

Microplastics Removal Through Water Treatment Plants- Current Knowledge and Future Directions

A Presentation by: Yasemin Kunukcu Roux Associates, Inc.





Microplastics in the News



As playoffs part

of growing up

Excusal of black jurors ruled legal

The study represents the most comprehensive look at microplasts California. The work is unique in quantifying just how much plastic oplitation comes from stormwarder runoff. The researchers estimate the rain is washing 300 times more plastic into the water than what enti-through severs and servage treatment plasts.

rehensive look at microelastics i

can give off plastic particles, that can end up in the oce

Particles of debris from car tyres are ending up in the ocean as "plastic soup", conservationists warn.

Microplastics from tyres and textiles are a bigger source of marine pollution than



Today's Topic

Overview: Microplastics in Water Treatment Plants

Removal with Conventional Water Treatment Technologies

Removal with Emerging Treatment Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Wastes

Challenges and Data Gaps



Today's Topic

Overview: Microplastics in Water Treatment Plants

Removal with Conventional Technologies

Removal with Emerging Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Wastes

Challenges and Data Gaps

How Do Microplastics Enter Water Treatment Plants?



Domestic liquid and soild wastes

Shen et al., 2020

ROUX



Removal with Conventional Treatment Technologies

Removal with Emerging Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Systems

Challenges and Data Gaps

Conventional Wastewater Treatment ROUX Plants



Conventional Drinking Water Treatment Plants



ROUX



Challenges Encountered



To interfere with the disinfection process by protecting bacteria or consuming disinfectants.

Microplastics Removal in Wastewater ROUX Treatment Plants



Source: Renee Lu, modified from Ali et al. (2021)

Unaccounted Microplastics in ROUX Wastewater Sludge: Where Do They Go?



Microplastic Removal in Drinking Water Treatment Plants

Comparison of microplastics removal efficiency with other studies.

Country	Raw water	System steps	MP size	MP (items/L)		Removal	Referenc	(A) 3% ^{4%} (B) _{9%} ^{5%} ■ PE
				Raw water	Treated water	efficiency (%)		33% 31% ■ PP ■ PET
Czech Republic	Large reservoir	Coagulation/flocculation and sand filtration	0.2- <u>1</u> 00 µm	$\underline{1}473\pm34$	443 ± 10	70	Pivokon: et al. (20	56% 4% 53% 2% ■ PS
Czech Republic	Small reservoir	Coagulation/flocculation, sedimentation, sand and GAC filtration	do	1812 ± 35	338 ± 76	81	Pivokon: et al. (20	(C) 4% ^{7%} (D) ^{1%2%}
Czech Republic	River	Coagulation-flocculation, flotation, sand filtration and GAC filtration	do	3605 ± 497	628 ± 28	83	Pivokon: et al. (20	33% 46%
Germany	Ground water	Aeration and filtration	>20 µm	0–7 items/ m ³	0–3 items/ m ³	-	Minteniş (2019)	53% 3%
Czech Republic	Úhlava River at Milence	Coagulation, flocculation, s and filtration, CO_2 lime and CIO_2 treatment	1-100 µm	23 ± 2	14±1	39.13	Pivokon: et al. (20	8% (F) 4%
Czech Republic	Úhlava River at Plzeň	Lime milk, coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, KMO ₄ oxidation, sand filtration, ozonation, GAC filtration, UV treatment, CO ₂ lime and chlorine treatment	do	1296 ± 35	<u>151 ± 4</u>	88.34	Pivokon: et al. (20	44% 41%
China	Yangtze River	Coagulation/flocculation, sedimentation, sand filtration, ozonation combined with GAC filtration	1-100 µm	6614±1132	930 ± 72	82.1-88.6	Wang et (2020)	51% 54%
India	Ganga River	Chlorination, coagulation, pulse clarification and sand filtration	25-100 µm	17.86 ± 2.66	2.75 ± 0.92	85.39	Present :	Percentage distribution of plastic types (PE, PP, PET, PS and others) at the different water treatment steps (A. Raw water: B.

D.J.Sharkar et al., 2021

Percentage distribution of plastic types (PE, PP, PET, PS and others) at the different water treatment steps (A. Raw water; B. Pre-disinfection; C. Flocculation; D. Pulse clarification; E. above Sand filtration



Removal with Conventional Technologies

Removal with Emerging Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Systems

Challenges and Data Gaps



Selected Emerging Technologies



A. Electrocoagulation

- i. Laboratory Scale
- ii. Optimum removal efficiency~99.24% (Perren et al., 2018)
- **B.** Magnetic Extraction
 - i. Better removal of small MPs (<20 µm)
 - ii. Suitable for drinking water treatment and not preferred for sediment
- **C.** Membrane Separation
 - i. Fouling
- D. Sol-Gel Method

Shen et al., 2020



Removal with Conventional Technologies

Removal with Emerging Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Systems

Challenges and Data Gaps

Management of Water Treatment ROUX Wastes



1 Dahhou et al, 2018 2 Cremades et al., 2018 3 Rodriguez et al., 2010 4 Mohamedou et al., 2010 5 Arola et al, 2019



Removal with Conventional Technologies

Removal with Emerging Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Systems

Challenges and Data Gaps



Key Challenges and Knowledge Gaps

- No two WWTPs are identical:
 - -Connectivity of wastewater system
 - Wastewater treatment processes
 - -Sludge treatment process
- Sources of microplastics to WWTPs



- Effect of different wastewater and sludge treatment processes
- Lacking standardized methodologies
- A full-size distribution of plastic particles in sludge



Removal with Conventional Treatment Technologies

Removal with Emerging Technologies

Management of Water Treatment Systems

Challenges and Data Gaps



- Efficiency of microplastics removal
- Range of compositions in the effluent of WWTPs
- Gaps related to the efficiency of treatment technologies
- More research related to the fate of MPs in the WTPs as wells as technologies removing MPs



What do all these things have in common?



ROUX

E-mail: ykunukcu@rouxinc.com