYPE OF TREATMENT
Α	Reactors as treatment followed by activated sludge and decant
В	Biological treatment (batch activated sludge) and disinfection w
C	Reactors followed by anoxic chamber, submerged aerated be decanter and disinfection with sodium hypochlorite
D (RWPS ^a)	Biological reactors with membranes (Membrane Bio Reactor, phosphorus removal followed by filter membrane

^a reuse water production station

Source: Personal Communication from WWTPS technicians.







Gabriela Cristina Fonseca Almeida. Acute ecotoxicity of effluents: comparing different wastewater treatments, UNICAMP – Brazil

ation

with sodium hypochlorite piological filter, secondary

MBR) with nitrogen and

activated sludge (Table II).

EC50, 48H EXPRESS % (CONFIDENCE INTERVAL)								
WWTPs	CAMPAINGS							
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Α	Not toxic	77% (60,56-97,99)	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic		
В								
(pre- chlorination)	93,5% (86,84-100,63)	91,8% (86,25-97,77)	62,7% (58,11-67,78)	100% (not calculated)	90% (83,01-97,73)	60,8% (55,22-67,04)		
(post- chlorination)	95,1% (not calculated)	Toxic 25% effect at maximum concentration	63,8% (58,83-69,31)	_b _	88% (84,80-91,69)	75,4% (69,88-81,34)		
C (pre- chlorination)	Not toxic	Toxic 25% effect at maximum concentration	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic		
(post- chlorination)	Not toxic	Toxic (<6,75%)	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic		
D (RWPS ^a)	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic	Not toxic		

^a reuse water production station ^{sample} not collected

effluents generated by different treatment technologies.







RESULTS

The only treatment that provided non toxic efffuents to *D. similis* was WWTP D which applies tertiary treatment. The worst scenario was the WWTP B, which uses batch

The results showed that applicability of aquatic biossays to evalutate the quality of

