

Acknowledgements

We thank Kemira Kemi AB of Helsingborg, Sweden, for their generosity in sponsoring this study. In particular, we are grateful to Henrik Skiöldebrand, Ilkka Renvall and Dr Ingemar Karlsson for their help and support. A great debt of gratitude is owed to the 17 scientists from eight European countries who took part in the Delphi consultation process, but who must remain anonymous under the terms of the Delphi procedure. Most of the scientists were visited personally by the authors to discuss their responses to the questionnaires and we thank them for their time and hospitality. On this occasion, too, we have asked Professor Nigel Bell of Imperial College London to act as an independent "auditor" for the Delphi panel, to scrutinise the recruitment of scientists to the panel and to verify the consultation procedures. Professor Bell was one of the original Delphi panel of British scientists whose views were solicited for "The Phosphate Report", published in January 1994, and we thank him most warmly for assuming the role of "scientific auditor" in this present study. We also wish to record our thanks to Dr Jan Hultgren of Stockholm Vatten, Dr Karl-Axel Melkersson, and Mr R. P. Earthy of Wessex Water for assisting us with information and practical guidance during the course of preparing this report.

Bob Wilson
Bryn Jones

May 1995

THE SWEDISH PHOSPHATE REPORT
A DELPHI STUDY TO COMPARE THE ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACTS OF DETERGENT BUILDERS IN NORDIC COUNTRIES
AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SUSTAINABLE
MANAGEMENT OF FRESHWATER RESOURCES IN EUROPE

R. Wilson & B. Jones

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the **British Library**

ISBN 0 9525639 0 8

© Landbank Environmental Research and Consulting,
1995

L A N K



B A N K

This report may not be reproduced in whole or part except
by express written permission of
Landbank Environmental Research and Consulting

Contents

Part 1: Introduction and Executive Summary	1
Part 2: The Delphi study and model of environmental impacts	9
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 The Delphi study	11
2.2.1 Panel selection	11
2.2.2 The task	13
2.2.3 Analysis of initial questionnaires	17
2.2.4 First and second iterations	19
2.2.5 Comparison of panel results	19
2.3 Fitting response curves	32
2.4 A small survey of European treatment works	41
2.4.1 Questionnaire response rates	41
2.4.2 Location	42
2.4.3 Plant details	42
2.4.4 Influent rates	42
2.4.5 Removal rates	42
2.4.6 Sludges	43
2.4.7 Receiving waters	43
2.4.8 Other published data	43
2.5 The model	48
2.5.1 Calculating an overall index for a scenario	48
2.5.2 Inputs to the model	52
2.5.3 Results	57
2.5.4 Sensitivity analysis	65
2.5.5 A comparison with the original Phosphate Report	69
Part 3: Discussion and conclusions	71
3.1 Conserving freshwater resources	72
3.2 A new climate of opinion in Europe	77
3.3 A sustainable wastewater treatment régime	80
3.4 Wastewater purification	83
3.5 Producing clean sludge	89
3.6 Sweden as a model for Europe	102
3.7 Changing perceptions of phosphorus	114
3.8 Conclusions and recommendations	120

Figures

2.2.1	Basic scenario treatment plant	14
2.2.2	Example of a recording grid	15
2.2.3	Example of a feedback response curve for Nordic Panel	17
2.2.4	Example of a feedback graph	18
2.2.5	Nordic and European response curves for phosphorus in lowland lakes	20
2.2.6	Nordic and European response curves for phosphorus in upland lakes	20
2.2.7	Impacts of phosphorus content of sludges used in agriculture	22
2.2.8	Section W1: Phosphorus concentration by location of receiving waters	24
2.2.9	Section W2: Zeolite A concentration by location of receiving waters	25
2.2.10	Section W3: Polycarboxylate concentration by location of receiving waters	26
2.2.11	Section S1: Phosphorus content by use of sludge	27
2.2.12	Section S2: Zeolite A content by use of sludge	28
2.2.13	Section S3: Polycarboxylate content by use of sludge	29
2.2.14	Section S4: Heavy metal content by use of sludge	30
2.2.15	Section S5: Calorific value against incineration type	31
2.2.16	Section S6: Sludge volumes	31
2.3.1	A comparison of response curves calculated using medians and trimmed means	32
2.3.2	Actual and fitted values for phosphorus concentrations in water	33
2.3.3	Response curves for zeolite concentrations in water	34
2.3.4	Response curves for polycarboxylate concentrations in water	35
2.3.5	Response curves for phosphorus in sludges	36
2.3.6	Response curves for zeolite in sludges	36
2.3.7	Response curves for polycarboxylates in sludges	37
2.3.8	Response curves for heavy metals in sludges	38
2.3.9	Response curves for calorific values of sludges	38
2.3.10	Response curve for sludge volumes	39
2.5.1	Overview of general method for calculating an overall index	50
3.1	Available water in 19 developing countries	75
3.2	The cycle of photosynthesis and respiration	80
3.3	Waste/wastewater cycle	80
3.4	Wastewater/sludge cycle	80
3.5	Stages in a modern wastewater treatment plant	88
3.6	Thermal treatment of sludge	96
3.7	Cadmium concentration in sludge, 1970-1993, at Bromma works	104
3.8	New technologies in the Netherlands: Vertech and Crystalactor	110
3.9	Wastewater treatment in well-populated parts of Sweden	111

Tables

1.1	Overall indices of environmental damage for Sweden and the UK	5
1.2	Index of environmental damage for five countries	6
2.2.1	Invitations and acceptances to the Nordic panel	12
2.2.2	Invitations and acceptances to the 'European' panel	12
2.2.3	Parameters and values used in Delphi study	16
2.2.4	Ratio of upland lake indices compared with lowland lake at same concentration	17
2.3.1	Parameters describing curves for phosphorus disposal to water	33
2.3.2	Parameters describing curves for zeolite A disposal to water	34
2.3.3	Parameters describing curves for polycarboxylates disposal to water	35
2.3.4	Parameters describing curves for phosphorus in sludges	36
2.3.5	Parameters describing curves for zeolite in sludges	36
2.3.6	Parameters describing curves for polycarboxylates in sludges	37
2.3.7	Parameters describing curves for heavy metals in sludges	37
2.3.8	Parameters describing curves for calorific values of sludges	38
2.3.9	Parameters and values for 'none-zero' judges	39
2.4.1	Response rates for the survey	41
2.4.2	Responses by type of receiving water	41
2.4.3	Summary of details of plants returning questionnaires	42
2.4.4	Influent rates to treatment plants in sample	43
2.4.5	Removal rates in treatment plants in sample	43
2.4.6	Sludge content and disposal routes	44
2.4.7	Receiving waters and phosphorus contributions	44
2.4.8	Some phosphorus concentrations in Nordic watercourses	45
2.4.9	Some phosphorus concentrations in European watercourses	46
2.5.1	Calculations and sources of average daily usage inputs	53
2.5.2	Derivation of inputs for treatment systems	54
2.5.3	Derivation of inputs for receiving waters	56
2.5.4	Derivation of inputs for sludge use	56
2.5.5	The model for Denmark	59
2.5.6	The model for Finland	60
2.5.7	The model for Norway	61
2.5.8	The model for Sweden	62
2.5.9	The model for the UK	63
2.5.10	A summary of the main indices for the five countries studied	64
2.5.11	Ratio of 'All-P' to 'As-is' indices for each country	58